

Expanding our Understanding of Constructive Voice:
Accounting for Voice Function and Scope

by

Daniel Newton

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2018 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Jeffery A. LePine, Chair
Jennifer N. Craig
Edward Wellman

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2018

ABSTRACT

Constructive voice, the sharing of ideas or concerns that improve organizational functioning, is an important workplace behavior. Recent narrative reviews of constructive voice have highlighted the importance of accounting for different types of voice. Initial efforts to explain the type of constructive voice have focused on voice function, and distinguished constructive voice as promotive or prohibitive in nature. Yet, research findings regarding relationships between promotive and prohibitive voice and antecedents of constructive voice reveal inconsistencies that suggest that our theoretical understanding is incomplete. In this dissertation, I argue that in addition to distinguishing constructive voice as to its function (i.e., promotive voice and prohibitive voice), it is also important to distinguish constructive voice as to its scope (i.e., the number of different issues expressed by employees). By accounting for the function *and* scope of voice, I develop four specific types of constructive voice (i.e., championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling) and conduct two studies wherein I establish construct validity and test differences in antecedent and outcome relationships with the specific types of voice. I first focus on scale development: generating items and assessing content validity. In Study 1, I test the factor structure of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, and the nomological network of the measures. My second study is a field study of 251 employees in an insurance company and manufacturing facility. In Study 2 I test the criterion-related validity of the measures and explore the implications of voice scope. The research reported in my dissertation contributes to our understanding of constructive voice, and following from this, facilitates further theoretical and practical advances as to when employees who voice may be heard and when they may be tuned out.

DEDICATION

*To Jedda
The best champion*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I honestly cannot believe I have somehow come this far in my academic journey. It is clear to me that I would not be here without the support, encouragement, and kindness of so many—individuals for whom I will be forever grateful.

First is my committee. Jeff, you have been the perfect mentor. You have invested countless hours teaching, training, and reassuring me. I appreciate your patience as I have slowly learned to be more critical and better close my arguments. I suspect that when I reflect on my PhD experience in twenty years, I'll remember conducting "OB in space" and the many meals shared at BLVD! Jennifer, I have said this to you many times, but you're the type of scholar and person I want to be. Thank you for helping me put things in perspective, listening to my ideas, and making me feel like I can make it as a scholar. Ned, I met you my first day on campus, and you helped me hit the ground running. Thank you for going to bat for me and encouraging me to take a long view of the profession and not get discouraged with temporary setbacks.

Second is the support of all my fellow students, whose daily interactions I will miss. Melissa, Ji, and Hudson: your friendship and support have been invaluable.

Third is my family. Thank you Sam, Jessica and Tim, and mom and dad for your support and faith during the difficult steps in this process. To my children: I thank you for being so willing to try a new adventure. Thank you for praying for me and my success at school. To my wife: Jedda, I could not have done this without you. You have sacrificed many things to pursue this degree. Yet you have never complained and instead have carried a crushing burden with unfailing optimism. Thank you for being a sounding board and constant cheerleader. I honor you and cherish your companionship and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Overview of Promotive and Prohibitive Voice	9
Hirschman and EVLN Voice	10
Roots of Prohibitive Voice	12
Roots of Promotive Voice	14
The Nomological Network of Constructive Voice	16
3 THEORY AND HYPOTHESES	24
Voice Scope	25
Integrating Promotive and Prohibitive Voice with Voice Scope	26
Similarities Among Antecedents of Voice	35
Differences Among Antecedents of Voice: A Regulatory Focus View	38
Differences Among Antecedents of Voice: A Control Theory View	45
Consequences of Voice	50
4 METHODS	59
Scale Development	59
Study 1: Factor Structure and Nomological Network	70
Study 2: Field Study	76
5 RESULTS	81

CHAPTER	Page
Study 1 Analysis: Factor Structure and Nomological Network	81
Study 2 Analysis: Field Study	91
6 DISCUSSION	100
Summary of Results	100
Theoretical and Empirical Implications	106
Limitations.....	111
Practical Implications.....	114
Conclusion.....	116
REFERENCES.....	117
APPENDIX	
A IRB APPROVAL	169
B SCALE DEVELOPMENT STUDY SURVEY ITEMS	172
C FIELD STUDY SURVEY ITEMS	182

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Framework of Constructive Voice Types.....	140
2. Summary of Hypotheses	141
3. Item Generation Assessment.....	142
4. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities of Study 1 Variables.....	150
5. Constructive Voice Items and Factor Loadings	153
6. Convergent Validity CFAs of Constructive Voice Models (Study 1).....	154
7. Discriminant Validity CFAs of Constructive Voice Models (Study 1).....	155
8. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 2 and 3 (Study 1).....	156
9. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 4-9 (Study 1)	157
10. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 10-12 (Study 1)	158
11. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 13-17 (Study 1)	159
12. Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities of Study 2 Variables.....	160
13. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 2 and 3 (Study 2).....	163
14. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 4-9 (Study 2)	164
15. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 10-12 (Study 2)	165
16. Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 13-17 (Study 2)	166
17. Summary of Hypothesized Findings.....	167

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since Hirschman's (1970) foundational work nearly five decades ago, scholars have examined the voice behavior of employees. *Constructive voice*, or the sharing of ideas, suggestions, or concerns that improve organizational functioning (Detert & Burris, 2007; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), is an important workplace behavior. For employees, the sharing of ideas can help prompt needed change in their work sphere. Employees who voice tend to be more satisfied in their jobs relative to those who do not (Burris, 2012), and are seen as more effective contributors in their jobs and organizations (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008).

Organizations and work groups also rely on employees' constructive voice to help facilitate the sharing of knowledge and information that can foster greater learning, high quality decisions, and lead to valuable improvements in working conditions and performance (Li, Liao, Tangirala, & Firth, 2017; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011; Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

Recent narrative reviews of voice have called for scholars to decompose voice, specifically with respect to understanding the function of voice employed (e.g., Morrison 2011, 2014). As a recent response to such calls, Maynes and Podsakoff (2014) offered a four-factor model of speaking up: constructive voice (i.e., speaking up with ideas or concerns to enact organizational change), supportive voice (i.e., speaking out in defense of organizational practices), destructive voice (i.e., expressing critical or overtly negative comments about the way things are done at work), and defensive voice (i.e., verbally opposing changes to the organizational status quo). Yet the majority of research on voice

has focused on constructive voice—and with good reason—as it appears to have the potential to most significantly impact individual and organizational performance (Van Dyne, Cummings, & McLean-Parks, 1995), the most important criterion variable to management and organizational scholars (Austin & Villanova, 1992). Hence the focus of my research centers on constructive voice.

Examples of constructive voice may include providing a specific solution to operate more efficiently, suggesting creative ideas for improved organizational functioning, calling attention to a specific critical problem that needs to be remedied, or communicating worries about the way things are done (Morrison, 2011). As these examples reveal, there appear to be different types of constructive voice. In fact, scholars have suggested that constructive voice can be distinguished as to whether it is intended to serve a promotive or prohibitive function (Liang, Farh, and Farh, 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). *Promotive voice* refers to the expression of ideas and suggestions that affect how future actions or changes could be implemented to improve organizational functioning (Liang et al., 2012). *Prohibitive voice* refers to communicating concern about problems or practices that could potentially harm organizational functioning if left unresolved (Liang et al., 2012). In contrast to promotive voice, prohibitive voice is preventative in nature in that it seeks to prevent negative organizational practices from occurring or continuing to occur (Van Dyne et al., 1995). The conceptual distinctions between promotive and prohibitive voice have been an important step forward in distilling the different functions of constructive voice.

Despite the additional refinement of constructive voice into its promotive and prohibitive forms, a certain level of ambiguity may linger in our understanding. First,

although research on constructive voice has provided valuable insights as to a comprehensive set of antecedents and consequences (e.g., Morrison, 2014), meta-analytic results revealed “no obvious pattern” in the similarities and differences of antecedent associations with promotive and prohibitive voice (Chamberlin, Newton, & LePine, 2017, p. 27). Although resolving these inconsistencies is not the primary focus of my dissertation, these clouded results—where it is unclear what factors drive promotive or prohibitive voice—may be a signal that the two types of constructive voice could be further refined.

Second, and perhaps a more critical point, although a sizeable empirical literature on constructive voice exists (e.g., Chamberlin et al., 2017; Morrison, 2014), the conceptual underpinnings of voice are somewhat ambiguous as to the meaning of variance in the construct. In other words, despite the development of a robust literature, our conceptualization of constructive voice is not entirely clear about distinctions between how high levels of voice are manifest. Scholars have been virtually silent on the potential patterns of employee voice behavior: whether employees speak up about many different issues or whether they focus on a certain issue and repeatedly bring up that issue. By ignoring this potentially central distinction in voice, the underlying assumption in the literature appears to be that the range of topics employees express is irrelevant and has little theoretical or practical value. Yet exploring the implications of repeating the same idea or problem appears to be an important question to address. It may be that voice targets view employees who repeatedly express an issue as akin to the voicer “crying wolf,” with negative consequences as they tune out the voicer. Or, repeating an issue may have positive outcomes as voice targets acquiesce so that a voicer will stop raising the

issue. Thus research that explores differences in effects of speaking up repeatedly would shed light on unclear but important implications as to whether constructive voice is tuned out or heard.

In addition to an incomplete theoretical picture that neglects the scope of ideas and issues embedded in voice, current measures of constructive voice are also limited empirically. Research on constructive voice often operationalizes and measures the frequency of voice behavior that organizational leaders observe in their subordinates (e.g., Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013; Detert & Burris, 2007; Grant, 2013; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012). But such measurement does not account for the possibility that employees may speak up on a narrow or wide number of different topics. For example, two employees may speak up frequently with promotive voice: one speaks up about the same idea over and over again whereas the other speaks up about many different ideas. Although the frequency and ratings of promotive voice (utilizing existing measures) would be consistent across these two individuals, our current theorizing has no means to differentiate between the two. As these examples indicate, our understanding of constructive voice would be enhanced with additional construct refinement, as clearly conceptualizing constructs is an important step for knowledge to accumulate (Suddaby, 2014).

My dissertation seeks to address these shortcomings in constructive voice by accounting for the scope of voice. Throughout this dissertation, I refer to the *scope* of voice as the number of different issues that employees express. The scope of voice may be quite narrow or it may be very wide. On the one hand is *voice concentration*: individuals may repeatedly express the same idea, same issue, or a narrow number of

ideas or issues. On the other hand is *voice breadth*: employees may speak up with a broad variety of ideas and issues. Although the voice literature has yet to directly consider the scope of voice, examining the degree to which promotive and prohibitive voice vary between voice concentration and voice breadth appears to present a productive means to clarify how constructive voice may operate. When crossing promotive and prohibitive voice with the scope of voice, I argue that four specific types of constructive voice emerge: championing (concentration of promotive voice), initiating (breadth of promotive voice), alarming (concentration of prohibitive voice), and patrolling (breadth of prohibitive voice). These four types of voice share some conceptual similarities with, but are ultimately distinct from existing constructs such as issue selling (Dutton & Ashford, 1993), championing (Howell & Higgins, 1990), creativity (Zhou & George, 2001), whistleblowing (Near & Miceli, 1985), upward dissent (Kassing, 1998), and complaining (Kowalski, 1996).

The purpose of my dissertation is to theoretically and empirically refine the constructs of promotive voice and prohibitive voice by introducing the notion of voice scope. Specifically, I identify and develop measures for four types of voice behaviors—championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling—and differential effects on outcomes such as voice endorsement, liking, listening, promotability, and performance. Employees who speak up about a concentrated number of ideas with promotive voice over and over again may be viewed as idea champions for their suggestions (e.g., Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Howell & Boies, 2004; Howell & Higgins, 1990; Van de Ven, 1986), whereas those who repeatedly speak up on a concentrated number of issues or problems with prohibitive voice may be viewed as alarmists who dissent or blow the whistle on

undesirable conditions or behavior in the organization (e.g., Kassing, 2002; Near & Miceli, 1985; Miceli & Near, 1985). Employees who speak up with promotive voice on a broad array of different issues may be seen big-picture thinkers who initiate and generate many novel ideas (e.g., Baas, De Dreu, & Nijstad, 2008; Benne & Sheats, 1948; Kanter, 1988; Zhou & George, 2001), whereas those who speak up with prohibitive voice on a broad variety of different issues could be seen as organizational watch dogs who patrol the organization in efforts to identify organizational problems that need to be addressed (e.g., Alicke et al., 1992; Heck, Bedeian, & Day, 2005). Guided by theories of self-regulation (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998; Higgins, 1997, 1998), I argue that different dispositional antecedents may manifest differently in the four types of voice. And, perhaps more importantly, I show differential reactions from coworkers and supervisors to the different types of voice that suggests when and why voice may be disregarded or heard.

Taken together, this dissertation seeks to make three contributions. First, I suggest that the scope of voice is a critical consideration in our conceptualization of constructive voice. That is, I expand the theoretical domain of the constructive voice construct by emphasizing the importance of understanding whether employees speak up about a variety of different ideas or concerns, or whether employees speak up and repeat the same idea or repeat the same concerning problem. In the process of introducing the scope of voice, I also provide an organizing framework of constructive voice that brings together various ways of “speaking up” that have been considered by previous scholars (e.g., Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Kassing, 2002; Near & Miceli, 1985; Zhou & George, 2001). In turn, the types of voice captured in the organizing framework—championing,

initiating, alarming, and patrolling—directly capture voice phenomenon that actually occur in the workplace. Finally, by bringing the scope of voice to the forefront, I highlight important implications to how voicers are viewed by peers and supervisors, and whether voicers’ ideas or concerns are implemented or ignored. Understanding when voicers are heard could shed light on reactions to voice and even strategies voicers could utilize to have their ideas heard.

In addition to the theoretical advances in introducing the scope of voice, I also provide measures scholars can utilize in their future empirical work. To ensure my proposed constructs and measures are unique, I conduct a detailed literature review and analysis of existing voice measures, and find that existing voice measures are deficient in regards to the scope of voice. In response to this deficiency, I develop items for championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, which measures incorporate the scope of voice with the promotive and prohibitive distinction articulated by Liang and colleagues (2012). By conceptualizing constructive voice as more refined than promotive and prohibitive voice, my work illustrates the distinction that not all promotive voice is the same and not all prohibitive voice is the same. The resulting theoretical broadening of voice and more precise empirical measures that I validate partially responds to Morrison’s (2014) call for “more fine-grained conceptualizations and operationalizations of voice when investigating antecedents and consequences” (p. 192).

Related to the previous point, I extend the voice literature in showing similarities and differences between championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling with antecedents and consequences. I provide evidence that key differential outcomes result from the four distinct types of voice. Specifically, I show that the different types of voice

influence whether voicers are “heard” by others and have their ideas endorsed (e.g., Burris, 2012), whether coworkers like employees that engage in different types of voice (e.g., Whiting, Maynes, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2012), and whether voicers are seen as good performers with greater or diminished opportunities for career advancement (e.g., Burris, 2012; Chamberlin et al., 2017).

My work also begins to suggest why some employees may be tuned out and have their voice ignored by coworkers and supervisors whereas other individuals are heard and more likely to receive opportunities for advancement in the organization. Even though each employee’s perspective is valid and important to hear, I argue that employees who utilize some types of voice may result in having their ideas ignored and even being passed up for a promotion. For instance, employees who speak up about many problems are likely to have their ideas ignored; further, supervisors are less likely to promote or listen to employees who repeat the same problem. In contrast, employees who speak up about many ideas are more likely to have those ideas endorsed, and employees who repeat the same idea are likely to be “heard” by supervisors. Thus, although each of the different types of constructive voice is important in its own way, the different types of voice may not always be appreciated by others in the organization.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following section, I first review the historical roots of constructive voice (via promotive voice and prohibitive voice), the empirical research that has shaped the nomological network of constructive voice, and some shortcomings in the current state of the literature. In so doing, I trace how constructive voice is currently conceptualized, how past scholars have viewed constructive voice, and how incorporating the scope of voice could increase our theoretical understanding of how constructive voice operates. I note that my review focuses on constructive voice and does not directly incorporate other types of voice recently advocated by Maynes and Podsakoff (2014): supportive voice (Burris, 2012; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003), destructive voice (Gorden, 1988), or defensive voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

Overview of Promotive and Prohibitive Voice

Constructive voice is the sharing of ideas, suggestions, or concerns that improve organizational functioning (Detert & Burris, 2007; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Recently, Liang, Farh, and Farh have noted that there are two types of constructive voice. On one hand is *promotive voice*: the expression of new ideas or suggestions that improve the functioning of the organization. On the other hand is *prohibitive voice*: employees' expression of concern about problematic work factors that may harm organizational functioning if unresolved. Both promotive voice and prohibitive voice can be considered constructive voice given that they are expressions of ideas or concerns that seek to improve organizational functioning (Chamberlin et al., 2017; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014).

Although the clarity and distinction between promotive and prohibitive voice is relatively recent, the roots of these two types of voice have a rich history. Promotive voice, or its variants, has been the predominant view in the literature over the last two decades with roots that can be traced back directly to the work of Van Dyne and LePine (1998) who operationalized a measure of promotive voice. In contrast, the roots of prohibitive voice can be traced back much further, directly to Hirschman's (1970) foundational work. Yet much less research has been conducted on prohibitive voice than promotive voice. Between 1970 and 1994, fewer than 15 management articles examined voice; this number would blossom to hundreds in the subsequent decades, likely due to Van Dyne and LePine's influential empirical work (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). In the sections that follow, I will overview the historical research on promotive and prohibitive voice. Given that prohibitive voice has the longest history, I will start with the seeds of prohibitive voice found in Hirschman's (1970) work, describe the shift in the literature in the mid-to-late-1990s to promotive voice, and then summarize the recent emphasis on both promotive and prohibitive voice seen in the current literature.

Hirschman and EVLN Voice

Albert Hirschman (1970) is widely acknowledged with laying the foundation for research on constructive voice through his political writings on exit, voice, and loyalty (e.g., Chamberlin et al., 2017; Detert & Burris, 2007; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Morrison, 2011). Hirschman framed exit, voice, and loyalty as potential behaviors individuals could engage in as a response to dissatisfying elements in their organizational or institutional environment. For instance, if an employee does not agree with organizational decisions or practices, the employee could choose to terminate

employment (i.e., exit), choose to vocalize concerns in order to try and make things right (i.e., voice), or “suffer in silence” (Hirschman, 1970, p. 38) and remain hopeful that things will improve (i.e. loyalty). From this perspective, voice is seen as a vocalized attempt directed towards higher authorities in order to change “an objectionable state of affairs” (p. 30) within an organization or larger institution. Hirschman also laid the groundwork that different types of voice exist. He argued that voice is a

“messy concept because it can be graduated, all the way from faint grumbling to violent protest; it implies articulation of one’s critical opinions rather than a private, ‘secret’ vote in the anonymity of the supermarket; and finally, it is direct and straightforward rather than roundabout. Voice is political action par excellence” (16).

Hirschman’s conceptualization of constructive voice inspired a stream of research that considered the elements of exit, voice, loyalty, and later neglect (i.e., withdrawing and avoiding the problem; Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992; Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn, 1982; Withey & Cooper, 1989). Early empirical articles utilizing the exit-voice-loyalty-neglect (EVLN) framework considered how individuals react to dissatisfying attributes of their organizational experience. EVLN research revealed that employees who voice tended to be more satisfied in their work, suggesting that they employed voice to remedy job elements they found dissatisfying (e.g., Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous, 1988; Withey & Cooper, 1989). Moreover, the EVLN view depicted voice as an active, constructive behavior (Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992; Rusbult et al., 1988). Although this line of research would wane, scholars do continue to draw upon the theoretical elements of the framework. More recent work has considered how the type of

voice influences the loyalty employees feel and whether their ideas are endorsed (Burris, 2012). Even at the strategic management level, research has employed Hirschman's view of voice to describe how shareholders can express discontent with public companies vis-à-vis proxy voting when electing firm directors (Hillman, Shropshire, Certo, Dalton, & Dalton, 2011).

Unfortunately, empirical support for constructive voice operationalized in EVLN studies has been mixed. EVLN studies of voice were plagued by poor psychometric properties, with Cronbach's alpha levels below .50 (e.g., Withey & Cooper, 1989; Rusbult et al., 1988). Although voice was clearly conceptualized—as voluntary constructive communication vocalized in response to dissatisfying factors in the workplace—measures of voice did not match the conceptualization and instead captured a wider range of proactive behaviors that subsequently did not reliably hang together (Morrison, 2014). Despite these shortcomings, this early voice research provided an important foundation that scholars could build on and refine. Furthermore, this need to refine our conceptualization of constructive voice along with the corresponding measures underlying the construct plays an important role in the accumulation of knowledge and continues to be an active component in the ongoing development of the voice literature (e.g., Burris, 2012; Liang et al., 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014).

Roots of Prohibitive Voice

Recognizing the shortcomings of the EVLN view of voice, Van Dyne, Cummings, and McLean Parks (1995) directly addressed the conceptualization of constructive voice and characterized the construct as one of many extra-role behaviors “which benefits the organization and/or is intended to benefit the organization, which is

discretionary and which goes beyond existing role expectations” (p. 218). Specifically, the authors suggested a typology of extra-role behaviors that would foreshadow later work on prohibitive and promotive voice (e.g., Liang et al., 2012) as well as work on affiliative and challenging behaviors (e.g., Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). On the one hand, Van Dyne et al. (1995) described prohibitive behaviors as behaviors that seek to stop or prevent wrong doing from taking place in contrast to promotive behaviors that encourage or cause something positive to occur. On the other hand, the authors described challenging behaviors that may disrupt social relationships because they may alter the status quo in contrast to affiliative behaviors (i.e., helping) that attempt to preserve and maintain social relationships.

In addition to what we now refer to as prohibitive voice (Liang et al., 2012), the conceptual boundaries of challenging-prohibitive speaking up behavior also include principled organizational dissent, whistleblowing, and EVLN voice (e.g., Graham, 1986, Near & Miceli, 1985; Withey & Cooper, 1989). With principled organizational dissent, employees can speak up to organizational leaders about some unethical or unsafe practice that threatens the status quo and violates their sense of justice or honesty (Graham, 1986; Kassing, 2002, 2005). Individuals who speak up and blow the whistle report to internal or external parties about illegal, immoral, or illegitimate wrongdoing they observe (Near & Miceli, 1985). Finally, as previously discussed, employees may speak up because they are generally dissatisfied with the way things are done in their work team or organization (Farrell, 1983). Each of these speaking up types can be characterized as prohibitive in function in that the speaking up behavior seeks to right some sort of organizational wrong

that an employee finds dissatisfying, harmful, or immoral (Chamberlin et al., 2017; Liang et al., 2012; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

As mentioned, empirical examination of prohibitive ways of speaking up occurred quite slowly (Liang et al., 2012), perhaps due to inadequate measures (e.g., Withey & Cooper, 1989). Still, the early research on EVLN voice and the prohibitive extra-role behaviors of principled organizational dissent and whistleblowing laid the groundwork for the conceptualization of prohibitive voice—expressions of existing or past concerns or problems that may hurt organizational functioning—offered by Liang et al. (2012). Thus employees can speak up about unjust procedures or practices they find disagreeable and, if implemented, would alter the status quo in a negative way (Graham, 1986). Or, if employees witness questionable behavior or wrongful practices that violate organizational norms and principles, they may escalate and share their concern with internal or external authorities (Near & Miceli, 1995). Furthermore, prohibitive voice typically contains a negative valence as individuals call out harmful and maybe even illegal aspects of the workplace that need to be addressed (Chamberlin et al., 2017). So even though individuals may engage in prohibitive voice with the best of intentions, the voice activates an increased sense of challenge that may disrupt interpersonal relations and cause the listening supervisor to feel threatened or defenseless (Liang et al., 2012). Despite these negative implications, prohibitive voice remains a crucial behavior that organizations, and even external constituents, depend on employees to utilize in order to share critical information and perspectives that help the organization avoid pitfalls and resolve important issues (Near & Miceli, 1995, 1996; Van Dyne et al., 1995).

Roots of Promotive Voice

In contrast to the conceptualization of prohibitive voice as a challenging extra-role behavior that seeks to prevent or resolve harm and wrongdoing, Van Dyne and colleagues (1995, 1998) described what they termed “voice” (and would later be more clearly labeled promotive voice; Liang et al., 2012) as a challenging promotive extra-role behavior wherein employees share ideas and suggestions intended to improve the organization. As an extra-role behavior, promotive voice is inherently proactive as individuals take initiative in altering the status quo (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Yet promotive voice is also challenging in that it may disrupt interpersonal relationships and “rock the boat” to some degree in the organization (Grant, 2013). Specifically, suggesting a different way of doing things may create tension or strain within the social system as individuals’ ideas for constructive change challenge the status quo or threaten managers’ credibility and way of doing things (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). In addition to its element of challenge, Van Dyne et al.’s (1995, 1998) view of voice also framed the construct as promotive in that it can prompt positive change to occur. As a promotive behavior, constructive suggestions question the way things are done and provide alternatives intended to improve the organizational status quo (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). In other words, this extra-role behavior view of voice is constructive in nature (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

Although subsequent scholarly work has provided variations on the conceptual definition of promotive voice provided by Van Dyne, Cummings, and McClean Parks (1995) and Van Dyne and LePine (1998), the common thread of subsequent research has been that promotive voice is a challenging promotive behavior (e.g., Chamberlin et al.,

2017; Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison, 2011). Furthermore, the slightly different labels of promotive voice that have been employed—OCB or extra-role behavior voice (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), prosocial voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003), and promotive voice (Liang et al., 2012)—are, from my perspective, conceptually and operationally equivalent in that they describe a constructive expression of ideas that promote changes to the organizational status quo. However, in order to be explicit as well as consistent with recent research, I refer to this predominant view of voice as *promotive voice* and utilize the definition of Liang et al. (2012): the expression of new ideas or suggestions that improve the functioning of the organization.

The Nomological Network of Constructive Voice

Building on my discussion of the historical roots of constructive voice and how the construct has evolved with its promotive and prohibitive functions, a natural next step is to review, in depth, the substantive relationships between voice and its antecedents and consequences. Schwab (1980) confirmed the importance of examining a construct's nomological network as a companion to construct validity efforts. He argued that “constructs are of interest only if they are connected to other constructs” (p. 6), and an imprecise conceptualization of constructs can lead to a misaligned understanding of the actual relationships with other constructs of interest. In order to adequately lay the foundation for my later construct validity efforts in incorporating the scope of voice, I next review the literature to date on constructive voice in order to provide a better sense of its nomological network.

Antecedents to voice. Scholarly efforts on constructive voice have focused on the antecedents that encourage individuals to engage in voice (Morrison, 2011). In her review of voice and silence, Morrison (2014) offered a most useful guide to structure antecedent factors that motivate or inhibit employee voice. Morrison suggested that antecedents can be grouped into the following categories: (a) individual dispositions, (b) job and organizational attitudes and perceptions, (c) emotions, beliefs, and schemas, (d) supervisor and leader behavior, and (e) other contextual factors. I utilize her structure to briefly review a few representative antecedents to voice.

Individual dispositions. Individual dispositions refer to individuals' tendencies, qualities, or characteristics that influence their behavior and that are relatively stable over time (Chernyshenko, Stark, & Drasgow, 2011; Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Some dispositional traits are more highly associated with constructive voice than other traits. Considering the Big-5 personality traits (Barrick & Mount, 1991), we can conceive how constructive voice is likely to come from individuals who like to talk and share ideas (i.e., extraversion), are persistent and strive for achievement (i.e., conscientiousness), and are open and looking for new ways of doing things (i.e., openness), and how constructive voice behavior would be less likely to be generated from individuals who are emotionally unstable and insecure with themselves and their opinions (i.e., neuroticism), or are social conformists who value cooperation instead of conflict (i.e., agreeableness). Empirical work has shown that extraversion and conscientiousness are positively related to promotive and prohibitive voice, neuroticism is negatively related to promotive and prohibitive voice, and agreeableness is negatively related to promotive voice and positively related to prohibitive voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Tucker, Chmiel,

Turner, Hershcovis, & Stride, 2008). As another example, employees' agentic, self-driven suggestions for how to alter the status quo are generally proactive in nature, as individuals extend themselves beyond their formally designated role (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Because some individuals have a tendency to look for opportunities to be proactive in making constructive changes (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Seibert, Crant, & Kraimer, 1999) or are more likely to take initiative to get involved (Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng, & Tag, 1997), research has shown that proactive personality and personal initiative influence individuals' promotive voice behavior (Crant, Kim, & Wang, 2011; Fuller, Marler, & Hester, 2006; Ohly, Sonnentag, & Pluntke, 2006). Of the individual dispositions in the literature, when applied to a relative weight analysis, meta-analytic work has demonstrated that personal initiative is the most influential dispositional factor that leads to constructive voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017).

Job and organizational attitudes and perceptions. Job attitudes are feelings or opinions that result from how individuals cognitively evaluate some target (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2012; Schleicher, Hansen, & Fox, 2011). As an example, research has shown that individuals who feel positive and satisfied with their work are more likely to speak up with promotive voice relative to those who do not (Burris, 2012; Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). However, research has demonstrated positive associations between job satisfaction and prohibitive voice (Thomas & Au, 2002; Withey & Cooper, 1989) as well as negative associations (Nikandrou & Papalexandris, 2008; Thomas & Pekerti, 2003). If individuals feel a sense of responsibility for how things are done at work as well as the ultimate success of the organization, then this felt obligation has been shown to motivate them to share their

ideas that improve the functioning of the organization (Choi, 2007; Liang et al., 2012; Lin & Johnson, 2015). Furthermore, the loyalty that employees feel to their organization is also important, particularly in the psychological connection or attachment they form to the workplace (i.e., affective commitment). As such, empirical research has shown that employees who feel a sense of commitment to their organizations are more likely to engage in higher levels of promotive voice and lower levels of prohibitive voice (e.g., Chamberlin et al., 2017; Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007; Sims & Keenan, 1998; Troster & van Knippenberg, 2012). Of these job attitudes considered in the voice literature to date, felt responsibility has been shown to be the most important attitude in influencing whether individuals will voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017).

Emotions, beliefs, and schemas. Constructive voice can be a risky behavior as it potentially calls into question the status quo and may disrupt interpersonal relationships (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Because there are risks embedded in speaking up, the more risky employees perceive the organizational environment, the less they will offer constructive ideas for change. Consequently, the degree that individuals perceive that it is safe for them to take risks such as speaking up (i.e., psychological safety; Edmondson, 1999), the more they have been shown to share their promotive thoughts and opinions (Burriss, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Liang et al., 2012). However, the need for psychological safety appears to be less salient for prohibitive voice, as the association is significantly lower than the association between promotive voice and psychological safety (Chamberlin et al., 2017; Liang et al., 2012). When employees evaluate their work environment as a safe and meaningful place for them to invest their personal energies, their sense of

engagement (Kahn, 1990; Rich, LePine, & Crawford, 2010) is positively related to their promotive voice (Cheng, Lu, Chang, & Johnstone, 2013; Wong, Spence Laschinger, & Cummings, 2010). Finally, when individuals perceive that their voice will fall on deaf ears or that speaking up will not result in any organizational change, then their perception of futility leads them to speak up less frequently—with either promotive or prohibitive voice (Burriss et al., 2008; Fast, Burriss, & Bartel, 2014; Tucker & Turner, 2011). Chamberlin et al.'s (2017) relative weight analysis showed that of these emotions, beliefs, and schemas, engagement and the degree to which individuals invest their personal resources into their work role is an important antecedent of voice.

Supervisor and leader behavior. Supervisor and leader behavior can foster the voice behavior of employees. Leaders are in a key organizational role regarding voice because they are frequently the target of employee voice and often in a position to endorse, implement, or escalate employees' ideas. It follows then that leaders can consult those around them, listen to their ideas as part of the decision-making process, and motivate others to complete their tasks effectively (Ashford, Sutcliffe, & Christianson, 2009; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012). As such, transformational leaders have been shown to bring out higher levels of employee promotive voice (Detert & Burriss, 2007; Zhang, LePine, Buckman, & Wei, 2014). Scholars have also found that leader openness can minimize power distance and leads to promotive voice behavior (Detert & Edmonson, 2011; Troster & van Knippenberg, 2012), although leader openness appears to be less critical for employees to speak up with prohibitive voice (e.g., Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003). Moreover, when leaders establish individualized relationships with employees built on trust and mutual respect,

then employees may feel more safe and inclined to share their ideas. In other words, leader-member exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) provides a supportive exchange relationship with the supervisor that has been shown to increase employee voice (Burriss et al., 2008; Gao, Janssen, & Shi, 2011; Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Joireman, 2008; Zhang, Huai, & Xie, 2014). Of the supervisor and leader behaviors, leader-member exchange and transformational leadership have been shown to be the largest drivers in motivating employees to share their constructive ideas (Chamberlin et al., 2017).

Contextual factors. The final antecedent category I review is contextual factors or environmental conditions that might motivate or inhibit voice behavior. Scholars have characterized individuals who voice as being able to process organizational cues and “read the wind” (Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, Hayes, & Wierba, 1997) in making judgments about the risks and rewards of speaking up (Detert & Burriss, 2007; Milliken et al., 2003). On the one hand, when individuals perceive their work climate as positive—innovative, open, supportive, or fair—then empirical research suggests that employees will tend to speak up (Axtell, Holman, Unsworth, Wall, Waterson, & Harrington, 2000; Choi, 2007; Hsiung, 2012). On the other hand, if employees perceive their work environment as overly negative and unsupportive, they may speak up less (Choi, Anderson, & Veillette, 2009). When subjected to a relative weight analysis, positive workplace climate is overwhelmingly the strongest contextual factor that influences employee voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017).

Performance consequences of voice. As Morrison (2011) has noted, a key premise in the voice literature is that the ideas individuals share have important benefits to the organization. Although the amount of voice research at the team, unit, or

organizational level is much less robust than the amount of research at the individual level, research has still shown that when there is a high level of voice within a group or team, then the performance at the team, unit, or even organization is enhanced in a positive way (De Dreu & Van Vianen, 2001; Detert, Burris, Harrison, & Martin, 2013; Erez, LePine, & Elms, 2002; Frazier & Bowler, 2012; MacKenzie et al., 2011). In this regard, voice may be a valuable explanation to describe how organizations utilize employee ideas to adapt, change, and improve. That is, constructive voice spurs the constant improvement process organizations find valuable. Furthermore, a high degree of sharing ideas in the organization may also be likely to spur organizational learning and knowledge sharing (Edmondson, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

In addition to the organizationally-relevant outcomes of constructive voice, there are also important individual-level consequences when individuals speak up and share their ideas. Organizational leaders are frequently the target of employee voice, may be tasked with responding to employees ideas, but also commonly rate the effectiveness of employee job performance. Performance can be thought of as the evaluated behavioral episodes aggregated over a certain time period that employees conduct (Motowidlo et al., 1997; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). Previous empirical research has suggested that employee voice would enhance the individuals' value in the eyes of supervisors who are rating performance (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Whiting et al., 2008). However, meta-analytic findings of constructive voice and individual employee performance has returned insignificant results (Chamberlin et al., 2017). Yet when constructive voice was separated into promotive voice and prohibitive voice, then promotive voice was shown to have a positive association with job performance whereas prohibitive voice was shown to have a

negative association with job performance (Chamberlin, et al., 2017). The implications of this finding are striking: even though individuals may speak up with constructive voice, those who tend towards promotive voice may find their performance rated more highly by organizational leaders whereas those who tend towards prohibitive voice may find they are viewed as worse performers.

CHAPTER 3

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this next chapter is to integrate the scope of voice (i.e., the number of different ideas or issues that individuals speak up about) with existing conceptualizations of promotive voice and prohibitive voice. As mentioned previously, I focus on constructive voice not only because it is the most prominent in the literature (e.g., Chamberlin et al., 2017) but also because it appears to be most relevant to individual and organizational performance (Van Dyne et al., 1995). In my integration of these concepts, I hypothesize that four specific types of constructive voice exist: championing, initiating, alarming, patrolling. Table 1 outlines these voice types and provides a definition of each, representative behaviors, and related speaking up constructs. Following this integration, I next seek to lay out a preliminary nomological network of these nuanced types of voice. I present personal initiative and felt obligation for constructive change, which have been shown to be the strongest dispositional and attitudinal predictors of constructive voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017), as two antecedents that may manifest similarly with each type of voice. Then, guided by regulatory focus theory (e.g., Higgins, 1997, 1998), I hypothesize that promotion focus, prevention focus, positive affect, and negative affect will manifest in the four types of voice along the promotive and prohibitive voice dimensions. Furthermore, guided by control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998), I argue that cognitive complexity, learning goal orientation, and performance goal orientation will manifest in the four types of voice along the voice concentration or breadth dimensions. In describing similar or different relationship among antecedents and the four types of voice, I aim to establish convergent

validity and discriminant validity. Finally, in efforts to confirm criterion-related validity, I hypothesize about the relationships the four types of voice may have with voice endorsement, interpersonal liking, active listening, promotability, and job performance.

Voice Scope

Although research on constructive voice has a long and rich history, very little is known about the implications of voice scope. Of course, some types of voice—issue selling and whistleblowing in particular (e.g., Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Miceli & Near, 1985)—seem to imply that employees may repeat a specific idea or problem. But compared to the literature on promotive voice, the literatures on whistleblowing and issue selling are relatively small and don't explicitly measure frequency (e.g., Chamberlin et al., 2017). Irrespective of their comparative size, the central limitation still looms: the notion of voice scope has not been directly examined, which limits our understanding of constructive voice.

Given these deficiencies, I suggest that the *scope* of voice—defined as the number of different ideas or issues that individuals speak up about—could enhance our conceptualization of constructive voice and provide greater precision in how we view promotive voice and prohibitive voice. First, in order for individuals to see progress with their suggested organizational change, I propose that it may be likely that individuals will need to repeat their ideas and issues. If individuals speak up repeatedly, but only repeat a limited number of ideas or a relatively few issues, I term this *voice concentration*. As an example, a worker may be dissatisfied with the current financing, coverage, and eligibility of an organization's parental leave policy (e.g., Ray, Gornick, & Schmitt, 2010). But in order to see the policy improved and enhanced, the worker may need to

provide repeated suggestions and ideas to human resource leaders over the course of an extended period of time. Consistent with this example, research on issue selling has demonstrated that individuals “go to bat” (Dutton & Ashford, 1993, p. 406) and speak up on behalf of a specific issue they may find valuable (Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998; Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, & Lawrence, 2001). In contrast, others may also speak up frequently but instead express a variety of ideas and issues, which I refer to as *voice breadth*. For example, an analyst in corporate strategy may be a “big picture” thinker who offers a high volume of ideas that touch a wide variety of the company’s operations, but may have little bandwidth to personally follow through and speak up again on all the original suggestions. In line with this reasoning, research on creativity has considered that individuals may speak up about a variety of different ideas. Labeled as fluency, or “the number of unique, nonredundant ideas or problem solutions that are generated” in a creative task (Baas et al., 2008, p. 781), research has described how individuals may also generate a large number of divergent ideas (Acar & Runco, 2012). In fact, individuals who generate and speak out with many ideas may be among the world’s greatest authorities in their disciplines (Grant, 2016). Although there may be valid counterpoints to the above arguments, examining voice scope appears to be a fruitful path to improve our understanding of constructive voice.

Integrating Promotive and Prohibitive Voice with Voice Scope

When crossing promotive and prohibitive voice with the scope of voice, the resulting combination is a 2x2 of constructive voice with four different types: (1) championing is the integration of voice concentration (i.e., the repeated expression of a specific idea or problem) with promotive voice; (2) initiating is the integration of voice

breadth (i.e., the expression of many ideas or problems) with promotive voice; (3) alarming is the integration of voice concentration and prohibitive voice; and (4) patrolling is the integration of voice breadth and prohibitive voice. I next describe each of these distinct types of constructive voice, how they may be similar, and how they are different.

Championing voice. *Championing* is the repeated expression of a specific idea that improves the functioning of the organization. Individuals who repeatedly promote specific ideas are typically proactive, committed to their idea, and driven to bring about beneficial organizational change (e.g., Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Taylor, Cocklin, Brown, & Wilson-Evered, 2011). Proactively promoting a specific idea that could improve the company or enhance its performance may require individuals to expend social capital to “stick their necks out” to advocate for the change of a specific work method (Howard-Grenville, 2007; Schon, 1963, Van de Ven, 1986). Consequently, individuals who speak up on a concentrated number of ideas with promotive voice may be viewed as champions for their suggestions (e.g., Howell & Boies, 2004; Howell & Higgins, 1990; Howell, Shea, & Higgins, 2005).

The need for individuals to engage in championing and voice the same idea over time may be an indication that there is organizational inertia against their suggested changes or a strongly entrenched resistance to retain existing organizational routines and repertoires (Lichtenthaler & Ernst, 2009; Markham & Griffin, 1998; Shane, 1994). Consequently, employees have to repeat their ideas and remind others about their suggestions. For example, Dutton and colleagues (2001) report how one individual sought to change a senior vice-president’s mind about how community service efforts in a hospital were handled:

“When you tell him about a concept, you sort of acclimate him to the situation and you repeatedly tell him about it for several months so he knows it is coming, and he knows what is happening. And then you hit him with the big package” (p. 722).

As individuals repeatedly mention a new way of doing things, even though others in the organization may disagree, individuals who champion an idea may have to balance promoting the idea and driving organizational change without significantly upsetting interpersonal relationships (e.g., Grant, 2013; Taylor et al., 2011). On the one hand, if the idea succeeds, then the performance of the group or unit will likely benefit and the individual may be recognized for his or her persistent voice efforts (Ashford et al., 1998; Howell & Boies, 2004; Howell & Shea, 2006; Lichtenthaler & Ernst, 2009). However, if the idea fails, then a voicer’s reputation may be damaged (Ashford et al., 1998), for “the price of failure is professional suicide, and a few become martyrs to the championed idea” (Schon, 1963, p. 85). Yet failure may be better than remaining silent, for without someone to persistently promote positive changes to organizational policies, work practices, and procedures, many needed organizational improvements would never occur (Dutton et al., 2001; Schon, 1963; Van de Ven, 1986).

Initiating voice. Instead of repeating the same idea for improving the organization, individuals may instead express an array of different ideas that may touch on a variety of organizational opportunities. I refer to this as *initiating*, defined as the expression of a large variety of ideas or suggestions given to improve organizational functioning. Individuals who speak up with promotive voice on a broad number of issues may be seen as initiators who mass produce many ideas for changes in group functioning

and organizational procedures (Benne & Sheats, 1948). Given that individuals who engage in initiating suggest a variety of different ideas for new work projects, they may be seen as introducing novel and useful ideas across the organization (Amabile, 1983, 1988) as generating and speaking up with big-picture, creative ideas is an important element or stage in the creative and innovative process (de Jong & den Hartog, 2010; Kanter, 1988; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Thus, those who speak up with many new ideas or many new solutions for improving organizational systems and practices may be seen as valuable organizational producers of important ideas that positively impact their surroundings (Zhou & George, 2001).

Employees who engage in initiating may see the world in broader, more open, terms (George & Zhou, 2001). They may integrate diverse strands of information, redefine challenges to the status quo, and then deviate with a variety of solutions (e.g., Acar & Runco, 2012; Kirton, 1976; Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999). Furthermore, such individuals may not be afraid to act and suggest deviations from the status quo, even though those ideas may be risky (Zhou & George, 2001). Instead, they proactively take initiative to alter the status quo and their organizational environment broadly and holistically (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 1995) through the frequent flow of many new and different ideas.

Alarming voice. Employees may speak up on a limited or broad number of ideas, but the function of constructive voice may not always be promotive in nature. Instead, employees may speak up with prohibitive voice, or express concern about problematic work factors that harm organizational functioning and need to be addressed (Liang et al., 2012). When individuals speak up on a limited number of ideas with prohibitive voice, I

refer to this as *alarming*. I define alarming behavior as the repeated expression of concern about a specific problematic work factor that harms organizational functioning.

Individuals who raise the same worry about organizational policies or vocalize the same problematic work factor that needs to be corrected may be viewed as alarmists who expose undesirable conditions or behavior in the organization. Although their behavior calls out negative—or even perhaps illegal, immoral, or illegitimate (Near & Miceli, 1985)—practices in the organization, repeatedly expressing the same concern that could harm the company is still prosocial in nature as voicers seek to protect future victims or remedy dissatisfying elements of the organizational environment (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Dozier & Miceli, 1985; Kassing, 2002; Miceli & Near, 1988). However, individuals who repeatedly speak up with prohibitive voice typically do not possess adequate organizational authority to enact change (Near & Miceli, 1985) and so they must alert others to the alarming practices that they perceive.

As with other types of constructive voice in which there are risks to speaking up, the risks with alarming appear to be particularly high. Because individuals must persist in voicing on a narrow number of problems, this may signal that there are problems in the organization as well as inertia against changing those problems. This inertia against change comes out in Kassing's (2002) study of upward dissent. He reports about a worker who repeatedly spoke up about the same problematic role clarity issue:

“I ran everything but was not given the authority to be the head person. When I expressed my concern to my boss, she understood my frustration, however nothing was ever done and my title and responsibilities were never defined. I talked about my situation several times” (p. 198).

As this example shows, when someone speaks up repeatedly to resolve and correct problematic organizational factors, then it may be likely that the individual is neglected or ignored. However, even worse, the person may experience interpersonal backlash or retaliation (i.e., firing) at the organizational level (Miceli & Near, 1989; Near & Miceli, 1986; Perrucci, Anderson, Schendel, & Trachtman, 1980).

Patrolling voice. Finally, individuals may also speak up with prohibitive voice on a variety of different issues. I refer to this as *patrolling* and define it as the expression of a large variety of issues and problematic work factors that harm organizational functioning. Patrolling behavior is manifest when individuals express concerns about many dysfunctional aspects about the workplace or when individuals call attention to all kinds of work-related problems that could be fixed. When individuals are perceived as “crying wolf” and express concerns about a wide variety of negative elements in the organization, they may be labeled as “chronic kickers” (Roethlisberger, 1941), “squeaky wheels” who get more attention than they probably deserve (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), or even “troublefinders” (Heck et al., 2005).

Yet expressions of troubling aspects that may exist across the organization are given with the intent to resolve the undesirable state of affairs. Consequently, patrolling is clearly constructive in that it seeks to enact change, and is not directly communicated with the intent of gaining social sympathy or enhancing personal goals (e.g., Heck et al., 2005). That is, individuals who speak up with prohibitive voice on a variety of organizational challenges and harmful issues act more as organizational watch dogs who are on the lookout for problems that could be rectified. This is not to say that others will always appreciate such behavior. It may be likely that others in the

organization may not enjoy being around people who engage in patrolling (Alberts, 1988; Kowalski, 1996). Kowalski (2002) describes how one woman felt when interacting with individuals who vocalized many problems that made things less effective at work:

“I am about to give up a job that pays more than any other I’ve had because I can’t listen to the complaints any more. The position involves the management of a long-term health care unit, staffing, budgets, and marketing. This is a breeze compared to the complaints and negative comments I hear from the residents on an on-going daily basis, only a very small proportion of which are valid, And, when the valid concerns are resolved it wasn’t done fast enough, good enough, or the way it was done in the past. I’ve only held this position for three months but I give up” (p. 1027).

As illustrated in this example, individuals, like this woman, may seek to avoid those who engage in patrolling and identify many critical concerns (e.g., Williams, 1997). Others may avoid those who speak up with patrolling in an effort to avoid any potential transfer of negative affect that accompanies the communication of many problematic issues (Kowalski, 1996).

Summary of constructive voice types. Championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling share some commonalities (perhaps a promotive/prohibitive dimension or a concentration/breadth dimension) but they are also different (e.g., Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998; Liang et al., 2012). First, there are good reasons to believe that the four different voice types I have outlined should be related. Specifically, the commonality between the types of voice may be driven by common dispositional tendencies and attitudes that manifest more or less the same across the four types. For example,

constructive voice requires a degree of initiative and proactivity as individuals extend themselves beyond their role assignments to offer ideas for improving the organization (Grant & Ashford, 2008; Morrison, 2014). Given this, a tendency to take personal initiative may be related to each type of constructive voice. Furthermore, the desire to change organizational work practices is embedded in constructive voice generally and each dimension by extension. Thus, high levels of felt obligation to make constructive changes may be equally important to each type of voice.

However, given that there are also differences between the different types, meaningful differences may also manifest. As I argue in a subsequent section, theories of self-regulation (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998; Higgins, 1997, 1998) point to differences among antecedent relationships. Furthermore, consistent with prior theorizing on constructive voice, individuals are more likely to voice when they perceive an opportunity to speak up and actually enhance organizationally functioning (e.g., Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Morrison, 2014). In other words, the different types of voice that are likely to be elicited (i.e., championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling) may be influenced differentially by specific opportunities to speak up. When there are few opportunities to suggest new ideas, then perhaps this may lead individuals to select a specific idea and promoting the idea over and over again (i.e., championing). Or, if opportunities to offer solutions and innovative changes abound in the organization, then it may be that initiating is more likely to manifest. If individuals encounter a limited number of specific challenging problems, then they may repeatedly express how a specific problem is harming the organization (i.e., alarming). Finally, if an organization is

rife with problems, then perhaps patrolling behavior that attempts to manage and resolve many of these problems will result.

My conceptualization of voice scope that ranges from voice concentration (i.e., repeatedly expressing the same idea or issue) to voice breadth (i.e., speaking up about a broad variety of ideas and issues) may seem a little messy. For example, it may be difficult to initially conceptualize how an employee could be rated high on championing or alarming *and* high on initiating or patrolling. One might expect that voice concentration and voice breadth are mutually exclusive and any reported correlation would be due to measurement error. However, there are compelling reasons that the four voice constructs I have identified would still manifest. First, the four nuanced voice behaviors are organizational phenomena that occur in the workplace (i.e., ecological validity). Second, the four types of voice are already loosely depicted in the literature and, even though no integrative framework exists, they fall to a certain extent under labels such as issue selling (Dutton & Ashford, 1993), championing (Howell & Higgins, 1990), creativity (Zhou & George, 2001), whistleblowing (Miceli & Near, 1985), upward dissent (Kassing, 1998), and complaining (Kowalski, 1996).

Third, it may also be possible for individuals to engage simultaneously in high levels of voice concentration and high levels of voice breadth. For example, an individual may have a plethora of suggestions and willingly share those with others (i.e., initiating); however, the same individual may also have one “pet project” that is repeatedly brought up (i.e., championing). As another example, an individual may mention many organizational problems (i.e., patrolling), but may see one of these issues as particularly concerning and repeatedly express how the problem could be remedied to improve

organizational functioning (i.e., alarming). Furthermore, an individual may be an organizational watch dog that identifies problems that could be resolved (i.e., patrolling), but has a specific promotive idea he or she is passionate about and brings up over and over again (i.e., championing). Finally, an individual could speak up with a variety of new ideas (i.e., initiating), but really step up and “go to bat” to resolve a potentially harmful problem that has violated his or her sense of justice or morality (i.e., alarming). As these examples illustrate, it may in fact be possible that individuals can enact high levels of voice concentration and voice breadth. Considering these reasons, along with my prior discussion of the commonality and differences between the four types of voice, I argue that the four types of voice will manifest together as types of constructive voice.

Hypothesis 1: Constructive voice manifests as four related voice types:

championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling are distinct voice factors.

Similarities Among Antecedents of Voice

In examining the similarities and differences between the four types of voice, I next consider potential relationships with sets of antecedents. Indeed, an important step in construct validity is clarifying the nomological network of the construct (Hinkin, 1998). In order to aid in this validation process, a summary of the hypotheses presented in the following sections is provided in Table 2. In this next section, I hypothesize a preliminary nomological network that some dispositional traits and attitudes (i.e., personal initiative, and felt obligation for constructive change) are equally influential in motivating individuals to speak up across the four different types of voice. My choice of these two variables is empirically driven. In a recent meta-analytic dominance analysis (Chamberlin et al., 2017), personal initiative was shown to be the strongest dispositional predictor of

constructive voice whereas felt obligation for constructive change was the strongest job attitude that predicted constructive voice. As these relationships are strongly related to constructive voice, I expect each to be positively related with each type of voice I propose.

Personal Initiative. *Personal initiative* is a trait that refers to individuals' tendency to be self-starting, proactive, and persistent (Frese & Fay, 2001; Frese et al., 1997). Functionally equivalent to Bateman and Crant's (1993) proactive personality construct (Tornau & Frese, 2013), individuals that display personal initiative are willing to take agentic action to find solutions or opportunities to improve their surroundings. Given that some individuals have a tendency to be more proactive in offering constructive suggestions (e.g., Seibert et al., 1999) and are more likely to persist in stepping beyond their roles to address problems and capture available opportunities (Frese et al., 1997), research has shown that individuals' tendency to be proactive and show personal initiative is associated with constructive voice (Crant et al., 2011; Fuller et al., 2006; Ohly et al., 2006).

Personal initiative is likely to predict championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. Repeatedly speaking up about a specific solution or innovative idea may require individuals to be both proactive and persistent in championing the same idea over and over again (e.g., Taylor et al., 2011). To initiate the sharing of a broad number of organizational ideas or changes may be strongly influenced by a self-starting tendency wherein such individuals continue to proactively bring up different suggestions. Personal initiative is also connected to identifying problems or issues gone wrong in the organization. To engage in alarming behavior requires persistence as supervisors or other

organizational leaders may initially ignore and resist expressions of a specific challenge (e.g., Kassing, 2009). Finally, individuals with a personal tendency to identify and attack the many problems that may exist in the organization would be expected to speak up broadly about the issues that may harm organizational functioning. Taken together, personal initiative is expected to have a positive association with each of the nuanced types of constructive voice.

Hypothesis 2: Personal initiative is positively associated with (a) championing, (b) initiating, (c) alarming, and (d) patrolling.

Felt obligation for constructive change. *Felt obligation for constructive change* can be defined as an individual's belief that he or she is responsible for helping to bring about change in the organization (Morrison & Phelps, 1999). In noting their observed limitations of voice, Withey and Cooper (1989) observed that "some individuals think somebody should do something but are not willing to do it themselves" (p. 535). However, other individuals care more deeply about how things in the organization are done and want to play their part in helping the organization meet its goals (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001; Fuller et al., 2006). Empirical research has shown that when individuals feel a heightened sense of obligation to help the organization, then they are more likely to engage in in proactive behaviors such as constructive voice (Choi, 2007; Fuller et al., 2006; Liang et al., 2012; Lin & Johnson, 2015).

Felt obligation for constructive change is likely to be positively associated with championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, respectively. Individuals who promote a specific project or idea over and over again in order to enhance organizational

functioning (Howell & Higgins, 1990) may be highly committed to helping the organization improve. Individuals' felt accountability for the good of the organization may manifest itself in their offering a broad variety of suggestions to improve their surrounding environment. Furthermore, individuals who speak up about a specific alarming factor that could harm the organization may do so because their accountability compels them to act (Miceli & Near, 1989). Finally, individuals may be more likely to call attention to a variety of problematic organizational factors when they feel a high degree of "skin in the game."

Hypothesis 3: Felt obligation for constructive change is positively associated with (a) championing, (b) initiating, (c) alarming, and (d) patrolling.

Differences Among Antecedents of Voice: A Regulatory Focus View

In contrast to anticipated similarities of personal initiative and felt obligation for constructive change across championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, I also expect that the four types of voice will have differential relationships with other antecedents. As informed by theories of self-regulation (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998; Higgins, 1997, 1998), which describes how individuals are motivated to accomplish their goals (Diefendorff & Chandler, 2011), I extend my hypothesizing to consider nomological network validity (Hinkin, 1998) or that different sets of antecedents may have differential relationships with the four types of voice. Self-regulation can be viewed as "the processes involved in attaining and maintaining (i.e., keeping *regular*) goals, where goals are internally represented (i.e., within the *self*) desired states" (Vancouver & Day, 2005, p.158). As I discuss in the next section, regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) describes basic strategies that regulate affect and behavior to realize gains or minimize

losses (Gamache, McNamara, Mannor, & Johnson, 2015; Johnson, King, Lin, Scott, Walker, & Wang, 2017). As suggested by Chamberlin, Newton, and LePine (2017) and others (Lin & Johnson, 2015), I incorporate regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997, 1998) to identify antecedents to championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling that may vary along the promotive and prohibitive voice dimension.

Promotion focus. Regulatory focus theory posits that individuals possess a promotion focus and/or a prevention focus to achieve gains or avoid losses (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Although self-regulation has been described as a chronic individual difference (Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010) or as more of an induced state (Shah & Higgins, 1997), I characterize self-regulation as more chronic in nature in order to emphasize its more enduring effects on individuals' general tendency to speak up with different types of constructive voice. The first of these self-regulation foci is a *promotion focus*, which is characterized by one's aspirations and hopes to accomplish desired goals. (Higgins, 1997, 1998). Individuals with a promotion focus are eager to advance, articulate, or call out new opportunities (Higgins, 1998; Higgins & Spiegel, 2004). Moreover, their desired goals represent ideal end states—ideals that could occur—that they can strive to achieve (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Johnson, Chang, & Rosen, 2010; Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010).

As has been shown in prior empirical work (e.g., Lin & Johnson, 2015), a promotion focus should lead to a tendency to speak up with promotive voice. Just as individuals with a promotion focus aspire to end states that help to accomplish their own aims, the use of promotive voice similarly seeks to vocalize what the organization could change in order to improve and reach its goals (Liang et al., 2012). Specifically, given

that promotive voice is the expression of new ideas and potential opportunities for organizational improvement, individuals who are eager and able to visualize how things could be improved in their work sphere should exhibit a greater tendency to vocalize desired end states that alter the status quo with promotive voice (Lin & Johnson, 2015). Thus I expect that a promotion focus should be positively associated with both championing and initiating. Those who speak up with championing may be particularly motivated to implement a specific organizational idea or especially eager to sponsor a new way of doing things (e.g., Ashford et al., 1998; Howell & Higgins, 1990), characteristics of a promotion focus. Furthermore, individuals with a promotion focus are generally sensitive to potential gains and opportunities across their environment that they can achieve (Lin & Johnson, 2015), which suggests a positive relationship with initiating as individuals broadly see opportunities and suggest ideas for how the organization can capture those desired end states.

Hypothesis 4: Promotion focus is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating.

Prevention focus. In contrast to a promotion focus, a *prevention focus* is associated with personal vigilance and obligation required in taking precautionary measures that prevent undesirable and potentially detrimental outcomes (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Higgins, 1998; Lanaj, Chang, & Johnson, 2012). Individuals with a prevention focus seek security and protection from harm, and desire to reduce uncertainty, minimize potential losses, and avoid adverse outcomes (Crowe & Higgins, 1997; Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010). Consequently, individuals with a prevention

focus are vigilant to protect themselves and others from loss and avoid end states that could be harmful in any way (Higgins & Spiegel, 2004; Lanaj et al., 2012).

A prevention focus is likely to result in prohibitive voice behavior (Lin & Johnson, 2015). Similar to a prevention focus that seeks to prevent and steer oneself away from undesirable outcomes, prohibitive voice expresses concern about worrisome organizational practices, procedures, or behaviors that should be remedied or avoided (Liang et al., 2012). Individuals utilize prohibitive voice to warn others about problematic practices that could cause organizational loss and may be unsafe or immoral (Near & Miceli, 1985; Tucker & Turner, 2011). Moreover, consistent with a prevention strategy, prohibitive voice is characterized by an vigilant avoidance strategy of harmful, unsatisfactory, or undesirable states that could be occur if no action is taken (Higgins & Spiegel, 2004; Lin & Johnson, 2015). Given that a prevention focus has been shown to predict prohibitive voice (e.g., Lin & Johnson, 2015), I argue that a prevention focus is positively related to both alarming and patrolling. Consistent with a prevention focus (Higgins, 1997, 1998), individuals who speak up about the same organizational problem over and over again (i.e., alarming) may feel a moral duty or obligation to act and warn others about troubling practices or behaviors in the workplace (Near & Miceli, 1985, 1995). Thus they may act on what they ought to do (Higgins, 1998) and take responsibility by engaging in behaviors that protect others from harm or failure (e.g., Lanaj et al., 2012), such as prohibitive voice. Individuals with a prevention focus may also exhibit a tendency to speak up about problems they see throughout the organization. A prevention focus may lead individuals to be particularly cautious of potential harm and

therefore, when they speak up, they may identify all sorts of organizational concerns or wrongs that need to be made right.

Hypothesis 5: Prevention focus is positively associated with (a) alarming and (b) patrolling.

Positive affect. In addition to describing individuals' tendency to adopt a promotion focus or prevention focus, regulatory focus theory also suggests that individuals' promotion or prevention focus sensitizes their experience of certain emotions (Brockner & Higgins, 2001; Carver & Scheier, 1998; Lanaj et al., 2012). When individuals make progress towards or achieve their goals, their success stirs up positive emotions such as cheerfulness or optimism (Higgins, 1998; Higgins et al., 1997; Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2007). Trait *positive affect* is typically defined as a stable personality characteristic that reflects individuals' feelings of alertness, enthusiasm, joy, and general positive energy (Kaplan, Bradley, Luchman, & Haynes, 2009; Watson & Clark, 1997). Individuals with a tendency towards positive affectivity are optimistic (Steed, 2002) and may be more inclined to consider and communicate new ideas that improve organizational functioning rather than identify problems. Moreover, positive affect is related to prosocial, promotive behaviors (e.g., George & Brief, 1992) including promotive forms of voice (Hochwarter, Ellen, & Ferris, 2014; Gilmore, Hu, Wei, Tetrick, & Zaccaro, 2013; Tenhiälä & Lount, 2013). In contrast, individuals prone to positive affect may be less likely to speak up with prohibitive voice because the negative valence of prohibitive voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017) may conflict with the positive emotions they experience. In line with this research, I suggest that positive affect is positively related to championing and initiating, and negatively related to alarming and patrolling.

Additionally, there are good reasons to believe that initiating has a stronger association with positive affect than championing. Positive affect may capture individuals' broad tendencies to view their environment in positive terms (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), which would be more strongly related to suggesting a greater number of promotive ideas rather than emphasizing a specific idea because "people in a positive mood are more likely to have richer associations within existing structures" (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005, p. 530). Empirical research has confirmed this line of reasoning: individuals high in positive affect produce a greater variety and quantity of ideas (Vosburg, 1998) that are more creative and innovative (e.g., Ashby, Isen, & Turken, 1999; Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005; Baas et al., 2008; Hirt, Melton, McDonald, & Harackiewicz, 1996). Isen's program of research provides additional evidence that positive affect would be more strongly associated with initiating. In her research, Isen (1999) has found that "positive affect increases a person's ability to organize ideas in multiple ways and access alternative cognitive perspectives" (p. 3) such that individuals may "become more able to make associations among ideas and see multiple relations among stimuli" (p. 5). In other words, individuals high in positive affect would be more likely to identify a greater number of opportunities or generate an increased number of creative ideas that could influence their tendency to speak up with initiating.

Hypothesis 6: Positive affect is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and negatively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

Hypothesis 7: Among the types of promotive voice, positive affect is more strongly associated with initiating than championing.

Negative affect. Whereas promotive voice is likely to be associated with positive affect, prohibitive voice is likely to be associated with negative affect, especially if individuals “ought to” goals are unsuccessful and lead to feelings of agitation or uneasiness (Higgins, 1997). Trait *negative affect* can be characterized as feelings of guilt, nervousness, anxiety, contempt, or fear (Kaplan et al., 2009; Watson & Clark, 1997). Individuals high in negative affect have a tendency to be more pessimistic (Marshall, Wortman, Kusulas, Hervig, & Vickers, 1992), which may make them more likely to notice and speak up about problems in the workplace that need to be resolved. Furthermore, negative effect can create a tendency for people to identify “a problematic state of affairs and propel people to systematically address the problem, figure out what’s wrong, and fix things” (George & Zhou, 2007, p. 606). Thus, negative affect may lead to behavior that not only identifies problematic state of affairs in the organization but also to speak up in order to “fix what’s broken.” However, when individuals experience negative affect, they may be less likely to speak up with promotive voice because they are more acutely aware of potential rejection or fear the downsides of having their ideas ignored (Bass et al., 2008; Chamberlin et al., 2017; Grant, Parker, & Collins, 2009; Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010). Accordingly, I argue that negative affect is negatively associated with championing and initiating, and positively associated with alarming and patrolling.

The positive relationships I propose above may be stronger between negative affect and patrolling than between negative affect and alarming. Individuals prone to negative affectivity may see the world in a slightly more negative light (Watson et al., 1988), feel motivated to avoid as many negative outcomes as they can (e.g., Lanaj et al.,

2012), and therefore speak up about the many troubling factors they observe in their organization. Moreover, negative affect may promulgate additional negative affect (Kowalski, 1996) that could lead to prohibitive voice on many different organizational problems rather than just one specific problem or issue.

Hypothesis 8: Negative affect is negatively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and positively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

Hypothesis 9: Among the types of prohibitive voice, negative affect is more strongly associated with patrolling than alarming.

Differences Among Antecedents of Voice: A Control Theory View

Whereas regulatory focus theory characterizes differences in antecedent relationships along the promotive and prohibitive voice dimension, a control theory view describes differences in antecedent relationships and the four types of voice based on voice concentration and voice breadth. Specifically, control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998), describes how individuals receive feedback to measure their goal progress. In a control theory perspective, a key element is how individuals cognitively arrange their goals. That is, how individuals perceive or are aware of their environmental surroundings influences how they react to feedback and adjust their behavior to reach their goals (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Klein, 1989). Furthermore, individuals' goal orientation, or the cognitive representations of their ability to achieve desired goals (Hulleman, Schragar, Bodmann, & Harackiewicz, 2010), also influences their behavior in the goal process.

Cognitive complexity. How individuals perceive their environment and social surroundings is a critical link to understanding the broad or narrow pursuit of goals (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998). *Cognitive complexity* is an individual difference that

captures how narrowly or broadly individuals evaluate their environment and cognitively structure social information (Carragher & Buckley, 1996; Tetlock, Peterson, & Berry, 1993). Originally developed by Kelly (1955) and expanded on by Bieri and colleagues (1966), individuals lower in cognitive complexity are less aware of their social environment and may fixate on a limited number of issues or items, whereas individuals high in cognitive complexity are more aware of their surroundings and able to order multifaceted components of their social environment (Dierdorff & Rubin, 2007).

I argue that the extent to which one engages in voice concentration or voice breadth may be determined by how narrowly or widely one views and experiences his or her surrounding environment. Individuals lower in cognitive complexity have a narrower view of the world and potentially see their social environment in less nuanced ways. When individuals low in cognitive complexity encounter differences in their environment, they may be less likely to structure and integrate those differences (Tetlock et al., 1993; Woehr, Miller, & Lane, 1998). Furthermore, they may experience some degree of “tunnel vision,” where they hone in on specific viewpoints available information in the environment and fixate on those issues (e.g., Goodwin & Ziegler, 1998). By focusing on a small set of specific issues, they may become confident in their ideas and unwilling to change their mind or refocus their perspective (Tetlock et al., 1993). Given these reasons, it is likely that individuals low in cognitive complexity may exhibit a greater tendency to speak up about a very specific idea over and over again that could benefit the organization (i.e., championing) or even repeatedly speak up about a specific problem of concern that is harming or could harm the organization (i.e., alarming).

In contrast, individuals higher in cognitive complexity see and appreciate many different points of view and can integrate and structure their surroundings (Carragher & Buckley, 1996). Such individuals are open to new points of view and able to make connections between competing views (Tetlock et al., 1993). Furthermore, individuals high in cognitive complexity are “big picture” thinkers who see the world in more nuanced and sophisticated ways (McAdams, 1990), and they proactively seek out new information and awareness on a variety of perspectives (Tetlock et al., 1993). This broad view of the world may lead individuals high in cognitive complexity to speak up on a wide variety of new ideas (i.e., initiating) or even a wide variety of existing problems (i.e., patrolling) that could enhance organizational functioning. On the one hand, viewing their social environment with a broader lens may increase their touch points around the organization, making it likely that they notice different perspectives and speak up with many different ideas or solutions that integrate the patterns they identify in their organizational environment. However, on the other hand, when individuals have a broad view of their social surroundings, they may also encounter additional problems in their work environment, and may speak up about those challenges that the organization could address or rectify. In sum, I hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 10: Cognitive complexity is negatively associated with (a) championing and (b) alarming, and positively associated with (c) initiating and (d) patrolling.

Learning goal orientation. An important element of control theory is the negative feedback loop, and how individuals incorporate feedback to alter their behavior and achieve their goals by minimizing any lingering discrepancies (Carver & Scheier,

1982; Klein, 1989). Individuals' ability and desire to receive feedback may be influenced by how they view goal striving situations. *Goal orientation*, which is "a mental framework for how individuals interpret and respond to achievement situations" (Brett & VandeWalle, 1999, p. 864), provides valuable insight on how individuals may approach their goals. Specifically, individuals may seek to do something new (i.e., learning goal orientation), prove their competence relative to others (performance-prove goal orientation) or avoid looking incompetent (performance-avoid goal orientation; Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996; Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007). On the surface, there may appear to be similarities between regulatory focus strategies and goal orientation. For example, promotion focus, learning goal orientation, and performance-prove goal orientation can be seen as approach motivations, whereas prevention focus and performance-avoid goal orientation are more avoidance motivations (e.g., Elliot & Thrash, 2002; Johnson, Chang, Meyer, Lanaj, & Way, 2013; Johnson et al., 2017). Yet there are also important distinctions. For instance, promotion and prevention focus are regulatory strategies that guide individuals in reaching their ideal or ought selves (Higgins, 1997) by maximizing gains or minimizing losses (Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010), whereas goal orientations are associated with implicit intelligence beliefs (Johnson et al., 2017). As evidence of these distinctions, Johnson and colleagues (2017) have shown relatively low to moderate correlations between regulatory focus strategies and the different components of goal orientation (correlations between .21 and .33).

Learning goal orientation refers to individuals' desire to do something new and increase their general competence in new situations (Brett & VandeWalle, 1999; Dweck, 1986). Very little research has been conducted on the relationship between learning goal

orientation and types of voice. Yet there are reasons to believe that a learning goal orientation could be positively associated with initiating and patrolling. For example, research has demonstrated that individuals high in learning goal orientation seek information and feedback (Payne et al., 2007) that they can then broadly apply to make progress on their goals, which information flow could be sparked when they speak up with a variety of constructive suggestions. Furthermore, given that a learning goal orientation is associated with novelty (LePine, 2005), individuals with a learning goal orientation may speak up with many novel ideas for constructive change (i.e., initiating). Or, individuals may speak up with patrolling voice to broadly communicate what they view as vital information to enhance organizational functioning. In support of these reasons, research has shown that learning goal orientation is generally associated with promotive voice but also with behavior that attempts to prevent a host of problems from occurring (Parker & Collins, 2010).

Hypothesis 11: Learning goal orientation is positively associated with (a) initiating and (b) patrolling.

Performance goal orientation. In contrast to a learning goal orientation, individuals with a performance goal orientation seek to show that they are either competent and intelligent (performance-prove goal orientation) or seek to avoid perceptions that they are not competent (performance-avoid goal orientation; Brett & VandeWalle, 1999). Individuals with a performance-prove goal orientation are aware of organizational rewards and want to prove their ability to succeed (Kakkar, Tangirala, Srivastava, & Kamdar, 2016). Such individuals may visualize the success and potential recognition they could gain as a champion for an innovative and new idea. Therefore,

they may be willing to spend valuable social capital to repeatedly pitch an idea (Van de Ven, 1986) because they find the potential positive payoff highly rewarding and satisfying. Consequently, I argue that a performance-prove goal orientation is positively associated with championing. However, individuals with a performance-avoid goal orientation may be less inclined to stick their necks out to repeatedly suggest an idea because they may understand that failed ideas can damage their reputation (Ashford et al., 1998; Schon, 1963). Yet, if some behavior, practice, or policy violates their sense of justice or ethics, then they may be willing to “sound the alarm” and alert others to the problem that needs to be remedied (Near & Miceli, 1985). Furthermore, it may be natural for individuals with a performance-avoid goal orientation to perceive harmful problems at work that require them to speak up repeatedly with prohibitive voice because they are internally attuned to identifying risks and drawbacks (Kakkar et al., 2016). Thus, I also argue that performance-avoid goal orientation is positively associated with alarming.

Hypothesis 12: Performance-prove goal orientation is positively associated with (a) championing, and performance-avoid goal orientation is positively associated with (b) alarming.

Consequences of Voice

When employees speak up in the different ways I have described, it is likely that differential consequences may ensue. Extending my exploration of nomological network validity, in the section that follows I propose that championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling have differential relationships with voice endorsement, interpersonal liking, active listening, promotability, and job performance—providing evidence of criterion-related validity. These variables are important to theories of self-regulation. For example,

an important component of control theory is the negative feedback loop as individuals receive feedback to assess their goal progress (Carver & Scheier, 1981, 1998; Klein, 1989). In the case of voice, as individuals make suggestions, supervisors or co-workers compare the value of expressed idea to other suggestions received, and may choose to advance the idea or ignore the voicer. Understanding voice endorsement is important outcome because colleagues can provide individuals valuable and needed feedback to alter their voice behavior (e.g., Klein, 1989). Moreover, as individuals apply their energy to make progress on relevant work goals, their behavior likely influences the behavioral options of others in the workplace (Carver & Scheier, 1982). Thus the behavioral interdependence of goal fulfillment suggests that co-workers may have interpersonal reactions to the behavior of others. Given this, examining interpersonal liking and active listening also appear to be important outcomes. The ultimate desired output of an organizational cybernetic system is to reduce any goal discrepancy and achieve effective goal accomplishment. Examining job performance and whether employees are more or less likely to be promoted, therefore, also appear to be important outcome variables.

Voice endorsement. *Voice endorsement* reflects the degree to which others in the organization are receptive to expressed ideas or issues (Burris, 2012). Individuals may endorse others' ideas by acting on ideas they hear, taking ideas forward, sharing those ideas with others, or by supporting or helping to implement the ideas. Employees who speak up with championing and alarming voice are likely to expend social capital to push forward their specific ideas or spend time rectifying problems they feel obligated to make right (e.g., Howell & Boies, 2004; Howell & Higgins, 1990; Near & Miceli, 1995). Without an individual to champion a specific idea or speak up to resolve a specific

harmful aspect of the organization, it is likely that the idea will not be implemented, supported, or endorsed by others (Schon, 1963; Van de Ven, 1986), or the problematic workplace issue will not be addressed. However, by virtue of the voicer's persistent and focused efforts, I argue that voicing the same idea or issue over and over again (i.e., championing and alarming) will eventually lead to others' endorsing or implementing the recommended change (e.g., Burris, 2012; Kassing, 2009; Taylor et al., 2011).

In contrast, individuals who speak up with initiating or patrolling voice may speak up so widely that their many ideas and issues that could enact change may not be endorsed by others and implemented in their work group or organization. The lack of voice endorsement with initiating and patrolling may occur for a number of reasons. For example, it is likely that the many ideas or issues expressed by an individual fall flat because no one may appear accountable for implementing the ideas or to follow through on resolving the many identified problems (e.g., Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001). Furthermore, given the sheer number of ideas or issues raised, it is likely that coworkers and leaders may not have sufficient personal resources to think about, respond to, or implement all the many ideas or issues (e.g., Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989). Instead, they may only be able to respond to a relatively small number of the ideas and issues, leaving the majority of expressed solutions or challenges to rot by the wayside. Based on these reasons, I propose a negative relationship between voice endorsement and initiating as well as patrolling.

Hypothesis 13: Voice endorsement is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) alarming, and negatively associated with (c) initiating and (d) patrolling.

Interpersonal liking. Given differences in the degree to which others' endorse the ideas and suggestions they hear expressed, there may also be differences in affective social responses to the different types of voice. *Interpersonal liking* can be thought of as an evaluation of another person and whether the evaluator feels an affective connection to that person (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). In general, a positive interpersonal reception may be more likely with championing and initiating due to the promotive nature of the idea that may be viewed as less threatening than prohibitive voice (Lam, Rees, Levesque, & Ornstein, 2017). Thus, individuals who champion ideas may generally be seen in a more positive light and well-liked by others in their organization (e.g., Whiting et al., 2012). Others may form a positive impression of those who persistently promote a new idea and view them as more engaged in their work and willing to put aside a personal agenda to enhance the work group or organization (Huang, Xu, & Lu, 2014). With initiating, coworkers and organizational leaders may find such behavior not only highly valuable and important, but may appreciate the variety of the "big picture" promotive ideas, which together with an increased prosocial view of that person, may result in increased liking (e.g., Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996). This line of reasoning is consistent with Lam and colleagues' (2017) recent theorizing that "when habitual voice is more promotive [e.g., initiating], it may be perceived as less threatening and voice recipients may perceive habitual voicers to be acting from prosocial rather than self-interested motives, leading to more functional outcomes for the voicer" (p. 27).

In contrast to championing and initiating, others in the organization may not respond as warmly to alarming and patrolling. A repeated expression of a specific organizational problem may create strain in the social system by threatening managers'

credibility and reputation (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Research has shown that others in the organization may experience alarming from others as overtly negative and interpersonally dissatisfying (e.g., Perrucci et al., 1980; Rehg, Miceli, Near, & Van Scotter, 2008). As an example, in his study of repeated expressions of upward dissent, Kassing (2009) found that repeatedly calling attention to an organizational problem elicited a negative response from others, who not only did not like the behavior but also found it irritating, annoying, and aggravating. If individuals engage in patrolling and express a variety of problematic issues with the organization, then this may result in “relatively more dysfunctional and few functional consequences compared to expressing promotive voice habitually, because habitually pointing out concerns, errors, and mistakes can make recipients feel threatened or unsupported” (Lam et al., 2017, p. 27). Thus, when individuals express concern about a variety of concerning problems that exist across the workplace, then this behavior may threaten interpersonal relationships (Alberts, 1988; Heck et al., 2005) and result in decreased liking of the voicer. As summarized by Kowalski (2002), “people find it annoying to listen to other people continually express dissatisfaction with everything under the sun” (p. 1026).

Hypothesis 14: Interpersonal liking is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and negatively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

Active listening. The value of voice expressed by employees may only be realized if the voicers’ ideas or concerns are actually listened to (Morrison, 2014). In this regard, *active listening* can be viewed as the behavioral process through which targets of voice signal to listeners that they are heard (Bodie, 2011; Drollinger, Comer, & Warrington, 2006). That is, voicers “read the wind” (Dutton et al., 1997) and look for

behavioral feedback that the target of their ideas or concerns is actually receiving their message. These signals come in the form of non-verbal cues, asking clarifying questions that show their engaged focus, and body language (e.g., head nods) that show others are listening (Bodie, 2011). There are good reasons to believe that supervisors will respond more favorably to championing and initiating compared to alarming and patrolling. For instance, championing and initiating are positively valenced (et al., Liang et al., 2012), which valence may soften the challenge component of constructive voice. Furthermore, supervisors may be find great value in the ideas and creative suggestions embedded in championing and initiating, and would seek behavioral confirmations that draw out this type of voice. Moreover, they may seek out employees who speak up with initiating as sources for new suggestions or positive perspectives on how a variety of things in the organization could be improved.

In contrast, supervisors or other organizational members may not listen as actively to the concerns and problems shared by employees. Alarming and patrolling may be more likely to create tension or strain within the social system as individuals' expressions of concerning issues or problematic workplace practices that need to be resolved make a discrete challenge to the status quo (e.g., Burrell, 2012; Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Grant, 2013). In addition to challenging the status quo in the team or organization, alarming and patrolling are also more likely to personally challenge supervisors and the way they have managed—or mismanaged—organizational matters in the past. Thus, with potentially higher levels of resistance from supervisors and increased threats to their credibility (e.g., Morrison & Milliken, 2000), supervisors may be less inclined to engage in the problems presented by employees, and the behavioral manifestation of their lack of

engagement will be visible in a diminished sense of active listening. Furthermore, supervisors may feel that they have “heard this problem before” and, akin to the “boy who cried wolf” will dismiss the repeated expression of a workplace problem (i.e., alarming) or the expression of yet another problem brought up by the organizational watchdog (i.e., patrolling)—and will not, therefore, give their full attention to listening to the voicer.

Hypothesis 15: Active listening is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and negatively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

Promotability and job performance. When employees engage in various types of voice, others are likely to notice and form impressions about that individual and the value they add with their suggestions to the organization (e.g., McClean, Martin, Emich, & Woodruff, 2018; Weiss & Morrison, 2018). Thus these impressions influence how others judge the current performance as well as the potential future performance of voicing individuals. *Job performance* is the aggregation of evaluated behavioral episodes over some distinct period of time (Motowidlo et al., 1997; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), and is the most important criterion variable in management research (Austin & Villanova, 1992). Similar to performance, *promotability* captures the upward mobility and future career potential of an individual. There are good reasons to believe that championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, as types of constructive voice, would be positively related to job performance and promotability. For example, constructive voice seeks to contribute to the enhanced performance and functioning of the organization (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). Moreover, constructive voice is an extra-role behavior, and prior research has shown that when individuals go beyond the formal bounds of their role to

contribute to the organization that they are rewarded with higher ratings of job performance (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podakoff, & Blume, 2009; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Thus, when individuals speak up with any type of constructive voice, it appears that supervisors would find those employees more valuable, view them in a more positive light (McClellan et al., 2018), and reward them with higher performance ratings (Whiting et al., 2012).

However, recent meta-analytic research found that promotive voice was positively associated with performance whereas prohibitive voice was negatively associated with performance (Chamberlin, et al., 2017). The negative relationship between prohibitive voice and job performance may be due to the fact that prohibitive voice is more negative in nature (Liang et al., 2012). Or, supervisors may tire or feel depleted when employees share problems and concerns because the supervisors then have to allocate their limited time and resources to addressing and resolving the problems. In a similar vein, recent work has shown that promotive voice is significantly related to the extent to which voicers are positive regarded—which views may lead to increased promotions—whereas prohibitive voice exhibits no significant positive perceptions (McClellan et al., 2018). Although some work by Huang and colleagues (2014) found that prohibitive voice can return positive ratings of job performance and promotability under high leader-member exchange conditions, the authors also found that a high frequency of prohibitive voice is more negatively viewed by managers vis-à-vis ratings of job performance and promotability than a high frequency of promotive voice. In other words, frequently mentioning problems that exist around the organization—whether the same problem repeatedly (i.e., alarming) or a variety of different problems (i.e., patrolling)—can lead to

negative ratings of job performance and diminished promotability as managers' performance association with employees is tainted by the connection to the negative and harmful aspects of the workplace that the employees expresses. In considering this most recent research along with these conceptual arguments, I propose that promotability and job performance are positively associated with the promotive types of voice (i.e., championing and initiating) and negatively associated with the prohibitive types of voice (i.e., alarming and patrolling).

Hypothesis 16: Promotability is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and negatively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

Hypothesis 17: Job performance is positively associated with (a) championing and (b) initiating, and negatively associated with (c) alarming and (d) patrolling.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

In this section I describe my process for establishing construct validity for championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. I follow the recommendations of Hinkin (1995, 1998) in demonstrating construct validity by examining its component pieces (i.e., content validity, internal consistency, factor structure, convergent validity, discriminant validity, nomological network validity, criterion-related validity). Providing evidence of construct validity is critical so that as scholars we can be assured that we are actually measuring the constructs that we think we are (Hinkin, 1998; Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). I next discuss my scale development process and how I generated items, assessed content validity, and reduced the number of items. I will then discuss Study 1 and Study 2, and how I examined the reliability, factor structure, convergent validity, discriminant validity, nomological network validity, and criterion-related validity. Although construct validation efforts are iterative in nature, I view my efforts as the first major step in indicating the importance of considering the scope of voice.

Scale Development

Significant scholarly work has been applied to developing different types of constructive voice. Some of this research has fallen under the voice label whereas some of the research has taken place in closely related domains. For example, a large majority of the research on constructive voice is clearly label as voice (Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Knoll & van Dick, 2013; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998) or even challenging voice (Burris, 2012). As noted, Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012) validated constructs on promotive voice and prohibitive voice that fall under the constructive voice umbrella (Maynes &

Podsakoff, 2014). Still other research has referred to constructive voice as creativity (Zhou & George, 2001), issue selling (Dutton & Ashford, 1993), or organizational dissent (Kassing, 1998). Finally, elements of constructive voice also appear present in champion behavior (Howell et al., 2005). Although there may be other constructs that fall, at least in part, under the domain of constructive voice, these conceptualizations of constructive voice mentioned above are representative of the construct's conceptual space.

Item generation. As articulated by Hinkin (1998), generating and creating items is the first step in scale development. Key to this process is the theoretical foundation of the construct that exists in the literature. In my case, and as is apparent throughout my review in previous sections, sufficient theoretical clarity exists in how constructive voice is defined: the expression of ideas and concerns to improve or preserve organizational functioning (Chamberlin et al., 2017; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). Because of the theoretical clarity and agreement in the literature, I employed a deductive approach (e.g., Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) to examine items of constructive voice and later generate items that tapped constructive voice in its promotive and prohibitive forms as well as accounting for the scope of voice.

I first conducted an extensive review of the literature in order to identify items that tapped the constructive voice construct as defined above. In so doing, I located 297 items from 47 different constructs. However, many of these items were part of other constructs that didn't intentionally measure voice. For example, in their study of taking charge, Morrison and Phelps (1999) present a 10-item measure, of which only one item measures constructive voice: "This person often makes constructive suggestions for improving how things operate within the organization." Even some voice-specific

constructs were contaminated by items that did not directly measure voice. Most prominently, Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) measure of voice contains two items – “This particular co-worker gets involved in issues that affect the quality of work life here in this group” and “This particular co-worker keeps well informed about issues where his/her opinion might be useful to this work group”—that are not considered constructive voice but more general extra role behavior. Other scholars have noted this contamination of the construct (Detert & Burris, 2007; Grant et al., 2009; Liang et al., 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). Moreover, I removed duplicate items that were created when more recent scholarly work utilized previously validated measures. As an example, Scott and Bruce (1994) developed a measure of innovative performance that contained the item, “Promotes and champions ideas to others,” which was later incorporated into Zhou and George's (2001) measures of creativity and Parker and Collins' (2010) measure of individual innovation (2010). In short, I examined the 297 identified items, removed exact duplicates and only retained items that captured a verbal expression of ideas, suggestions, or concerns that were given to improve or preserve the effective functioning of the organization.

Completing this exercise resulted in 130 unique constructive voice items. I next evaluated these 130 items, which are listed in Table 3, and examined whether the items tapped promotive voice (i.e., expression of new ideas or suggestions for improving organizational functioning), prohibitive voice (i.e., expression of concern about problematic work factors that harm organizational functioning), voice concentration voice (i.e., repeated expression of a specific idea or issues), or voice breadth (i.e., expression of a variety of ideas and issues). 92 of the items were promotive in nature,

whereas 38 of the items were prohibitive in nature. The ratio of promotive to prohibitive voice items appears reasonable considering the balance of empirical work on the constructs. Of the items identified in Table 3, some of the measures were clearly promotive in nature: “This particular co-worker speaks up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures” (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), “Proactively develop and make suggestions for issues that may influence the unit” (Liang et al., 2012), “Comes up with new and practical ideas to improve performance” (Zhou & George, 2001), and “Sells the innovation to key people” (Howell et al., 2005). In contrast, other measures were clearly prohibitive in nature: “Advise other colleagues against undesirable behaviors that would hamper job performance” (Liang et al, 2012) and “I would address the problem even if speaking up entailed disadvantages” (Knoll & van Dick, 2013). Finally, some measures were a mixture of promotive voice and prohibitive voice items: “Regularly proposes ideas for new or more effective work methods” and “Often speaks up with recommendations about how to fix work-related problems” (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014), “Makes constructive suggestions” and “Speaks up to prohibit behavior harmful to the organization” (Farh et al., 2004), “I give suggestions to my District Manager about how to make this restaurant better, even if others disagree” and “I challenge my District Manager to deal with problems around here” (Burriss, 2012), and “I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization” and “I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren’t working to my supervisor or someone in management” (Kassing, 1998).

Initial set of items. Curiously, out of the 130 constructive voice items I identified and considered, none of the 130 items could readily be classified as voice concentration

or voice breadth. The scope of voice appears to be completely missing from empirical measures. I should note that in my initial literature search I came across one assertiveness item from the literature on upward influence that approached voice concentration: “Repeatedly reminded him or her about what I wanted” (Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980). Unfortunately, even this item is not clearly constructive voice; in the item, it is uncertain not clear whether the reminder or what the person may want is constructive-oriented in nature. Furthermore, although the creative literature has examined fluency (i.e., the number of unique ideas generated), common tests of fluency are primarily derived from experimental problem solving tasks, typically with children (e.g., Torrance, 1995). In sum, the lack of direct measures of the scope of voice led me to the process of generating items that could measure championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling by adapting existing items and writing new, more direct items.

In order to develop the items for my four types of constructive voice, I continued to follow Hinkin’s (1998) guidelines. Specifically, I developed items for each dimension by amending existing scales where possible, and created new items that were simple, straightforward, not double-barreled or two-pronged, not reverse-coded, and needed to match the definition of the construct (Hinkin, 1995, 1998). Given that existing constructs did not directly tap voice concentration or voice breadth, I had to incorporate components of the scope of voice into each item. Of the items identified in the literature, I amended items from Howell et al. (2005), Liang et al., (2012), Maynes and Podsakoff (2014), Podsakoff et al., (1990), Van Dyne and LePine (1998), Zhou and George (2001), among others noted in my analysis. In seeking to balance parsimony with domain sampling, I began with the 7 items I created for each type of voice, with the expectation that

approximately half of those items would make it to the final scale (Hinkin, 1998). These initial 28 items are included in Appendix B.

I report these initial items in the Appendix, but also include them here. For championing, the items are: “Advocates the change of a specific work method,” “Frequently promotes an innovative solution that could benefit the organization,” “Keeps talking about a new way of doing things even though others may disagree,” “Makes recommendations about a workplace improvement over and over again,” “Proactively suggests pursuing a specific opportunity to improve the company,” “Promotes a specific idea that could help the organization be more productive,” and “Voices the same repeated idea that could enhance performance.” The initiating items are: “Speaks up with many new approaches to execute tasks,” “Discusses ideas for a lot of new projects,” “Generates a seemingly limitless number of solutions to be more productive,” “Communicates a large number of work-related ideas that enhance effectiveness,” “Proposes a variety of ideas for more effective work methods,” “Raises an array of suggestions to improve work procedures or processes,” and “Suggests many different ideas for new projects.” The alarming items are: “Persists in telling others about an alarming workplace practice,” “Repeatedly expresses concern about a specific practice that could harm the company,” “Reports about a specific workplace coordination problem to management,” “Seems to always be talking about the same issue that affects efficiency at work,” “Speaks up like a ‘broken record’ about a particular organizational challenge,” “Raises the same worry about how things are done around here,” and “Vocalizes against a problematic work factor to be avoided.” Finally, the patrolling items are: “Advises against all of the undesirable behaviors he/she sees at work,” “Communicates the many issues that exist

throughout the workplace,” “Reports on a variety of faulty work procedures,” “Expresses concern about all sorts of practices that could hurt the company,” “Gives recommendations about how to fix many work-related problems,” “Mentions all the wrongs the organization could make right,” and “Points out workplace challenges everywhere they arise.”

Content validity. In developing these items, I sought to assess content validity by determining whether the items capture the breadth of content domain (Hinkin & Tracey, 1999). In adapting and writing these new voice items, I sought to capture the content domain of constructive voice and maintain balance or parallelism across the championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling dimensions. For example, previously developed measures of voice have incorporated how employees may voice about organizational practices (Liang et al., 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014), procedures (Liang et al., 2012; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), work methods (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014), projects (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), efficiency or effectiveness (Liang et al., 2012), processes (Farh et al., 2007), and task work (Choi, 2007; Zhou & George, 2001)—all in order to improve the functioning of the team, work unit, or organization. Given this existing voice content domain, I sought to maintain balance among and across the different dimensions as I developed and refined new voice items.

Content validity: Stage 1. The first step in my content validation process was to understand how the four types of voice may be related and whether the initial items would correlate and load together on a factor analysis. To this end, I first recruited a sample of 76 individuals on Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) who were at least 18

years of age and otherwise employed full time. Because the choice of sample is important, I chose a sample that represents the population of subsequent organizational workers who may respond to my instruments (Hinkin, 1995). Research has suggested that MTurk workers may be more representative of an organizational population than student subject pools (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). The average age of my sample was 33.7 years ($SD = 10.0$), 66.7% were male, and average work experience was 11.9 years ($SD = 8.3$). Given that reliability is an indication of the precision of a measure and the corresponding interrelatedness among the measure's items (Cortina, 1993), I assessed the internal reliability of my voice constructs to ensure that they present a coefficient alpha of at least .70 (e.g., Hinkin, 1998). Each of the constructive voice dimensions exhibited adequate reliability: championing ($\alpha = .87$), initiating ($\alpha = .92$), alarming ($\alpha = .83$), and patrolling ($\alpha = .89$). However, calculating correlations in SPSS v. 23 revealed very high correlations among championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling (between .64 and .86)—an indication that my initial items were too similar. Consequently, I revised my initial voice items in order to reduce the inter-item correlation and better delineate the types of voice.

Content validity: Stage 2. I administered my revised 7-item measures to a new MTurk sample of 152 full-time working employees. In order to have an independent and conscientious sample, I removed eight individuals from my sample, seven who had taken the stage 1 survey and one person who failed a simple attention check (“please select “disagree””; Meade & Craig, 2012; Hinkin, 1998). Of the remaining 144 respondents, the average age of my sample was 35.2 years ($SD = 9.8$), 62.9% were male, 69.4% were Caucasian, 13.9% were Asian, and average work experience was 13.7 years ($SD = 9.3$).

Reliabilities for my measures were still adequate: championing ($\alpha = .86$), initiating ($\alpha = .91$), alarming ($\alpha = .86$), and patrolling ($\alpha = .91$). Although the revisions I made to the items appeared to reduce the composite correlations, the correlations between my focal voice variables were still high (between .54 and .78). I compared inter-item correlations to see which items were particularly problematic in overlapping across composite variables. Consequently, I identified and removed two items from each scale which exhibited the highest inter-item correlations. When these eight items were removed, the composite correlations were reduced even further (between .50 and .72). However, the inter-item correlations for some of the remaining twenty items were still not distinct enough and warranted additional refinement. Specifically, in running an exploratory factor analysis, only three factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (the fourth component had an eigenvalue of .97). The variance explained by those three factors was 58%, which was below Hinkin's (1998) minimum threshold of 60%.

Content validity: Stage 3. In an effort to further refine my measures, I revised the current five item measures and collected data from 151 workers from MTurk. Of these individuals, 38 had taken a previous survey and an additional five respondents failed the attention check. I removed these participants, yielding a final sample of 108 respondents of which the average age was 34.5 years ($SD = 8.8$), 59.8% were male, 68.5% were Caucasian, 13.0% were Asian, 10.2% were African American, and average years of work experience was 12.7 ($SD = 8.3$). With this sample of 108 workers, I examined the factor structure by submitting the responses of the twenty voice items to an exploratory factor analysis. Consistent with my theorizing, four factors emerged with eigenvalues over 1.0. The total variance explained by the first factor was 47.6%, with all four factors

explaining 70.8% of the variance—well above Hinkin’s (1998) recommendation of 60% variance explained. I then examined cross-loadings greater than .30 on these four factors. From those cross-loading items, I removed the lowest loading item from each dimension, which resulted in four final items for each type of constructive voice. When running a subsequent exploratory factor analysis of these sixteen voice items, four distinct factors (eigenvalues > 1) still emerged with 73.1% of the variance explained. One initiating item (“I propose a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods”) had a cross-loading at .45 whereas none of the other items had cross-loadings above the .40 threshold recommended by Hinkin (1998). The correlations between the four types of voice with these revised items was between .46 and .60, which is consistent with correlations reported between promotive and prohibitive voice as well as other types of voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017; Liang et al., 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). Also of note, the reliability of those four-item scales was still sufficient across this new separate sample and with fewer scale items: championing ($\alpha = .85$), initiating ($\alpha = .84$), alarming ($\alpha = .91$), and patrolling ($\alpha = .87$). In removing items in this stage as well as the previous stage, I ensured that I was not making the construct deficient and removing items that would reduce my ability to fully capture the constructive voice domain. Consequently, the final four items for each scale capture the most frequently mentioned elements of constructive voice’s content domain: the remaining items evoke how employees may voice about organizational practices, procedures, work methods, and projects that are employed in the most commonly used voice measures (e.g., Liang et al., 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

Content validity: Stage 4. Once the items were settled, I followed the approach developed by Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, and Lankau (1993) as my final test of content validity. Specifically, I presented respondents with a four-page survey. Each survey page presented one of the types of constructive voice, along with its definition, and asked respondents to indicate whether each of the 16 items reflected or did not reflect the definition of the construct. Their response choices ranged from 1 (“Not at all captured by the definition”) to 5 (“Completely captured by the definition”). I recruited a sample of 157 MTurk workers to participate in this effort. The average age of this sample was 32.7 years ($SD = 8.3$), 71.3% were male, 58.0% Caucasian, 22.3% were Asian, and the average years of work experience was 11.3 years ($SD = 7.8$).

As recommended by Hinkin and Tracey (1999), I conducted one-way ANOVAs and compared the mean ratings of each item on the four type of voice. If any of the item means on one factor were not significantly different than an item mean on a different factor, then that item does not sufficiently match the content of that specific dimension. The results of each *t*-test revealed that the championing items had significantly higher ratings (all $p < .01$) on the championing definition ($M = 3.95$) than on the initiating definition ($M = 2.42$), alarming definition ($M = 2.17$), and the patrolling definition ($M = 1.82$). Similarly, the initiating items were significantly higher (all $p < .01$) on the initiating definition ($M = 3.98$) than on the championing definition ($M = 2.41$), alarming definition ($M = 1.92$), and patrolling definition ($M = 2.05$). The alarming items were also significantly higher (all $p < .01$) on the alarming definition ($M = 3.70$) than on the championing definition ($M = 2.34$), initiating definition ($M = 1.92$), and the patrolling definition ($M = 2.50$). Finally, the patrolling items were significantly higher (all $p < .01$)

on the patrolling definition ($M = 3.42$) than on the championing definition ($M = 1.90$), initiating definition ($M = 2.29$), and the alarming definition ($M = 2.87$). These significant differences provide additional evidence of content validity.

Study 1: Factor Structure and Nomological Network

With the content validity of my scales established, I further probed the psychometric properties of the four types of voice and tested the nomological network I hypothesized. Specifically, I collected data from 396 MTurk workers to evaluate the factor structure of my data (i.e., convergent validity and discriminant validity in my model). Consistent with previous stages, I removed 88 individuals who had taken a previous version of the survey and hence may have been somewhat familiar with the voice items but may not have noticed the refinement to the items. Additionally, 12 respondents failed an attention check, five of whom had also taken a previous survey. After removing these individuals, my sample was composed of 301 full-time working employees. Hinkin (1998) has suggested that having a sample of 200 individuals is a conservative sample size when conducting confirmatory factor analysis. Of my 301 person sample, the average age was 34.9 years ($SD = 9.2$), 64.2% were male, 71.7% Caucasian, 11.9% were Asian, and the average years of work experience was 13.1 years ($SD = 8.5$).

Measures. I administered a number of measures to my recruited sample. Except for the revised voice measures, the complete list of measures and items can be found in Appendix B. Unless noted differently, all measures were on a five-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree). The

measures chosen in my assessment of the nomological network was guided by theories of self-regulation (Carver & Scheier, 1998; Higgins, 1997, 1998).

Types of constructive voice. The primary constructs in this study are the developed measures of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling found in Table 5. In this sample, items were adapted to be self-reported. Thus sample items for championing ($\alpha = .94$) include, “I repeatedly suggest one innovative workplace practice” and “I often suggest pursuing a specific project to improve the company.” Sample items for initiating are: “I propose a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods” and “I raise an array of original suggestions to improve future work procedures” ($\alpha = .92$). For alarming, sample items are: “I express concern about one problematic work method over and over again” and “I vocally oppose a specific poorly functioning work project time after time” ($\alpha = .93$). Finally, sample items for patrolling are: “I alert others to all sorts of hurtful work practices” and “I warn against various problems with organizational procedures” ($\alpha = .93$).

Personal initiative. An individual’s tendency to be self-starting, proactive, and persistent is an important predictor of constructive voice (Chamberlin et al., 2017). Consequently, I measured personal initiative with Frese et al.’s (1997) seven-item measure. Sample items include: “Whenever something goes wrong, I search for a solution immediately,” “Whenever there is a chance to get actively involved, I take it,” and “I take initiative immediately even when others don’t” ($\alpha = .89$).

Felt obligation for constructive change. Liang et al. (2012) have shown the importance of individuals’ feeling responsible for suggesting changes to improve the organization. I employed their measure of felt obligation for constructive change, with

sample items such as “I owe it to the organization to do whatever I can to come up with ideas/solutions to achieve its goals,” “I have an obligation to the organization to voice out my own opinions,” and “I feel a personal obligation to produce constructive suggestions to help the organization achieve its goals” ($\alpha = .92$).

Promotion focus. Regulatory focus theory suggests the importance of individuals’ basic goal striving strategies and whether individuals’ focus is more promotion or prevention in nature. I utilized a shortened promotion focus scale developed by Lockwood, Jordan, and Kunda (2002). Sample items include, “I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations,” “I see myself as someone who is striving to reach my ‘ideal self’ – to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations,” and “In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life” ($\alpha = .86$).

Prevention focus. Whereas promotion focus is concerned about what might be, a prevention focus seeks to avoid harm or failure (Johnson, Chang, & Yang, 2010). I used a shortened version of Lockwood et al.’s (2002) prevention focus scale. Sample items include “In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life,” “I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my work goals,” and “I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life” ($\alpha = .89$).

Positive affect. Finally, one’s goal focus may sensitive employees to experience positive and negative emotions (Carver & Scheier, 1998; Lanaj et al., 2012) and the scope of voice could be influenced by the extent to which they tend to experience either positive affect or negative affect (e.g., Fredrickson, 2001; Kowalski, 1996). I measured trait positive affect using 10 items from the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994). Participants indicated the extent which they generally feel “active,” “alert,” “attentive,”

“determined,” “enthusiastic,” “excited,” “inspired,” “interested,” “proud,” and “strong.” These items were anchored from 1 (“Not at All”) to 5 (“A Great Deal”). Cronbach alpha for this scale is .91.

Negative affect. Participants will also be asked to indicate the extent to which they generally experience negative affect. Again, employing the PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994), respondents indicated their general feelings of being “afraid,” “scared,” “nervous,” “jittery,” irritable,” “hostile,” “guilty,” “ashamed,” “upset,” or “distressed.” Like positive affect, these items ranged from 1 (“Not at All”) to 5 (“A Great Deal”). Cronbach’s alphas is .94.

Cognitive complexity. I measured cognitive complexity in two ways in order to mitigate potential respondent fatigue for my field sample. The Bieri and colleagues (1966) repertory grid based on Kelly’s (1955) rep test can take up to 60 minutes (e.g., Carraher & Buckley, 1996). Because of the fatiguing length of this test, I administered the shortened 4x6 response grid validated by Spengler and Strohmer, (1994a, 1994b) that yields sufficient reliability and correlates highly with Bieri et al.’s (1966) original test. In addition to this, I used a five-item scale Presbitero (2015) adapted from Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, and Jarvis (1996) to measure cognitive complexity. Sample items include: “I would prefer complex to simple problems” and “I prefer to think about small and daily projects to complicated and long-term ones (reversed).” For this latter scale, Cronbach’s alpha is .82.

Learning goal orientation. Participants responded to the items developed by VandeWalle (1997) regarding their learning goal orientation. Sample items include “I

often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge” and “I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I’ll learn new skills” ($\alpha = .90$).

Performance goal orientation. I also administered VandeWalle’s measures of performance-prove goal orientation and performance-avoid goal orientation. Sample items of performance-prove goal orientation are “I’m concerned with showing that I can perform better than my coworkers” and “I try to figure out what it takes to prove my ability to others at work” ($\alpha = .86$). Sample items of performance-avoid goal orientation are “Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill” and “I prefer to avoid situations at work where I might perform poorly” ($\alpha = .90$).

Promotive voice. I examine whether championing and initiating correlate with promotive voice in order to assess convergent validity. I used Liang et al.’s, (2012) validated measure of promotive voice. Sample items include, “Proactively suggest new projects which are beneficial to the work unit” and “Raise suggestions to improve the unit’s working procedure” ($\alpha = .93$).

Prohibitive voice. It is likely that alarming and patrolling correlate highly with prohibitive voice. I included Liang et al.’s, (2012) measure of prohibitive voice, which includes items such as “Advise other colleagues against undesirable behaviors that would hamper job performance” and “Speak up honestly with problems that might cause serious loss to the work unit, even when/though dissenting opinions exist” ($\alpha = .91$).

Voice concentration. As a robustness check, in case my proposed factor structure does not hold, I also included three items intended to measure voice concentration. Those items are: “I repeat suggestions about a small set of issues,” “I make recommendations

related to the same few topics,” and “I share ideas regarding a very limited number of subjects” ($\alpha = .88$).

Voice endorsement. The frequency with which individuals suggest an idea or issue may vary, which may influence the likelihood that others will support and endorse ideas they hear. I administered an adapted version of Burriss’s (2012) voice endorsement measure, which includes two facets. One facet of his measure captures whether coworkers hear an idea and take it forward. I adapted items such as “Others take my comments to my supervisor” to be self-rated. The other facet of Burriss’s measure is whether an idea should be acted upon. Again adapted to be a self-rating, this dimension includes items such as “My comments are valuable.” Overall Cronbach’s alpha is .85.

Interpersonal liking. Individuals may speak up with ideas or about issues that could improve the workplace, but others could react negatively or positively to their coworkers’ speaking up behavior. Consequently, individuals responded to Wayne and Ferris’ (1990) adapted four-item measure about the degree to which they perceive others in their work group like interacting with them. With this dependent variable and the others, items were adapted so individuals could provide self-ratings on these constructs. Sample liking items include “Others like me as a coworker” or “I am a pleasure to work with” ($\alpha = .90$).

Active listening. How others respond to employees’ speaking up behavior is an important signal whether one feels heard. I measured active listening with Drollinger, Comer, and Warrington’s (2006) scale. Sample items are “Others assure me that they are listening by using verbal acknowledgement,” “Others ask questions that show they

understand my positions” and “Others show me that they are listening by their body language (e.g., head nods)” ($\alpha = .86$).

Promotability. Participants responded to an adapted three-item scale developed by Thacker and Wayne (1995) regarding their potential job promotability. Items were adapted to change the referent. Sample items are “I believe that I will have a successful career” and “I believe that I have high potential” ($\alpha = .82$).

Job performance. Individuals responded to four-items adapted from MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter (1991) about their job performance. Items include “I am one of the best at what I do” and “In general, I am a good performer” ($\alpha = .88$).

Demographic and other measures. In addition to these constructs, I gathered demographic information from respondents. I collected information on gender, which has been shown to influence how frequently individuals may speak up (e.g., Brescoll, 2011). Individuals with higher levels of education may have a greater number of ideas to share (e.g., Frese, Teng, & Wijnen, 1999) so I collected education level. Individuals in more senior organizational positions or who have been in their position or with the company for a longer tenure, may perceive a greater license to speak up (e.g., Fuller et al., 2006; Stamper & Van Dyne, 2001). Finally, I collected information on respondents’ age and ethnicity. Also, given the online nature of the study, I incorporated an attention check item (“please choose ‘strongly disagree’”) as well as a qualitative question (“In your honest opinion, should we use your data in our analysis in this study”) as advocated by Meade and Craig (2012). For Study 1 as well as Study 2, I report the findings in the Results section.

Study 2: Field Study

The overall purpose of Study 2 was to further validate my measures in a field sample by accounting for deficiencies in Study 1 and examining the outcomes of the four types of voice. Specifically, I designed a multi-source, multi-wave study in order to build on findings observed in Study 1 and minimize common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). In addition to testing the nomological network of antecedents to championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, my primary Study 2 aim was to establish criterion validity. That is, I sought to better understand the consequences of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, and whether others “hear” or “tune out” these different types of voice, along with exploring other associated implications.

Sample and procedures. I collected my data from two field samples, a regional unit of a publicly traded insurance firm comprised of 158 employees (128 subordinates and 30 supervisors) and a manufacturing facility of a publicly traded company comprised of 163 employees (151 subordinates and 12 supervisors). One of the firms is based in the western United States and the other is based in the Midwest. The insurance-based firm had multiple branch locations where employees in the branch worked together; the manufacturing facility had only one location, but employees worked on different machines or packaging processes together. When I contacted each firm, I initially presented my overarching research project to the operating manager of the regional unit or facility. In exchange for access to the organizations’ employees, I agreed to provide a high level summary of my findings along with insights the firms may find appropriate to their business.

I administered surveys in three waves. In one firm, surveys were administered via Qualtrics.com; with the other firm, I personally administered hard copies of the surveys.

With each communication, respondents were assured of the confidentiality of the survey—that their personal responses would not be shared with top management. Instead, top management would only receive a high-level summary of the findings, from which the individual employee could not be identified. In the first wave, subordinates responded to questions regarding the antecedent variables in my model (i.e., personal initiative, felt obligation for constructive change, promotion focus, prevention focus, positive affect, negative affect, cognitive complexity, learning goal orientation, performance goal orientation, championing, initiating, alarming, patrolling, and demographic variables). In the first wave, 218 subordinates responded to the survey, a response rate of 78.1%. Approximately three weeks later, supervisors received a survey and rated subordinates on championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. Utilizing supervisor ratings of voice is a norm in the voice literature. This norm exists because the majority of research on voice has focused on its antecedents and what motivates or inhibits employees to speak up (Morrison, 2011, 2014); as such, voice is often a dependent variable and rated by supervisors in order to avoid common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Consistent with the supervisor rating norm, 26 supervisors responded in the second wave, a response rate of 86.7%. A final survey was administered to subordinates and supervisors regarding the outcomes in my model (i.e., interpersonal liking, voice endorsement, active listening, promotability, and job performance) approximately three weeks after the second wave. Employees rated up to three coworkers in their workgroup on voice endorsement and interpersonal liking, whereas supervisors responded to active listening, promotability, and job performance items about their subordinates. In the final wave, 251 total employees participated, a response rate of 78.2%. The average age of respondents was 49.6 years

($SD = 12.0$), 43.8% were male, 89.2% Caucasian and 8.5% were Hispanic, and the average years of work experience was 26.5 years ($SD = 11.6$).

Measures. I assessed time one subordinate-rated measures with the same scales described in the previous study. In contrast to the self-ratings of voice and outcome variables collected in Study 1, supervisors and coworkers (in the same branch or on the same machine/process) responded to items about subordinates or other coworkers with the aim of establishing criterion validity as described below.

Types of constructive voice. Supervisors responded to the finalized measures for championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling (reported in Table 4) for each subordinate. Sample items include: This employee “repeatedly suggests one innovative workplace practice” (championing), “proposes a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods” (initiating), “expresses concern about one problematic work method over and over again” (alarming), and “advises against many adverse work methods he/she has seen at work” (patrolling). As continued evidence of construct validity, each of these scales demonstrated adequate reliability: championing $\alpha = .91$, initiating $\alpha = .90$, alarming $\alpha = .90$, and patrolling $\alpha = .91$.

Voice endorsement. I administered Burris’s (2012) measure of voice endorsement to coworkers with sample items: “I take this person’s comments to my supervisor” and “I think this person’s comments should be implemented” ($\alpha = .88$). For each employee rated, I calculated the average of the coworkers’ ratings. Further, I calculated $r_{wg(j)}$ utilizing a uniform distribution (e.g., LeBreton & Senter, 2008) to ensure consistency among multiple coworker responses of the focal individual. The $r_{wg(j)}$ for voice endorsement was .75 ($SD = .32$).

Interpersonal liking. Up to three coworkers responded to Wayne and Ferris' (1990) four-item measure about the degree to which they like interacting with those on their immediate work group. Sample items include "[Coworker] is someone I like as a coworker" or "[Coworker] is a pleasure to work with" ($\alpha = .97$). Similar to the voice endorsement responses, I averaged coworkers' responses for each individual and calculated the $r_{wg(j)}$. The $r_{wg(j)}$ for interpersonal liking was .80 ($SD = .29$).

Active listening. I measured active listening from the supervisor's perspective with Drollinger, Comer, and Warrington's (2006) four-item scale. For each subordinate, supervisors responded to the following items: "I assure them that I am listening by using verbal acknowledgements," "I assure them that I am receptive to their ideas," "I ask questions that show my understanding of their positions," and "I show them that I am listening by my body language (e.g., head nods). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .83.

Promotability. Supervisors also rated subordinates' career potential. I used Thacker and Wayne's (1995) scale. Items are "I believe that this employee will have a successful career," "If I had to select a successor for my position, it would be this subordinate," and "I believe that this employee has high potential" ($\alpha = .80$).

Job performance. As the ultimate criterion measure (Austin & Villanova, 1992), I also measured job performance. Supervisors responded to four-items adapted from MacKenzie, Podsakoff, and Fetter (1991) about their subordinates' job performance. The four items are "All things considered, they are outstanding at their job," "They are one of the best at what they do," "They are very good at their daily job activities," and "In general, they are a good performer" ($\alpha = .95$).

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

I report the results of two studies in the section that follows. First, I report the tests of my hypotheses. That is, I report on the factor structure (i.e., convergent and discriminant validity) as well as the nomological network validity from my final MTurk sample. Second, I report my findings from my field study, including the criterion validity of my voice measures that highlights the implications of the different types of voice.

Study 1 Analysis: Factor Structure and Nomological Network

Table 4 reports the descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities of Study 1. The correlations between the different types of constructive voice range from .54 to .72 (the average is .61), indicative of constructive commonality yet also distinctive dimensions (Law et al., 1998). Additionally, not all but many of the correlations between my constructive voice items and hypothesized antecedents or outcomes are significant and in the hypothesized direction. For example, personal initiative and felt obligation are positive and significant for each type of voice. Promotion focus and positive affect are positively associated with championing and initiating, whereas prevention focus and negative affect are positively associated with alarming and patrolling. Or, cognitive complexity and learning goal orientation are positively associated with initiating and patrolling. On the outcome side, liking and listening are positively associated with championing and initiating. Each type of voice is positively associated with voice endorsement, promotability, and performance. Consideration of these effects does not constitute a formal test of my hypotheses, but does provide some preliminary evidence that the hypothesized nomological network does find some support in the data.

Convergent and discriminant validity. With my online sample of 301 working employees, I first conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the four-factor voice model examined in a prior exploratory factor analysis. I conducted this analysis using Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015). I tested my hypothesized model—that there are four different types of constructive voice—as a baseline model against other viable nested models (e.g., Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

I first modeled a four-factor model, in which championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling load on their own separate factor. As reported in Table 5, this model fit the data well: $\chi^2(98) = 205.46$, CFI = .98, SRMR = .03, RMSEA = .06. I compared this model to a four-factor model in which constructive voice is a higher-order latent factor. Although this model fit the data well in an absolute sense— $\chi^2(100) = 240.97$, CFI = .97, SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .07—it was inferior to the four-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2(2) = 35.51$, $p < .01$). I next fit the data to two sets of two-factor models. The first two-factor model I fit was with championing and initiating loaded on a “promotive voice” factor, and alarming and patrolling loaded on a “prohibitive voice” factor. This model was inferior to the baseline model: $\chi^2(103) = 938.88$, CFI = .77, SRMR = .08, RMSEA = .18; $\Delta\chi^2(5) = 938.88$, $p < .01$. The second two-factor model was one where championing and alarming loaded on a “voice concentration” factor, and initiating and patrolling loaded on a “voice breadth” model. This model fit was still unacceptable considering Hu and Bentler’s (1999) criteria and compared to the baseline model: $\chi^2(103) = 1,315.11$, CFI = .74, SRMR = .09, RMSEA = .20; $\Delta\chi^2(5) = 1,109.66$, $p < .01$. Finally, I fit all 16 items to a single constructive voice factor. The data did not fit the one-factor model well: $\chi^2(104) = 1,660.29$, CFI = .66, SRMR = .10, RMSEA = .22; $\Delta\chi^2(6) = 1,454.83$, $p < .01$. In sum, Hypothesis 1, which predicted

that constructive voice is composed of four types of voice (i.e., championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling), was supported given that the four-factor model in which each voice type loads on a distinct factor is the best-fitting model. As reported in Table 6, the factor loadings for this best-fitting four-factor model are strong and significant ($p < .01$), with the average variance explained (AVE) above .50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Taken together, these findings suggest evidence of convergent validity with my developed measures and theoretical model.

In order to probe the distinctiveness of my voice constructs, I compared whether the focal constructs were less than perfectly correlated. Specifically, as evidence of discriminant validity, the average variance explained reported in Table 5 is greater than the shared variance among the voice factors and greater than the shared variance between the four types of voice and promotive voice, prohibitive voice, or voice concentration. To supplement this, I also compared whether my four dimensions of voice were significantly different than promotive and prohibitive voice as well as voice concentration. Although some non-comparison constructs are significant and also strongly correlated, the correlations between promotive voice and championing ($r = .59, p < .05$), promotive voice and initiating ($r = .76, p < .05$), prohibitive voice and alarming ($r = .48, p < .05$), prohibitive voice and patrolling ($r = .57, p < .05$), voice concentration and championing ($r = .57, p < .05$), and voice concentration and alarming ($r = .48, p < .05$) are each strong and significant. As reported in Table 7, I again conducted CFAs in Mplus 7.4. The best-fitting model was a seven-factor model, where each type of voice was distinct: $\chi^2 (356) = 705.17$, CFI = .96, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .04. This was significantly better than a seven-factor model where constructive voice was a higher-order latent variable [$\chi^2 (370)$

= 896.21, CFI = .94, SRMR = .07, RMSEA = .07, $\Delta\chi^2$ (14) = 191.04, $p < .01$], a four-factor model of “voice concentration,” “voice breadth,” “promotive voice,” and “prohibitive voice” [χ^2 (371) = 2,169.95, CFI = .78, SRMR = .13, RMSEA = .08, $\Delta\chi^2$ (15) = 1,464.78, $p < .01$], a three-factor model of “promotive voice,” “prohibitive voice,” and “voice concentration” [χ^2 (374) = 2,019.59, CFI = .71, SRMR = .15, RMSEA = .10, $\Delta\chi^2$ (18) = 2,019.59, $p < .01$], and a single-factor model where all the items were loaded on a “voice” factor [χ^2 (377) = 3,487.08, CFI = .62, SRMR = .17, RMSEA = .11, $\Delta\chi^2$ (21) = 2,781.91, $p < .01$]. These results provide additional evidence of the distinctiveness of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling.

Nomological network validity. In addition to confirming the factor structure of my model and the associated convergent and discriminant validity, I also sought to conduct a test of my hypothesized relationships. For this next set of analyses, I regressed the four types of voice on my hypothesized antecedents. Given potential theoretical distinctions in how specific antecedents might be related to my four types of voice as well as multicollinearity concerns, I performed these analyses in sets as guided by previous meta-analytical empirical results (Hypotheses 2-3), regulatory focus theory (Hypotheses 4-9), and control theory (Hypotheses 10-12). For outcomes, given that they are self-reported, more formal tests of these hypotheses—and examination of criterion validity—follow in my subsequent field sample study. For these relationships, I regressed the dependent variables simultaneously on the four types of voice. I performed each of these path analyses utilizing maximum likelihood estimation in Mplus 7.4. Given that the models I tested were fully saturated, I analyzed path estimates (including standard errors) and product terms as opposed to tests of model fit. Finally, because my hypotheses are

directional in nature, I consider effects significant with one-tailed tests (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003).

Personal initiative and felt obligation for constructive change. Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 predicted that, as dimensions of constructive voice, championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling would be positively associated with personal initiative and felt obligation for constructive change. As reported in Table 8 and providing support for Hypothesis 2a, 2b, and 2c, I found that personal initiative was positively associated with championing ($b = .38$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$), initiating ($b = .43$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$), and alarming ($b = .38$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$). However, in contrast to Hypothesis 2d, personal initiative was not associated with patrolling ($b = .15$, $SE = .11$, $p > .05$). Furthermore, felt responsibility was positively related to championing ($b = .31$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$), initiating ($b = .40$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$), alarming ($b = .15$, $SE = .08$, $p < .10$), and patrolling ($b = .34$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$). These results provide support for Hypothesis 3a, 3b, 3c, and 3d.

Promotion focus and prevention focus. The next set of hypotheses examines differences in constructive voice that may vary on the promotive/prohibitive dimension as guided by regulatory focus theory. As such, I specified a model where championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling were regressed on promotion focus, prevention focus, positive affect, and negative affect. Hypothesis 4 predicted that championing and initiating would be positively associated with promotion focus. The data reported in Table 9 suggests this association exists, as promotion focus is positively associated with both championing ($b = .17$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$) and initiating ($b = .22$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$). Hypothesis 5 predicted that alarming and patrolling would be positively associated with

prevention focus. As evidence of this relationship, prevention focus is positively related with alarming ($b = .28$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and patrolling ($b = .36$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$). I should note here that although not hypothesized, the regression coefficient between prevention focus and championing ($b = .22$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$) and initiating ($b = .15$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) were both positive and significant.

Positive affect. In Hypothesis 6, I argued that positive affect is positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. Providing supporting of Hypothesis 6a and 6b but not 6c and 6d, I found that positive affect was positively associated with championing ($b = .52$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and initiating ($b = .46$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$), and also positively associated with alarming ($b = .34$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and patrolling ($b = .32$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). Furthermore, in Hypothesis 7, I hypothesized that the relationship between initiating and positive affect would be stronger than the relationship between championing and positive affect. Support for this hypothesis is not found as the confidence intervals (CI) of the path estimates overlap: championing ($b = .52$, 95% CI .38 to .67) and initiating ($b = .46$, 95% CI .30 to .61). In addition to my hypothesized effects, I also found a significant positive association between positive affect and alarming ($b = .34$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and patrolling ($b = .32$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$).

Negative affect. Hypothesis 8 predicted that negative affect would be negatively related to championing and initiating, and positively related to alarming and patrolling. Additionally, Hypothesis 9 predicted that the relationship between patrolling and negative affect would be stronger than the relationship between alarming and negative affect. Contrary to each of these predictions, when accounting for promotion focus,

prevention focus, and positive affect, negative affect is not significantly associated with any of the types of voice although the nature of the associations are in the hypothesized direction: championing ($b = -.03$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$), initiating ($b = -.10$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$), alarming ($b = .06$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$), and patrolling ($b = .01$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$).

Cognitive complexity. The next set of hypotheses considers differences on the voice concentrated/breadth dimension. Similar to the previous set, I specified a model where championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling were regressed on cognitive complexity, learning goal orientation, performance-prove goal orientation, and performance-avoid goal orientation. Hypothesis 10 predicted that cognitive complexity would be negatively associated with championing and alarming, and positively associated with initiating and patrolling. As shown in Table 10, championing ($b = -.19$, $SE = .10$, $p < .10$) and patrolling ($b = .19$, $SE = .10$, $p < .10$) were significant, whereas alarming ($b = -.12$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$) and initiating ($b = -.05$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$) were not. Thus, Hypothesis 10a and 10d are supported, and Hypothesis 10b and 10c are not. With respect to Hypothesis 10a, I do note that the correlation between cognitive complexity and championing is positive whereas the regression coefficient is negative.

Learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation. As far as hypothesized relationships with goal orientation, Hypothesis 11 is that learning goal orientation is positively associated initiating and patrolling, whereas Hypothesis 12a is that performance-prove goal orientation is positively associated with championing and Hypothesis 12b is that performance-avoid goal orientation is positively associated with alarming. Providing partial support for Hypothesis 11, I found that learning goal orientation was positively associated with initiating ($b = .49$, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$) but not

patrolling ($b = .11$, $SE = .12$, $p > .05$). Championing was positively associated with performance-prove goal orientation ($b = .18$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$) but alarming was not associated with performance-avoid goal orientation ($b = -.02$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$), suggesting support for Hypothesis 12a but not Hypothesis 12b. As with some of the other relationships in my model, I did not hypothesize but found that performance-prove goal orientation was also positive associated with initiating ($b = .26$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$), alarming ($b = .33$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$), and patrolling ($b = .32$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$).

Voice endorsement. My final set of nomological network analyses in Study 1 are a preliminary test of criterion validity and how championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling relate to voice endorsement, interpersonal liking, active listening, promotability, and job performance. Again, I specified a fully saturated model: the outcomes variables were regressed on championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. Hypothesis 13 predicted that voice endorsement would be positively associated with championing and alarming, and negatively associated with initiating and patrolling. The results from Table 11 show that voice endorsement is positively associated with championing ($b = .10$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$) but not alarming ($b = -.04$, $SE = .04$, $p > .05$). Further, voice endorsement is also positively associated with initiating ($b = .32$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$) and is not negatively related to patrolling ($b = .02$, $SE = .04$, $p > .05$). Thus, these findings indicate initial support for Hypothesis 13a, but not Hypothesis 13b, 13c, or 13d.

Interpersonal liking. I argued in Hypothesis 14 that liking would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. Providing preliminary support for Hypothesis 14a, 14b, and 14c, I found a positive association between liking and championing ($b = .18$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$) and

liking and initiating ($b = .14$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$), as well as a negative relationship between liking and alarming ($b = -.11$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$). However, the association between liking and patrolling, although negative, was not significant ($b = -.07$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$).

Active listening. Hypothesis 15 postulates that active listening would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. I found that listening was significantly related to championing ($b = .09$, $SE = .05$, $p < .10$), was positively associated with initiating ($b = .25$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$), was not associated with alarming ($b = -.00$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$), and was negatively associated with patrolling ($b = -.13$, $SE = .05$, $p < .05$). These findings offer initial support for Hypotheses 15a, 15b and 15d, but not Hypotheses 15c.

Promotability and job performance. With Hypothesis 16, I articulated how promotability would be affected by the different types of voice. Specifically, I argued that promotability would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. Closely paralleling this hypothesis was Hypothesis 17, in which I argued that job performance would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. Providing preliminary support of Hypothesis 16b and 17b, I found that initiating was positively associated with promotability ($b = .29$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$) and job performance ($b = .30$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$). However, none of the other relationships were significant as hypothesized: promotability and championing ($b = .09$, $SE = .06$, $p > .05$), job performance and championing ($b = .05$, $SE = .06$, $p > .05$), promotability and alarming ($b = -.05$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$), job performance and alarming ($b = .01$, $SE = .05$, p

> .05), promotability and patrolling ($b = -.05$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$), and job performance and promotability ($b = -.07$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$).

In seeking to establish the factor structure and nomological network of my measures, slightly more than half of my hypotheses received support in this sample. Overall, it appears that championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling are distinct types of speaking up. Individual differences such as personal initiative or felt obligation were, for the most part, likely to lead to each type of voice. Along the promotive/prohibitive dimension, distinctions were most evident with promotion focus and prevention focus, wherein a promotion focus appears to lead to championing and initiating and a prevention focus appears to lead to alarming and patrolling. Along the voice concentration/breadth dimension, there was some evidence that learning goal orientation is associated with initiating and performance-prove goal orientation is associated with championing.

As far as outcomes, I'm more cautious with my conclusions given that the field sample more fully probes those hypotheses to probe criterion validity. As a prelude to that study, Study 1 suggests that championing and initiating are more likely to be associated with having ideas endorsed. Moreover, others are more likely to like those who voice with championing and initiating and are less likely to like those who speak up with alarming. Finally, initiating is positively associated with outcomes such as listening, promotability, and performance, whereas patrolling is less likely to be "heard." These findings suggest that speaking up more broadly is best in getting ideas endorsed, being heard by others, getting rewarded with promotions and being seen as a good performer. In regards to initiating and voice endorsement, this significant positive relationship was in the opposite direction as my hypothesis. Contrary to my prediction, it appears that

when employees speak up with many ideas, those ideas are endorsed and carried forward to others, perhaps because initiating actually gives voice targets more ideas that they can act on or find value in.

Despite these findings, there are some limitations to the sample, including same source ratings that are not separated by time that may strengthen the likelihood of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Consequently, I probed the extent to which common method bias influenced the models I ran in Study 1. As advocated and described by Podsakoff and colleagues (2003), I ran a series of CFAs—with the same grouping of variables utilized in testing my hypotheses—where items were loaded on their theoretical factor in addition to a common methods factor. I examined the structural parameters of my models (i.e., factor loadings and correlations between factors) both with the common methods factor and without the common methods factor. In comparing each combination of models against each other, the parameter estimates and the statistical significance of the estimates did not change materially or substantially. Thus, it appears that common method bias is not driving the pattern of the relationships I observed in Study 1. All of this notwithstanding, I did design a field study that was multi-source and multi-wave in order to better separate the source of the ratings as well as provide some time separation to allow me to examine criterion validity and explore the implications of voice scope.

Study 2 Analysis: Field Study

In Table 12, I report the descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities of Study 2. The correlations of different types of voice range between .31 and .71 (the average is .50), again an indication of commonality among distinction construct

dimensions (Law et al., 1998). In the two companies where I collected field data, employees worked in different work groups. Given that the employees in my sample were nested within work groups and separate organizations (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), I assessed between-group variance for the endogenous variables in my model (i.e., championing, initiating, alarming, patrolling, voice endorsement, interpersonal likeability, active listening, promotability, and job performance). The majority of the variables exhibited significant between-group variance at the work group or organizational level. At the work group level, championing ($\tau^2 = .32, p < .05, ICC(1) = .45$), initiating ($\tau^2 = .15, p < .05, ICC(1) = .22$), alarming ($\tau^2 = .13, p < .05, ICC(1) = .23$), patrolling ($\tau^2 = .19, p < .05, ICC(1) = .28$), voice endorsement ($\tau^2 = .07, p < .05, ICC(1) = .14$), liking ($\tau^2 = .12, p < .05, ICC(1) = .21$), active listening ($\tau^2 = .17, p < .05, ICC(1) = .49$), and promotability ($\tau^2 = .23, p < .05, ICC(1) = .27$) were significant, whereas performance ($\tau^2 = .09, p > .05, ICC(1) = .12$) was not significant. At the organizational level, each of the endogenous variables exhibited significance between group variance: championing ($\tau^2 = .14, p < .05, ICC(1) = .20$), initiating ($\tau^2 = .05, p < .05, ICC(1) = .07$), alarming ($\tau^2 = .02, p < .05, ICC(1) = .03$), patrolling ($\tau^2 = .03, p < .05, ICC(1) = .04$), voice endorsement ($\tau^2 = .00, p > .05, ICC(1) = .01$), liking ($\tau^2 = .09, p < .05, ICC(1) = .16$), active listening ($\tau^2 = .12, p < .05, ICC(1) = .34$), promotability ($\tau^2 = .13, p < .05, ICC(1) = .16$), and performance ($\tau^2 = .07, p < .05, ICC(1) = .10$). Given the significant between-level variance, my path analyses control for workgroup effects using “type=twolevel” in Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015) as well as organizational level effects with a dummy code.

Evaluation of hypotheses. In order to confirm the factor structure in this sample, I subjected my field data to a CFA using Mplus 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2015). Utilizing supervisor ratings of employee voice nested in work groups, the best fitting model was again a model of constructive voice with four factors. I allowed the error variance in two similar patrolling items—“alerts others to all sorts of hurtful work practices” and “cautions others about a wide variety of harmful work projects”—to covary. The resulting fit of the four-factor model was marginal: $\chi^2(97) = 235.64$, CFI = .90, SRMR = .06, RMSEA = .09. The factor loadings of this model, however, are consistent with those from Study 1. As reported in Table 6, the factor loadings are high and significant ($p < .01$), with the average variance explained on each factor above .69 (e.g., Fornell & Larcker, 1981). When considering employee self-ratings of voice, the four-factor model was also superior. The fit of the four-factor model of voice rated by employees appeared to fit the data well. $\chi^2(97) = 152.98$, CFI = .96, SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .05, in line with guidelines for acceptable model fit established by Hu and Bentler (1999). The observed differences in model fit between supervisor and employee ratings of voice motivated me to compare the factorial invariance of my voice items across samples. I combined my self-ratings of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling from Study 1 and Study 2, with the supervisor ratings in Study 2 and ran a multiple group CFA in Mplus 7.4 using the “grouping” command. I first ran a model where factor loadings, intercepts, and residual variances were freely estimated across samples. The model fit of this combined four-factor model was adequate: $\chi^2(294) = 810.810$, CFI = .95, SRMR = .05, RMSEA = .08. As indicated by previous model fit, the supervisor-ratings had the highest contribution to chi-square ($\chi^2 = 420.22$), whereas the employee ratings from Study 2 had

the lowest ($\chi^2 = 185.13$), and the self-ratings from Study 1 were in the middle ($\chi^2 = 205.46$). It appears that supervisor ratings of voice may be leading to increased model misfit and worse parameter estimates. To test this, I next ran a multiple group CFA where factor loadings were constrained to be equal across samples. This model fit the data worse than the previous model where factor loadings were freely estimated: ($\Delta\chi^2 (32) = 112.14, p < .01$), which indicates the lack of similarity between factor loadings across samples. Again, the supervisor-ratings contributed nearly twice as much to the chi-squared as compared to the other two samples. These differences between voice as rated by supervisors and voice that is self-reported may point to some distinctions between the two that I will expand on in the Discussion. Despite these differences and consistent with Study 1, the best fitting model was still the four-factor model that had significant factor loadings and sufficient variance explained, all of which provides additional support for Hypothesis 1 and the distinctiveness between the voice types.

Personal initiative and felt obligation for constructive change. The primary focus of my field sample was to establish criterion validity and explore the implications of the different types of constructive voice. However, prior to doing so, I report the relationships between employee-rated antecedents and supervisor-rated voice. First, I argued that personal initiative (Hypothesis 2) and felt obligation for constructive change (Hypothesis 3) would be positively associated with championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. As reported in Table 13 and in only support of Hypothesis 2c, I find that personal initiative is positively associated with alarming ($\beta = .25, SE = .10, p < .05$), but not significantly predictive of championing ($\beta = .17, SE = .10, p > .05$), initiating ($\beta = .06, SE = .11, p > .05$) or patrolling ($\beta = .12, SE = .11, p < .05$). I failed to find evidence

supporting Hypothesis 3 as felt obligation was not significantly associated with championing ($\beta = .03$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$), initiating ($\beta = .06$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$), or patrolling ($\beta = -.04$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$). With alarming, the effects were significant, but in the opposite direction as hypothesized: ($\beta = -.16$, $SE = .09$, $p < .10$).

Promotion focus and prevention focus. Table 14 reports the results of the next set of hypotheses, in which I compared hypothesized differences that may arise on the promotive/prohibitive dimension. I failed to find support for Hypothesis 4, which was that a promotion focus would be positively associated with championing ($\beta = .03$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$) and initiating ($\beta = -.11$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$). I also failed to find support for Hypothesis 5, or a positive association between prevention focus and alarming ($\beta = -.08$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$) or patrolling ($\beta = -.05$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$).

Positive affect and negative affect. With Hypothesis 6, I argued that positive affect would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. Again, I did not find support for this hypothesis, as positive affect was not significant related to championing ($\beta = .04$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$), initiating ($\beta = .08$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$), alarming ($\beta = .04$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$), or patrolling ($\beta = .09$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$). Considering there were no significant effects between positive affect and championing or positive affect and initiating, I did not probe Hypothesis 7, wherein I argued that positive affect would be more strongly associated with initiating than championing. Hypothesis 8 argued that negative affect would be negatively associated with championing and initiating, and positively associated with alarming and patrolling. In support of Hypothesis 8a, I did find evidence that negative affect was negatively associated with championing ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$). However, negative affect was not

significantly associated with and initiating ($\beta = -.13$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$) or alarming ($\beta = -.11$, $SE = .07$, $p > .05$), but was significant with patrolling in the opposite direction than was hypothesized ($\beta = -.17$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$). Thus Hypothesis 8a is supported whereas 8b, 8c, and 8d are not. Given that 8c and 8d were not supported, I also did not probe Hypothesis 9, which argued that negative affect would be more strongly associated with patrolling than with alarming.

Cognitive complexity. The next set of hypotheses examines potential distinctions along the voice concentration/breadth dimension. I argued in Hypothesis 10 that cognitive complexity would be negatively associated with championing and alarming, and positively associated with initiating and patrolling. As shown in Table 15, I did not find support for this hypothesis as cognitive complexity was not associated with championing ($\beta = .09$, $SE = .13$, $p > .05$), initiating ($\beta = .13$, $SE = .14$, $p > .05$), alarming ($\beta = .20$, $SE = .13$, $p > .05$), or patrolling ($\beta = .14$, $SE = .14$, $p > .05$) as hypothesized.

Learning goal orientation and performance goal orientation. Furthermore, Hypothesis 11 and 12—which postulated that learning goal orientation is associated with initiating and patrolling, performance-prove goal orientation is associated with championing, and performance-avoid goal orientation is associated with alarming—were also not supported. Learning goal orientation was negatively associated with both initiating ($\beta = -.17$, $SE = .12$, $p > .05$) and patrolling ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .12$, $p > .05$). Moreover, performance-prove goal orientation was not significantly associated with championing ($\beta = .02$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$), nor is performance-avoid goal orientation positively associated with alarming ($\beta = .01$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$).

Voice endorsement. The final set of analyses were to establish criterion validity of my four types of constructive voice. To this end, I again performed path analysis of fully saturated models using maximum likelihood estimation in Mplus 7.4, and tested the effects of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling on various outcomes of interest. First is voice endorsement, which in Hypothesis 13 I hypothesized would be positively associated with championing and alarming, and negatively associated with initiating and patrolling. As reported in Table 16, contrary to my predictions, neither championing nor alarming was statistically significant: championing ($b = .11$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$), alarming ($b = -.02$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$). However, the effects were significant with initiating ($b = .27$, $SE = .12$, $p < .05$) and patrolling ($b = -.22$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$), with the direction of initiating opposite of my hypothesized direction. Thus, Hypothesis 13d is supported, but Hypothesis 13a, 13b, and 13c are not.

Interpersonal liking. Hypothesis 14 argues that liking is positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. In support of Hypothesis 14a and 14c, the effects of championing ($b = .16$, $SE = .09$, $p < .10$) and alarming ($b = -.14$, $SE = .08$, $p < .10$) were both significant. I failed to find support for Hypothesis 14b and 14d as initiating ($b = .04$, $SE = .11$, $p > .05$) and patrolling ($b = -.02$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$) are not statistically significant.

Active listening. I argued in Hypothesis 15 that listening would be positively associated with championing and initiating, and negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. I find support for Hypothesis 15a and 15b as listening was significantly related to championing ($b = .12$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$) and initiating ($b = .14$, $SE = .08$, $p < .10$).

Hypothesis 15c and 15d are not supported as listening was not predicted by alarming ($b = -.07$, $SE = .05$, $p > .05$) or patrolling ($b = -.02$, $SE = .06$, $p > .05$).

Promotability and job performance. Hypothesis 16 argued that promotability is positively associated with championing and initiating, but negatively associated with alarming and patrolling. This hypothesis is mostly supported as promotability was positively associated with championing ($b = .43$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$) and initiating ($b = .32$, $SE = .12$, $p < .05$), and negatively associated with alarming ($b = -.21$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$). Contrary to Hypothesis 16d, patrolling was not significantly associated with promotability ($b = .04$, $SE = .10$, $p > .05$). My final hypothesis is regarding the relationship between the four types of voice and job performance. In support of Hypothesis 17a, 17b, and 17c, I found evidence of a significant relationship between job performance and championing ($b = .42$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$), initiating ($b = .22$, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$), and alarming ($b = -.18$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). I did not, however, find support for the negative relationship between job performance and patrolling ($b = .05$, $SE = .09$, $p > .05$).

The pattern of results with antecedent relationships are a little less clear in Study 2 than in Study 1, a summary of which I report in Table 17. Specifically, the majority of the antecedent hypotheses are unsupported. The exceptions to this is that personal initiative is a key component to individuals speaking up about the same issues over and over again. Furthermore, negative affect is likely to reduce individuals' likelihood to continually champion a specific idea or project. Although confirming the antecedent nomological network was not the focus of the field study, it does temper the results from Study 1. Consistent with Study 1, I again found in Study 2 that a four-factor model of constructive voice was the best fitting model, suggesting some distinction between my theorized voice

types. In respect to criterion validity, I found that over half of my hypotheses were supported. For ideas to be endorsed and carried forward, I found—consistent with Study 1 and again contrary to my predictions—that initiating was a positive predictor of voice endorsement. Moreover, patrolling and speaking up with many problems or concerns is negatively associated with having ideas endorsed by coworkers. Coworkers appear to like those voicers who champion an idea and do not find as likeable voicers who speak up repeatedly about a particular problem or concern. I also found that supervisors are more likely to send listening signals in response to championing and initiating. Moreover, employees who utilize championing and initiating types of voice are more likely to be seen as having career opportunities within the company and effective performers in their jobs. However, individuals who speak up with alarming and repeat the same problem are less likely to be seen as promotable or good performers. In the chapter that follows, I discuss the implications of these findings.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

As the voice literature grows and becomes even more established, it is important that voice is clearly conceptualized and measured. I have proposed that the precision of the voice construct could be enhanced if we differentiated between four different types of constructive voice: championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. By directly considering the role of voice scope, my dissertation has aimed to delineate voice in terms of its function (i.e., promotive/prohibitive) *and* scope, and sought to refine our precision in how voice is conceptualized and measured. In other words, I have offered an organizing framework of voice that has sought to weave together different strands of speaking up that have been unconnected in the past. I have developed, tested, and distinguished—both theoretically and empirically—the four types of constructive voice. I have also attempted to develop a preliminary nomological network of the four types of voice, with mixed results. Finally, I have sought to understand when voicing employees may be “heard” or alternatively “tuned out” at work along with the associated implications.

Summary of Results

I conducted studies with the aim to establish the construct validity of my scales and explore the implications of being heard when speaking up constructively. Following the guidelines recommended by Hinkin (1998), I developed scales of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling by first gathering existing items of constructive voice from previously published articles. In the 130 constructive voice items I identified, none of the items captured the scope of voice. Furthermore, many of the measures had a mix of

promotive and prohibitive items. In order to incorporate the scope of voice directly, I generated 28 items of constructive voice (7 items each for championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling). Through a content validation process, I reduced those items to 4 items per voice factor. I ran a CFA of the finalized 16 items, which revealed that a four-factor model of constructive voice was the best fitting model. Thus, I was able to validate and provide measures of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling.

Study 1 summary of results. Extending the scale development process, Study 1 tested the nomological network of the four types of voice. Approximately half of my hypotheses were supported as to the antecedents that may be common or unique predictors of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling. As far as common predictors and consistent with prior research, I largely found support for personal initiative and felt obligation as positive predictors of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling (e.g., Grant & Mayer, 2009; Liang et al., 2012; Ohly et al., 2006; Parker & Collins, 2010). These findings are consistent with meta-analytic research on voice: Chamberlin et al. (2017) report the population coefficient between voice and personal initiative at ($\rho = .40$) whereas the correlations between personal initiative and the four types of voice in this sample range between .28 and .51. With respect to felt obligation, the correlations between felt obligation and championing ($r = .42$) and felt obligation and initiating ($r = .55$) are higher than the correlations between felt obligation and alarm ($r = .27$) and felt obligation and patrolling ($r = .38$), which is in line with meta-analytic work that shows that felt obligation and promotive voice ($\rho = .59$) are stronger than felt obligation and prohibitive voice ($\rho = .27$). In short, these findings that are consistent with the broader voice literature provide evidence that being a self-starter who can is not afraid

to take action and can persist when needed in repeating an idea or problem (e.g., Frese & Fay, 2001; Frese et al., 1996; Frese et al., 1997), is an important antecedent of each type of voice. Moreover, employees who have “skin in the game” are more likely to step up and speak out about a number of issues or one specific issue (Withey & Cooper, 1989).

The promotive and prohibitive distinction was also apparent as a promotion focus was positively associated with championing and initiating, and a prevention focus was associated with alarming and patrolling. These findings align with Lin and Johnson’s (2015) weekly diary study, which showed how a promotion focus predicts promotion voice and a prevention focus predicts subsequent prohibitive voice. However, contrary to their findings, I also found that a prevention focus was positively associated with championing and initiating, although smaller in magnitude. This positive association may be an indication that employees with a tendency towards a prevention focus could also speak up about potential ideas that, if implemented, could still reduce potential negative outcomes.

The role of affect on the four voice types was less clear. As I hypothesized, positive affect was positively associated with championing and initiating. The correlations of positive affect to these promotive types of voice (both correlations are .44) are positive yet higher than the population coefficient ($\rho = .21$) reported in the Chamberlin et al., (2017) meta-analysis. Contrary to my predictions, positive affect was also positively associated with alarming and patrolling, with those correlations between positive affect and alarming and patrolling being more in line with Chamberlin et al.’s findings (.25 and .22, respectively). However, I should note that positive affect was more strongly associated with championing and initiating than alarming and patrolling, which

may suggest that positive affect is more likely to lead to promotive types of voice than prohibitive types of voice, which notion is consistent with work on creativity (e.g., Ashby et al., 1999; Baas et al., 2008). Negative affect was not significantly associated with any of the types of voice. In Chamberlin et al.'s (2017) meta-analysis, negative affect was negatively associated with promotive voice, but the magnitude is small ($\rho = -.09$). In considering the lack of evidence between negative affect and alarming or patrolling, my findings may be an indication that negative affect is not a strong motivator in generating prohibitive types of voice.

Study 1 also presented some evidence of the distinction of voice scope along the concentrated/breadth dimension. Cognitive complexity was significantly associated with increased patrolling and decreased championing, yet not significantly associated with either initiating or alarming. I am cautious, however, about the significant negative finding with championing given that the correlation was positive. In fact, all of the voice types were positively correlated with cognitive complexity, with championing and alarming having small correlations and initiating and patrolling having more moderate and positive correlations. Thus, narrow cognitive complexity may still lead employees to speak up, but just on fewer issues or less frequently than those with a broader cognitive complexity. Learning goal orientation, however, was a significant predictor of initiating, and performance-prove goal orientation did also significantly predict championing. The former finding aligns with Parker and Collin's (2010) research that has shown that learning goal orientation is positively associated with promotive voice. Yet, in contrast to my findings, Parker and Collins also find that performance goal orientation has no relationship with promotive types of voice. Interestingly, my results showed that

performance-prove goal orientation was positively associated with each type of voice, which may suggest that the act of speaking up implicitly has a “prove” element embedded—as employees seek to prove a new idea or show that something really is a problem.

As I described earlier, I am more cautious in the relationships of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling with outcome variables in Study 1 given the lack of source and time separation. Still, as a brief summary, Study 1 revealed that championing is positively associated with voice endorsement, liking, and listening; initiating is positively associated with voice endorsement (contrary to my prediction), liking, listening, promotability, and job performance; alarming is negatively associated with liking; and patrolling is negatively associated with listening. Although these findings are preliminary, they do provide some initial direction as to the potential importance of scope, particularly in speaking up with many different ideas as a potential strategy for employees.

Study 2 summary of results. In Study 2, a field study in two separate organizations, I confirmed that the four-factor model of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling was again the best fitting model, which was consistent across supervisor or employee ratings of voice. However, the employee-ratings of voice fit the model better than supervisor-ratings of voice. Although half of my nomological network hypotheses of relationships between voice and antecedents were significant in Study 1, very few were significant in Study 2. Exceptions to this are the positive association between personal initiative and alarming, and the negative association between negative affect and championing. Although testing the antecedent nomological network was not

the focus of Study 2, it certainly does dampen the conclusions I can draw about the hypothesized nomological network.

There may be many reasons why I was not able to replicate the findings from Study 1 in Study 2. One key explanation may be the source of the voice ratings that differ between employee-rated voice and supervisor-rated voice. Although I collected both in the field sample, I only utilized supervisor-rated voice in my analyses. Yet differences between the two were apparent in my measurement model and multiple group CFA; consequently, utilizing supervisor ratings may have altered the effects I found when testing antecedent relationships with different types of supervisor-rated voice. From a conceptual perspective, my lack of consistent antecedent findings across studies may beg the question whether supervisors are best positioned to hear employee voice, specifically voice that may be repeated which is an integral part of voice scope. Specifically, supervisors may not hear all the voice from their subordinates, especially the repetition of issues. Thus there might be some range restriction as supervisors only hear a few important ideas or pressing problems, and even then they may not hear those ideas or problems repeated. As an example, prior to pitching an idea or reporting a problem to a supervisor, an employee might engage in a vetting process among coworkers, where coworkers act as sounding boards. That is, employees may frequently repeat ideas or problems to *each other*—with many of the problems finding resolution among themselves or never being escalated to supervisors. Yet the use of different raters of voice, particularly coworkers, may be valuable for future research to consider (e.g., Morrison, 2014). Some work has already been conducted on this issue. For example, Burris, Detert, and Romney (2013) found that employees who overestimated their voice

relative to a supervisor-rating of voice were more likely to turnover and be seen as poor performers, whereas employees who underestimated their voice relative to a supervisor's estimate were more likely to stay with the company and be seen as good performers. Although much of the research on voice has utilized supervisor ratings of voice—given that prior research has more fully examined what motivates employees to speak up (e.g., Morrison, 2014) and supervisor ratings of voice (as a dependent variable) help mitigate common method bias—my lack of consistent findings on the antecedent side may question, at least to a small extent, the use of supervisor ratings for voice and whether they should be preferred when simultaneously considering the scope of voice.

As I will discuss in greater detail in the section that follows, the focus of Study 2 was on criterion validity and the implications of voice. I found that championing is positively associated with liking, listening, promotability, and job performance. Initiating was positively associated with voice endorsement (contrary to my prediction but consistent with Study 1), listening, promotability, and job performance. Alarming was negatively associated with liking, promotability, and job performance. And finally, patrolling was negatively associated with voice endorsement. I discuss the implications of these findings next.

Theoretical and Empirical Implications

My dissertation makes a number of theoretical and empirical contributions. First, my primary contribution is the emphasis on the theoretical importance of the scope of voice. From a phenomenon-based perspective, it is unlikely that employees' ideas or concerns, when first mentioned, are immediately implemented or acted upon. Instead, employees may have to repeat their ideas or concerns in order to see action taken within

their team or broader organization. Thus how employees persist in voice—whether they speak up about the same issue or idea repeatedly, or if they speak up broadly about a number of different issues and ideas—is a critical component that the voice literature has largely ignored. From a general level and as I will discuss in more detail, speaking up about more—as compared to fewer issues—seems to intensify the positive (i.e., promotive voice) and negative (i.e., prohibitive voice) effects of constructive voice for some outcomes (i.e., voice endorsement) but the opposite pattern exists for other outcomes (i.e., liking, promotability) where fewer ideas or problems exhibit stronger effects. This distinction appears to suggest that a “shotgun” approach to voice may help people get constructive suggestions accepted but comes with image costs.

Given these distinctions, I theorize how constructive voice can be viewed more broadly than we have previously supposed by virtue of integrating the scope of voice. I theorize about four distinct types of voice: (1) Employees may champion a specific idea and proactively promote an idea or suggestion that they think will benefit the organization (e.g., Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Howell & Higgins, 1990); (2) Employees may initiate and suggest a variety of ideas that could improve how things are done at work (e.g., Benne & Sheats, 1948; Kanter, 1988); (3) Employees may “sound the alarm” to alert others in the organization about a specific problematic concern they feel is detrimental to the functioning of the organization (e.g., Near & Miceli, 1985); and (4) Employees may express many different negative aspects of the organization they find troubling or concerning (e.g., Heck et al., 2005; Kowalski, 1996). In describing and theorizing about these types of voice, my work brings together various strands in the voice literature to offer a unifying theoretical view of constructive voice that varies based

on the promotive/prohibitive dimension and how concentrated or broad the voice may be. By enhancing our conceptualization of constructive voice, my work provides a theoretical framework necessary for more precision and insight in future voice models and thought.

Second and relatedly, I provide empirically validated scales that integrate the promotive and prohibitive dimensions of voice with the scope of voice. My measures of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling are empirically distinct. Moreover, my measures also capture more of the theoretical domain of voice by expanding our conceptual view and helping us better understand the phenomena our measures could be targeting. By providing measures of championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling, I have laid a foundation required for future scholars to develop and test more nuanced theoretical models of voice. Armed with these validated measures, scholars could begin to test questions such as “What is the role of ownership in persistently championing an idea?” “Do employees who suggest many ideas feel burdened by increased workload in implementing their ideas?” “When might voice be seen as complaining?” or “What are the organizational factors that lead employees to identify many problems?” In sum, I provide a more detailed view of how voice operates in the workplace and begin to frame how voice can be more precisely operationalized and empirically tested (e.g., Morrison, 2014).

Third and finally, my work begins to identify the implications for voice endorsement, liking, listening, promotability, and performance when employees speak up with the different types of voice. In regards to voice endorsement, speaking up about a large number of ideas (i.e., initiating) is better than speaking up about a number of problems (i.e., patrolling), in that coworkers are more likely to endorse and carry forward

ideas and much less likely to endorse and carry forward problems. This finding adds to Burris's (2012) work, which showed distinctions between challenging and supportive types of voice on voice endorsement, by teasing apart other aspects of the voice message such as scope. Furthermore, the notion that initiating is better than championing and getting others to endorse ideas is contrary to my predictions and also contrary to some of the work by Dutton and colleagues (2001), which showed that repeatedly mentioning a suggested change may sometimes be important to successfully selling an issue. In contrast to my prediction, it may be that providing *more* ideas actually gives coworkers more opportunities to endorse and see value in those ideas. Yet when employees only speak up about a limited number of ideas, then others simply have less options of suggestions to carry forward (e.g., Schon, 1963). Or, if an employee continually repeats an idea, then others may see little need to also repeat the idea because the voicing employee has already covered the issue. In other words, suggesting a broader range of ideas appears to be better in both of my studies than voicing either a limited number of ideas or a broad range of problems.

I also show that peers form a positive impression about coworkers who engage in championing and like coworkers who engage in alarming much less. Extending the results of Whiting and colleagues (2012), who found that aspects of voice delivery are associated with interpersonal liking, my results provide evidence that employees who persist with a specific idea are, in fact, more likeable. This may be perhaps because they are seen as more committed to the organization and motivated by prosocial intentions (e.g., Lam et al., 2017; Huang et al., 2014). So even if peers do not endorse or find much added value in the ideas themselves that are repeated, repeating a specific idea still

appears to have some social benefits among coworkers. However, employees who repeat the same problem are more likely to be viewed as an irritating “squeaky wheel,” where coworkers actually dislike the voicer who expresses the same concerning issue. Yet even though others may find a vocal dissenter who repeatedly brings up the same challenging issue overtly negative or annoying (e.g., Rehg et al., 2008; Kassing, 2009), my results confirm the uphill battle employees may have in actually altering the status quo and improving the organization when faced with communicating the same unresolved problem.

When employees speak up, they “read the wind” (Dutton et al., 1997) to see if the voice target is listening and whether that target appears to be processing and accepting the delivered voice message. My results suggest that both championing and initiating positively predict supervisors’ listening to employee voice. This may be because supervisors who are approached with positively valenced promotive voice can more easily digest the message. Furthermore, it may be likely that employees who speak up with an idea already have a solution and desired change in mind. Consequently, supervisors may not only be more engaged and communicate their support through active listening cues to such voice, but they can do so because the messenger may be a perfect candidate to execute the proposed idea. In contrast, prohibitive voice may function more like a “hot potato” where employees dump a problem on a supervisor; so although supervisors may attempt to fill the responsibilities of their role and try to listen (Detert & Burris, 2007; Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002), my results indicate that supervisors are not more likely to lend an listening ear to problems or concerns communicated by employees. Thus, although it is important to hear problems that could be fixed in the organization,

supervisors may not want to listen to the problems and may instead prefer to ignore what is going wrong.

My findings also have implications to promotability and job performance. Employees who engage in championing and initiating are more likely to be given career opportunities and are seen as better performers in their job. This is in contrast to employees who speak up about the same problem over and over again, which employees may be viewed as complainers who are then also seen as less promotable and worse performers. This latter finding is consistent with work on whistleblowing, which has shown that employees may suffer retaliation when they repeatedly speak up about a problem in the organization and, consequently, may not only be seen as worse performers but also be given fewer future job opportunities (e.g., Miceli & Near, 1989; Near & Miceli, 1986; Rehg et al., 2008). As it relates to promotive voice and job performance, my work aligns closely with recent meta-analytic findings (Chamberlin et al., 2017), which showed that promotive voice leads to positive ratings of job performance, whereas prohibitive voice leads to diminished job performance evaluations. I continue to find this conclusion noteworthy: even though employees speak up to improve the organization, the very act of articulating or highlight a problem—especially, as my findings show, when they have to repeat that problem—then others view this person as a worse performer. Thus the different types of constructive voice, although similar in some ways, signify that others might not equally appreciate the voice expressions. This finding confirms that the way employees speak up not only affects whether they are heard or ignored by others but also has implications to employee career opportunities and performance evaluations.

Limitations

Like all research, my dissertation has a number of limitations. For example, my studies did not account for the target of voice. Previous scholarship has shown that employees speak up to different organizational targets in different ways. For example, employee voice to direct leaders and skip level leaders may differ depending on relationship ties and perceived available resources held by the leader (Liu, Tangirala, & Ramanujam, 2013). As another example, Detert et al. (2013) have shown that when voice is targeted to the supervisor then unit performance is enhanced whereas voice targeted at coworkers diminishes unit performance. Unfortunately, I did not account for the target of my different types of voice in my field samples, which may be another reason that some of my hypothesized effects were not confirmed. Considering if the type of constructive voice differs when directed at a coworker as opposed to a supervisor could be a fruitful avenue in a subsequent study. Relatedly, the importance of “group voice” (Morrison et al., 2011) and the designation of one person as a potential spokesperson to the supervisor on behalf of the collective could also be an interesting area to examine in future research. In sum, future research could explore issues related to targets of voice, differences in who rates voice, and the potential role that coworkers play in the voice process.

A second limitation is that my field sample may have suffered from limited statistical power. Although I designed a multi-wave, multi-source field study in order to combat common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003) and the limitations embedded in Study 1, the nature of multi-wave and multi-source studies is that not every participant will respond at each wave, nor may a matching rating from a supervisor or coworker be available even if employees do respond at each time period. Given these realities, my sample size was reduced due to my longitudinal design and matching with supervisor or

coworker responses. My ultimate sample size may not have afforded me with sufficient statistical power given that my responding employees were nested within work groups and given that the number of parameter estimates in my model did not begin to approach the recommended 20-1 or even 10-1 ratio between observed variables to cases (e.g., Kline, 2011). Consequently, I had to test and analyze path models in pieces instead of a more robust structural equation model. Still, considering I found effects, particularly on the implications of the different types of voice in the field sample gives me increased confidence that many of findings would be strengthened with additional statistical power.

The potential for reverse causality is another limitation in my studies. Specifically, I found that when employees speak up with many ideas (i.e., initiating) that those ideas are more likely to be seen as valuable and carried forward by others in the organization relative to repeated ideas (i.e., championing) and especially relative to the expression of many problems (i.e., patrolling). Yet employees' past success in getting ideas endorsed may influence their willingness to enact subsequent voice behaviors (e.g., Ashford et al., 1998). In other words, the direction of my hypothesized effects—where the voice types predicted outcomes such as voice endorsement—could operate in the opposite manner. Of course, providing some time separation between the measurement of voice and voice endorsement does provide some assurance that the effects are operating in the hypothesized direction. Notwithstanding, future research—particularly a controlled laboratory experiment—may be better suited to ascertain causality between the types of voice and hypothesized outcomes.

Finally, I did not hypothesize interaction effects between the different types of constructive voice. Although such interactions appeared to me, at the outset, beyond the

scope of my construct validation efforts, I can see now that interactions may have been beneficial to explore. That is, no employee is completely one-dimensional in perfectly mapping onto one of my types of constructive voice. Instead, it is more likely that employees speak up with a mix of constructive voice, and thus interactions between the four voice types could uncover important implications for voicers. It may be, for instance, that employees who voice with alarming or patrolling will be heard if they supplement that type of voice with championing or initiating. To this point, a latent profile analysis could be a worthwhile endeavor for scholars to probe in order to uncover what mix of constructive voice types are most (or least) beneficial to employees and those who hear the voice messages.

Practical Implications

Given these limitations to my findings, I am cautious in describing sweeping practical implications. Even the implications that follow are presented somewhat tentatively and should be treated judiciously. When employees speak up with promotive voice, an implication of my work may be that others find value in their voice, including taking the expressed idea and supporting it in interactions with others. Given that initiating may be more likely to be associated with voice endorsement, individual employees may find value in pitching many suggestions and ideas for improvement. Even if all of their ideas are not implemented, others—particularly supervisors—appear to find the breadth of shared ideas valuable because such employees are more likely to be heard and be seen as a high performer. Positive outcomes—enhanced liking, performance, and promotability—also extend to those who champion ideas. Consequently, repeatedly pitching ways the organization could improve appears to be

most effective when voice is about ideas and opportunities as opposed to challenges or problems. Consistent with work on issue selling (Ashford et al., 1998; Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Dutton et al., 2001), my findings speak to the importance of employees packing and framing their communication as an idea or positively valenced—instead of a negatively valenced problem—in order to enjoy the positive reactions from others that follow championing and initiating.

My findings suggest that organizational leaders may be more apt to listen to promotive voice than prohibitive voice. So if employees see concerning issues that need to be addressed and resolved in the workplace, then employees may find it helpful to remember that others may not appreciate the message they have to deliver nor are others likely to endorse and find value in what employees have to say. However, just because other organizational members (including supervisors) fail to listen does not mean that the message should be tucked away and never delivered. For example, highly publicized recent events associated with the #MeToo movement have highlighted the importance of speaking up—sometimes repeatedly—about worrisome issues in the workplace (Zacherek, Dockterman, & Edwards, 2017). As evidenced by the #MeToo movement, prohibitive voice messages need to be heard so that organizations can remedy problematic workplace factors. Unfortunately, consistent with findings in the whistleblowing literature (Miceli & Near, 1989; Near & Miceli, 1986; Rehg et al., 2008; Perrucci et al., 1980), there are often negative consequences when individuals have to repeatedly speak up about issues including backlash, termination of employment, or perhaps even social ostracism. My findings may suggest that speaking up about the same problem repeatedly results in being seen as a worse performer and diminished

opportunities for promotion. So instead of tuning out problematic issues that are voiced and hoping the issue resolves itself or goes away, organizational leaders could be sensitive to the need to create a climate where employees not only feel safe speaking up but one where employees are not punished for presenting challenging problems that need to be heard and would help the workplace improve.

Conclusion

Voice is an employee behavior important to contemporary organizations. Given its importance, I argue that the need for additional clarity in our conceptualization and measures is critical. In an effort to advance the voice literature, I introduce the concept of voice scope: that constructive voice may vary by its promotive or prohibitive function as well as whether employees speak up about a wide range of issues or if they repeat the same issues. I show that four types of constructive voice—championing, initiating, alarming, and patrolling—exist, with differential outcomes to how others employees listen and respond to voicers. I view my work as a first step in exploring the scope of voice, and my results indicate that such a path could, in fact, be a fruitful exploration.

REFERENCES

- Acar, S., & Runco, M. A. (2012). Creative abilities: Divergent thinking. In M. D. Mumford (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Creativity* (pp. 115-139). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Alberts, J. K. (1988). An analysis of couples' conversational complaints. *Communications Monographs*, 55(2), 184-197. doi: 10.1080/03637758809376165
- Alicke, M. D., Braun, J. C., Glor, J. E., Klotz, M. L., Magee, J., Sederhoim, H., & Siegel, R. (1992). Complaining behavior in social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(3), 286-295. doi: 10.1177/0146167292183004
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 357-376. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.357
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 10, pp. 123-167). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Amabile, T. M., Barsade, S. G., Mueller, J. S., & Staw, B. M. (2005). Affect and creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 367-403. doi: 10.2189/asqu.2005.50.3.367
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184. doi: 10.2307/256995
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommend 2-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- Ashby, F. G., Isen, A. M., & Turken, A. U. (1999). A neuropsychological theory of positive affect and its influence on cognition. *Psychological Review*, 106(3), 529-550. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.106.3.529
- Ashford, S. J., Rothbard, N. P., Piderit, S. K., & Dutton, J. E. (1998). Out on a limb: The role of context and impression management in selling gender-equality issues. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 23-57. doi: 10.2307/2393590
- Ashford, S. J., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Christianson, M. K. (2009). Speaking up and speaking out: The leadership dynamics of voice in organizations. In J. Greenberg & M. S. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and silence in organizations* (pp. 175-202). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- Austin, J. T., & Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917–1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(6), 836-874. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.77.6.836
- Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E. (2000). Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 265-285. doi: 10.1348/096317900167029
- Baas, M., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Nijstad, B. A. (2008). A meta-analysis of 25 years of mood-creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus? *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(6), 779-806. doi: 10.1037/a0012815
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big 5 personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*(1), 1-26. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(2), 103-118. doi: 10.1002/job.4030140202
- Benne, K. D., & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. *Journal of Social Issues, 4*(2), 41-49. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1948.tb01783.x
- Bieri, J., Atkins, A. L., Briar, S., Leaman, R. L., Miller, H., & Tripodi, T. (1966). *Clinical and social judgment: The discrimination of behavioral information*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Binnewies, C., & Gromer, M. (2012). Creativity and innovation at work: The role of work characteristics and personal initiative. *Psicothema, 24*(1), 100-105.
- Binnewies, C., Ohly, S., & Sonnentag, S. (2007). Taking personal initiative and communicating about ideas: what is important for the creative process and for idea creativity? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 16*(4), 432-455. doi: 10.1080/13594320701514728
- Bodie, G. D. (2011). The Active-Empathic Listening Scale (AELS): Conceptualization and evidence of validity within the interpersonal domain. *Communication Quarterly, 59*(3), 277-295. doi: 10.1080/01463373.2011.583495
- Brescoll, V. L. (2011). Who takes the floor and why: Gender, power, and volubility in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 56*(4), 622-641. doi: 10.1177/0001839212439994

- Brett, J. F., & VandeWalle, D. (1999). Goal orientation and goal content as predictors of performance in a training program. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(6), 863-873. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.6.863
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(4), 710-725. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1986.4283909
- Brockner, J., & Higgins, E. T. (2001). Regulatory focus theory: Implications for the study of emotions at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 86*(1), 35-66. doi: 10.1006/obhd.2001.2972
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(1), 3-5. doi: 10.1177/1745691610393980
- Burris, E. R. (2012). The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(4), 851-875. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.0562
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(4), 912-922. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.912
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Romney, A. C. (2013). Speaking up vs. being heard: The disagreement around and outcomes of employee voice. *Organization Science, 24*(1), 22-38. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1110.0732
- Button, S. B., Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1996). Goal orientation in empirical research: A conceptual and empirical foundation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67*(1), 26-48. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1996.0063
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Feinstein, J. A., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*(2), 197-253. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.197
- Carraher, S. M., & Buckley, M. R. (1996). Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(1), 102-109. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.102
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control theory to human behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality, social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92(1), 111-135. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.92.1.111
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamberlin, M., Newton, D. W., & LePine, J. A. (2017). A meta-analysis of voice and its promotive and prohibitive forms: Identification of key associations, distinctions, and future research directions. *Personnel Psychology*, 70, 11-71. doi: 10.1111/peps.12185
- Cheng, J. W., Lu, K. M., Chang, Y. Y., & Johnstone, S. (2013). Voice behavior and work engagement: the moderating role of supervisor-attributed motives. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 51(1), 81-102. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7941.2012.00030.x
- Chernyshenko, O. S., Stark, S., & Drasgow, F. (2011). Individual differences: Their measurement and validity. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 117-151). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Choi, J. N. (2007). Change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: effects of work environment characteristics and intervening psychological processes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(4), 467-484. doi: 10.1002/job.433
- Choi, J. N., Anderson, T. A., & Veillette, A. (2009). Contextual inhibitors of employee creativity in organizations the insulating role of creative ability. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(3), 330-357. doi: 10.1177/1059601108329811
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3 ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98
- Crant, J. M. (1995). The proactive personality scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 532-537.
- Crant, J. M., Kim, T.-Y., & Wang, J. (2011). Dispositional antecedents of demonstration and usefulness of voice behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 26(3), 285-297. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9197-y

- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281-302. doi: 10.1037/h0040957
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision-making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117-132. doi: 10.1006/obhd.1996.2675
- De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2001). Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(3), 309-328. doi: 10.1002/job.71
- De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23-36. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x
- 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. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2007.26279183
- Detert, J. R., Burris, E. R., Harrison, D. A., & Martin, S. R. (2013). Voice flows to and around leaders: Understanding when units are helped or hurt by employee voice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(4), 624-668. doi: 10.1177/0001839213510151
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461-488. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2011.61967925
- Diefendorff, J. M., & Chandler, M. M. (2011). Motivating employees. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 65-135). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Dierdorff, E. C., & Rubin, R. S. (2007). Carelessness and discriminability in work role requirement judgments: Influences of role ambiguity and cognitive complexity. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 597-625. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00085.x
- Dozier, J. B., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Potential predictors of whistle-blowing: A prosocial behavior perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 823-836. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1985.4279105
- Drollinger, T., Comer, L. B., & Warrington, P. T. (2006). Development and validation of the active empathetic listening scale. *Psychology & Marketing*, 23(2), 161-180. doi: 10.1002/mar.20105

- Dulaimi, M. F., Nepal, M. P., & Park, M. (2005). A hierarchical structural model of assessing innovation and project performance. *Construction Management and Economics*, 23(6), 565-577. doi: 10.1080/01446190500126684
- Dutton, J. E., & Ashford, S. J. (1993). Selling issues to top management. *Academy of Management Review*, 397-428. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1993.9309035145
- 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. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199705)18:5<407::AID-SMJ881>3.0.CO;2-J
- Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., & Lawrence, K. A. (2001). Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 716-736. doi: 10.2307/3069412
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41(10), 1040-1048. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.41.10.1040
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383. doi: 10.2307/2666999
- Edmondson, A. C. (2003). Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1419-1452. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00386
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 42-51. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.42
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2002). Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(5), 804-818. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.804
- Erez, A., LePine, J. A., & Elms, H. (2002). Effects of rotated leadership and peer evaluation on the functioning and effectiveness of self-managed teams: A quasi-experiment. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(4), 929-948. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2002.tb00135.x
- Farh, J.-L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support-employee outcome relationships in China: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715-729. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2007.25530866

- Farh, J.-L., Zhong, C.-B., & Organ, D. W. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China. *Organization Science, 15*(2), 241-253.
- Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job satisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 596-607. doi: 10.2307/255909
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1992). Exploring the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect typology: The influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 5*(3), 201-218. doi: 10.1007/BF01385048
- Fast, N. J., Burris, E. R., & Bartel, C. A. (2014). Managing to stay in the dark: Managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(4), 1013-1034. doi: 10.5465/amj.2012.0393
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39-50. doi: 10.2307/3150980
- Frazier, M. L., & Bowler, W. M. (2015). Voice climate, supervisor undermining, and work outcomes: A group-level examination. *Journal of Management, 41*(3), 841-863. doi: 10.1177/0149206311434533
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218-226.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 23*, 133-188.
- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70*(2), 139-161. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00639.x
- Frese, M., Teng, E., & Wijnen, C. J. (1999). Helping to improve suggestion systems: Predictors of making suggestions in companies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(7), 1139-1155. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7<1139::AID-JOB946>3.0.CO;2-I
- Fuller, J. B., Marler, L. E., & Hester, K. (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*(8), 1089-1120. doi: 10.1002/job.408

- Gamache, D. L., McNamara, G., Mannor, M. J., & Johnson, R. E. (2015). Motivated to acquire? The impact of CEO regulatory focus on firm acquisitions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 1261-1282. doi: 10.5465/amj.2013.0377
- Gao, L. P., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011). Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 787-798. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.015
- George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1992). Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(2), 310-329. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.310
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: An interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 513-524. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.513
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2007). Dual tuning in a supportive context: Joint contributions of positive mood, negative mood, and supervisory behaviors to employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 605-622. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2007.25525934
- Gilmore, P. L., Hu, X., Wei, F., Tetrick, L. E., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2013). Positive affectivity neutralizes transformational leadership's influence on creative performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(8), 1061-1075. doi: 10.1002/job.1833
- Goodwin, V. L., & Ziegler, L. (1998). A test of relationships in a model of organizational cognitive complexity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 371-386.
- Gorden, W. I. (1988). Range of employee voice. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1(4), 283-299. doi: 10.1007/BF01556937
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 8, pp. 1-52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Grant, A. (2016). *Originals: How non-conformists move the world*. New York: Penguin Books.

- Grant, A., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3-34.
- Grant, A. M. (2013). Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotion regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6), 1703-1723. doi: 10.5465/amj.2011.0035
- Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Good soldiers and good actors: prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 900-912. doi: 10.1037/a0013770
- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31-55. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.01128.x
- Heck, A. K., Bedeian, A. G., & Day, D. V. (2005). Mountains out of molehills? Tests of the mediating effects of self - esteem in predicting workplace complaining. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35(11), 2262-2289. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02102.x
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 1-46). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Higgins, E. T., Shah, J., & Friedman, R. (1997). Emotional responses to goal attainment: Strength of regulatory focus as moderator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(3), 515-525. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.515
- Higgins, E. T., & Spiegel, S. (2004). Promotion and prevention strategies for self-regulation: A motivated cognition perspective. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory, and applications* (pp. 171-187). New York: Guilford Press.
- Hillman, A. J., Shropshire, C., Certo, S. T., Dalton, D. R., & Dalton, C. M. (2011). What I like about you: A multilevel study of shareholder discontent with director monitoring. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 675-687.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 967-988. doi: 10.1177/014920639502100509

- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods, 1*(1), 104-121. doi: 10.1177/109442819800100106
- Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1999). An analysis of variance approach to content validation. *Organizational Research Methods, 2*(2), 175-186. doi: 10.1177/109442819922004
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hirt, E. R., Melton, R. J., McDonald, H. E., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (1996). Processing goals, task interest, and the mood–performance relationship: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(2), 245-261. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.245
- Hochwarter, W. A., Ellen, B. P., & Ferris, G. R. (2014). Examining the interactive effects of accountability, politics, and voice. *Career Development International, 19*(4), 358-380. doi: 10.1108/CDI-01-2014-0012
- Holman, D., Totterdell, P., Axtell, C., Stride, C., Port, R., Svensson, R., & Zibarras, L. (2012). Job design and the employee innovation process: The mediating role of learning strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 27*(2), 177-191. doi: 10.1007/s10869-011-9242-5
- Howard-Grenville, J. A. (2007). Developing issue-selling effectiveness over time: Issue selling as resourcing. *Organization Science, 18*(4), 560-577. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1070.0266
- Howell, J. M., & Boies, K. (2004). Champions of technological innovation: The influence of contextual knowledge, role orientation, idea generation, and idea promotion on champion emergence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(1), 123-143. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.008
- Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 317-341. doi: 10.2307/2393393
- Howell, J. M., & Shea, C. M. (2006). Effects of champion behavior, team potency, and external communication activities on predicting team performance. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(2), 180-211. doi: 10.1177/1059601104273067
- Howell, J. M., Shea, C. M., & Higgins, C. A. (2005). Champions of product innovations: Defining, developing, and validating a measure of champion behavior. *Journal of Business Venturing, 20*(5), 641-661. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2004.06.001

- Hsiung, H.-H. (2012). Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*(3), 349-361. doi: 10.1007/s10551-011-1043-2
- Hu, L.-t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118
- Huang, X., Xu, E., & Liu, W. (2014). *When upward voicing becomes "upward nagging": Employee voice, LMX, and managers' reactions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management Conference, Philadelphia, USA.
- Hulleman, C. S., Schrage, S. M., Bodmann, S. M., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2010). A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: Different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels? *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*(3), 422-449. doi: 10.1037/a0018947
- Isen, A. M. (1999). On the relationship between affect and creative problem solving. In S. W. Russ (Ed.), *Affect, creative experience, and psychological adjustment* (Vol. 3, pp. 3-17). Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Janssen, O. (2001). Fairness perceptions as a moderator in the curvilinear relationships between job demands, and job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*(5), 1039-1050. doi: 10.2307/3069447
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C. H., Meyer, T., Lanaj, K., & Way, J. (2013). Approaching success or avoiding failure? Approach and avoidance motives in the work domain. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*(5), 424-441. doi: 10.1002/per.1883
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C. H., & Rosen, C. C. (2010). "Who I am depends on how fairly I'm treated": Effects of justice on self - identity and regulatory focus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(12), 3020-3058. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00691.x
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C.-H. D., & Yang, L.-Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(2), 226-245.
- Johnson, R. E., King, D. D., Lin, S.-H. J., Scott, B. A., Walker, E. M. J., & Wang, M. (2017). Regulatory focus trickle-down: How leader regulatory focus and behavior shape follower regulatory focus. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *140*, 29-45. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2017.03.002

- Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2012). Job attitudes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*, 341-367. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100511
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692-724. doi: 10.2307/256287
- Kakkar, H., Tangirala, S., Srivastava, N. K., & Kamdar, D. (2016). The dispositional antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *101*(9), 1342-1351. doi: 10.1037/apl0000130
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*(4), 657-690. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.657
- Kanter, R. M. (1988). Three tiers for innovation research. *Communication Research*, *15*(5), 509-523. doi: 10.1177/009365088015005001
- Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: a meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 162-176. doi: 10.1037/a0013115
- Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *12*(2), 183-229. doi: 10.1177/0893318998122002
- Kassing, J. W. (2002). Speaking up: Identifying employees' upward dissent strategies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *16*(2), 187-209. doi: 10.1177/089331802237234
- Kassing, J. W. (2005). Speaking up competently: A comparison of perceived competence in upward dissent strategies. *Communication Research Reports*, *22*(3), 227-234. doi: 10.1080/00036810500230651
- Kassing, J. W. (2009). "In case you didn't hear me the first time:" An examination of repetitious upward dissent. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *22*(3), 416-436. doi: 10.1177/0893318908327008
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.
- Kerlinger, F., & Lee, H. (2000). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning.

- Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*(4), 440. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.65.4.440
- Kirton, M. (1976). Adaptors and innovators: A description and measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61*(5), 622-629. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.61.5.622
- Klein, H. J. (1989). An integrated control theory model of work motivation. *Academy of Management Review, 14*, 150-172. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1989.4282072
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford.
- Knoll, M., & van Dick, R. (2013). Authenticity, employee silence, prohibitive voice, and the moderating effect of organizational identification. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 8*(4), 346-360. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2013.804113
- Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 657-669. doi: 10.1177/014920639502100404
- Kowalski, R. M. (1996). Complaints and complaining: Functions, antecedents, and consequences. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*(2), 179-196. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.179
- Kowalski, R. M. (2002). Whining, griping, and complaining: Positivity in the negativity. *Journal of clinical psychology, 58*(9), 1023-1035. doi: 10.1002/jclp.10095
- Lam, C. F., Rees, L., Levesque, L., & Ornstein, S. (2017). Shooting from the hip: A habit perspective of voice. *Academy of Management Review*. doi: 10.5465/amr.2015.0366
- Lanaj, K., Chang, C.-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2012). Regulatory focus and work-related outcomes: a review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 138*(5), 998-1034. doi: 10.1037/a0027723
- Law, K. S., Wong, C.-S., & Mobley, W. H. (1998). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. *The Academy of Management Review, 23*(4), 741-755. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1998.1255636
- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*(4), 815-852. doi: 10.1177/1094428106296642

- LePine, J. A. (2005). Adaptation of teams in response to unforeseen change: Effects of goal difficulty and team composition in terms of cognitive ability and goal orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1153-1167. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1153
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(6), 853-868. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.853
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 326-336. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.2.326
- Li, A. N., Liao, H., Tangirala, S., & Firth, B. M. (2017). The content of the message matters: The differential effects of promotive and prohibitive team voice on team productivity and safety performance gains. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 1-12*. doi: 10.1037/apl0000215
- 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. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.0176
- Lichtenthaler, U., & Ernst, H. (2009). Opening up the innovation process: the role of technology aggressiveness. *R&D Management, 39*(1), 38-54. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9310.2008.00522.x
- Lin, S.-H., & Johnson, R. E. (2015). A suggestion to improve a day keeps your depletion away: Examining promotive and prohibitive voice behaviors within a regulatory focus and ego depletion framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*, 1381-1397. doi: 10.1037/apl0000018
- Lipponen, J., Bardi, A., & Haapamäki, J. (2008). The interaction between values and organizational identification in predicting suggestion - making at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*(2), 241-248. doi: 10.1348/096317907X216658
- Liu, W., Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2013). The relational antecedents of voice targeted at different leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(5), 841-851. doi: 10.1037/a0032913
- Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(4), 854-864. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.83.4.854

- Louro, M. J., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2007). Dynamics of multiple-goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(2), 174-193. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.174
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 803-855. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(1), 123-150.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2011). Challenge-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational effectiveness: Do challenge-oriented behaviors really have an impact on the organization's bottom line? *Personnel Psychology, 64*(3), 559-592. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01219.x
- Markham, S. K., & Griffin, A. (1998). The breakfast of champions: Associations between champions and product development environments, practices and performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 15*(5), 436-454. doi: 10.1111/1540-5885.1550436
- Marshall, G. N., Wortman, C. B., Kusulas, J. W., Hervig, L. K., & Vickers Jr, R. R. (1992). Distinguishing optimism from pessimism: Relations to fundamental dimensions of mood and personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*(6), 1067-1074. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.6.1067
- Maynes, T. D., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2014). Speaking more broadly: An examination of the nature, antecedents, and consequences of an expanded set of employee voice behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(1), 87-112. doi: 10.1037/a0034284
- McAdams, D. P. (1990). *The person: An introduction to personality psychology*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- McClellan, E., Martin, S. R., Emich, K., & Woodruff, T. (2018). The social consequences of voice: An examination of voice type and gender on status and subsequent leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal*. doi: 10.5465/amj.2016.0148
- Meade, A. W., & Craig, S. B. (2012). Identifying careless responses in survey data. *Psychological Methods, 17*(3), 437-455. doi: 10.1037/a0028085

- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1985). Characteristics of organizational climate and perceived wrongdoing associated with whistle-blowing decisions. *Personnel Psychology*, 38(3), 525-544. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1985.tb00558.x
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1988). Individual and situational correlates of whistle-blowing. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(2), 267-281. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb02385.x
- Miceli, M. P., & Near, J. P. (1989). The incidence of wrongdoing, whistle-blowing, and retaliation: Results of a naturally occurring field experiment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2(2), 91-108. doi: 10.1007/BF01384940
- 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. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00387
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16(2), 127-142. doi: 10.1002/job.4030160204
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 373-412. doi: 10.1080/19416520.2011.574506
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee Voice and Silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 173-197. doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328
- 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. doi: 10.2307/259200
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4), 403-419. doi: 10.2307/257011
- Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Speaking Up in Groups: A Cross-Level Study of Group Voice Climate and Voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 183-191. doi: 10.1037/a0020744
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 71-83. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1002_1

- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2015). *Mplus user's guide* (7.4 ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1985). Organizational dissidence: The case of whistle-blowing. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1007/BF00382668
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1986). Retaliation against whistle blowers: Predictors and effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 137-145. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.1.137
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1995). Effective-whistle blowing. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 679-708. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080334
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1996). Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality. *Journal of Management*, 22(3), 507-526. doi: 10.1016/S0149-2063(96)90034-3
- Nikandrou, I., & Papalexandris, N. (2008). Employee responses to acquisitions: Evidence from Greek firms. *Employee Relations*, 30(2), 104-120. doi: 10.1108/01425450810843311
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., & Pluntke, F. (2006). Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(3), 257-279. doi: 10.1002/job.376
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 5(5), 411-419.
- Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 36(3), 633-662. doi: 10.1177/0149206308321554
- Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 128-150. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.128
- Perrucci, R., Anderson, R. M., Schendel, D. E., & Trachtman, L. E. (1980). Whistle-blowing: Professionals' resistance to organizational authority. *Social Problems*, 28(2), 149-164. doi: 10.2307/800148
- Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 298-310. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2001.4378028
- Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A

- meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122-141. doi: 10.1037/a0013079
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9101.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7
- Premeaux, S. F., & Bedeian, A. G. (2003). Breaking the silence: The moderating effects of self-monitoring in predicting speaking up in the workplace. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1537-1562. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00390
- Presbitero, A. (2015). Proactivity in career development of employees: The roles of proactive personality and cognitive complexity. *Career Development International*, 20(5), 525-538. doi: 10.1108/CDI-03-2015-0043
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ray, R., Gornick, J. C., & Schmitt, J. (2010). Who cares? Assessing generosity and gender equality in parental leave policy designs in 21 countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20(3), 196-216. doi: 10.1177/0958928710364434
- Rehg, M. T., Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., & Van Scotter, J. R. (2008). Antecedents and outcomes of retaliation against whistleblowers: Gender differences and power relationships. *Organization Science*, 19(2), 221-240. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1070.0310
- Rich, B. L., LePine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1941). *Management and morale*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.1.66

- Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous, A. G. (1988). Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job-satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *31*(3), 599-627. doi: 10.2307/256461
- Rusbult, C. E., Zembrodt, I. M., & Gunn, L. K. (1982). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*(6), 1230-1242. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.43.6.1230
- Schleicher, D. J., Hansen, S. D., & Fox, K. E. (2011). Job attitudes and work values. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 137-189). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schon, D. A. (1963). Champions for radical new inventions. *Harvard Business Review*, *41*(2), 77-86.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management*, *19*(2), 385-417. doi: 10.1016/0149-2063(93)90058-U
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct behavior in organizational behavior. In B. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 580-607. doi: 10.2307/256701
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(3), 416-427. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416
- Shah, J., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Expectancy \times value effects: Regulatory focus as determinant of magnitude and direction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*(3), 447-458. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.447
- Shane, S. (1994). Championing innovation in the global corporation. *Research-Technology Management*, *37*(4), 29-35.
- Sims, R. L., & Keenan, J. P. (1998). Predictors of external whistleblowing: Organizational and intrapersonal variables. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *17*(4), 411-421. doi: 10.1023/A:1005763807868

- Spengler, P. M., & Strohmer, D. C. (1994). Clinical judgmental biases: The moderating roles of counselor cognitive complexity and counselor client preferences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*(1), 8-17. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.41.1.8
- Spengler, P. M., & Strohmer, D. C. (1994). Stability of a 4 × 6 repertory grid for measuring cognitive complexity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 7*(2), 137-145. doi: 10.1080/10720539408405074
- Stamper, C. L., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*(5), 517-536. doi: 10.1002/job.100
- Steed, L. G. (2002). A psychometric comparison of four measures of hope and optimism. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*(3), 466-482. doi: 10.1177/00164402062003005
- Suddaby, R. (2014). Editor's comments: Why theory? *Academy of Management Review, 39*(4), 407-411. doi: 10.5465/amr.2014.0252
- Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2012). Ask and you shall hear (but not always): Examining the relationship between manager consultation and employee voice. *Personnel Psychology, 65*(2), 251-282. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01248.x
- Taylor, A., Cocklin, C., Brown, R., & Wilson-Evered, E. (2011). An investigation of champion-driven leadership processes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(2), 412-433. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.014
- Tenhiälä, A., & Lount, R. B. (2013). Affective reactions to a pay system reform and their impact on employee behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 86*(1), 100-118. doi: 10.1111/joop.12002
- Tetlock, P. E., Peterson, R. S., & Berry, J. M. (1993). Flattering and unflattering personality portraits of integratively simple and complex managers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(3), 500-511. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.500
- Thacker, R. A., & Wayne, S. J. (1995). An examination of the relationship between upward influence tactics and assessments of promotability. *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 739-756. doi: 10.1016/0149-2063(95)90008-X
- Thomas, D. C., & Au, K. (2002). The effect of cultural differences on behavioral responses to low job satisfaction. *Journal of International Business Studies, 33*(2), 309-326. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8491018

- Thomas, D. C., & Pekerti, A. A. (2003). Effect of culture on situational determinants of exchange behavior in organizations: A comparison of New Zealand and Indonesia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*(3), 269-281. doi: 10.1177/0022022103034003002
- Tierney, P., Farmer, S. M., & Graen, G. B. (1999). An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(3), 591-620. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00173.x
- Tornau, K., & Frese, M. (2013). Construct clean-up in proactivity research: A meta-analysis on the nomological net of work-related proactivity concepts and their incremental validities. *Applied Psychology, 62*(1), 44-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00514.x
- Torrance, E. P. (1995). *Why fly? A philosophy of creativity*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Troster, C., & van Knippenberg, D. (2012). Leader openness, nationality dissimilarity, and voice in multinational management teams. *Journal of International Business Studies, 43*(6), 591-613. doi: 10.1057/jibs.2012.15
- Tucker, S., Chmiel, N., Turner, N., Hershcovis, M. S., & Stride, C. B. (2008). Perceived organizational support for safety and employee safety voice: The mediating role of coworker support for safety. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*(4), 319-330. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.13.4.319
- Tucker, S., & Turner, N. (2011). Young worker safety behaviors: Development and validation of measures. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 43*(1), 165-175. doi: 10.1016/j.aap.2010.08.006
- Van de Ven, A. H. (1986). Central problems in the management of innovation. *Management Science, 32*(5), 590-607. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.32.5.590
- 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. doi: 10.1111/1467-6486.00384
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior, 17*, 215-285.
- Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Joireman, J. (2008). In-role perceptions buffer the negative impact of low LMX on helping and enhance the positive impact of high LMX on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1195-1207. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.6.1195

- 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. doi: 10.2307/256902
- Vancouver, J. B., & Day, D. V. (2005). Industrial and organisation research on self - regulation: From constructs to applications. *Applied Psychology*, *54*(2), 155-185. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00202.x
- VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *57*, 995-1015. doi: 10.1177/0013164497057006009
- Venkataramani, V., & Tangirala, S. (2010). When and Why Do Central Employees Speak Up? An Examination of Mediating and Moderating Variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(3), 582-591. doi: 10.1037/a0018315
- Vosburg, S. K. (1998). Mood and the quantity and quality of ideas. *Creativity Research Journal*, *11*(4), 315-324. doi: 10.1207/s15326934crj1104_5
- Wang, A. C., Hsieh, H. H., Tsai, C. Y., & Cheng, B. S. (2012). Does value congruence lead to voice? Cooperative voice and cooperative silence under team and differentiated transformational leadership. *Management and Organization Review*, *8*(2), 341-370. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2011.00255.x
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). *Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule (expanded form)*. University of Iowa. Iowa City, IA.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Measurement and mismeasurement of mood: Recurrent and emergent issues. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *68*(2), 267-296. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6802_4
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(6), 1063-1070.
- Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *75*(5), 487-499.
- Weiss, M., & Morrison, E. W. (2018). Speaking up and moving up: How voice can enhance employees' social status. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1-15. doi: 10.1002/job.2262

- Whiting, S. W., Maynes, T. D., Podsakoff, N. P., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2012). Effects of message, source, and context on evaluations of employee voice behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(1), 159-182. doi: 10.1037/a0024871
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.125
- Williams, K. D. (1997). Social ostracism. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversive interpersonal behaviors* (pp. 133-170). New York: Basic Books.
- Withey, M. J., & Cooper, W. H. (1989). Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34*(4), 521-539. doi: 10.2307/2393565
- Woehr, D. J., Miller, M. J., & Lane, J. A. (1998). The development and evaluation of a computer-administered measure of cognitive complexity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*(6), 1037-1049. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00068-3
- Wong, C. A., Spence Laschinger, H. K., & Cummings, G. G. (2010). Authentic leadership and nurses' voice behaviour and perceptions of care quality. *Journal of Nursing Management, 18*(8), 889-900. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01113.x
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A Hierarchical Taxonomy of Leadership Behavior: Integrating a Half Century of Behavior Research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 15-32. doi: 10.1177/107179190200900102
- Zacharek, S., Dockterman, E., & Edwards, H. S. (2017). The Silence Breakers. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/time-person-of-the-year-2017-silence-breakers/> website:
- Zhang, Y., Huai, M.-y., & Xie, Y.-h. (2014). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice in China: A dual process model. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*, 25-36. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.01.002
- Zhang, Y., LePine, J., Buckman, B., & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair...or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor-job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(3), 675-697. doi: 10.5465/amj.2011.1110
- Zhou, J., & George, J. M. (2001). When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 682-696. doi: 10.2307/3069410

Table 1

Framework of Constructive Voice Types

Dimension	Promotive	Prohibitive
Concentration	<p data-bbox="574 478 743 512" style="text-align: center;"><i>Championing</i></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="459 552 837 646"><i>Definition:</i> Repeated expression of a specific idea to improve organizational functioning.</p> <p data-bbox="459 720 829 884"><i>Representative Behaviors</i> Persistently advocates for a specific practice. Promotes an organizational solution over and over again.</p> <p data-bbox="459 919 862 1083"><i>Related Constructs</i> Championing (Howell et al., 2005) Issue selling (Dutton & Ashford, 1993)</p>	<p data-bbox="1084 478 1205 512" style="text-align: center;"><i>Alarming</i></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="946 552 1341 680"><i>Definition:</i> Repeated expression of concern about a specific problematic work factor that harms organizational functioning.</p> <p data-bbox="946 720 1300 884"><i>Representative Behaviors</i> Speaks up about the same organizational problem. Frequently reports a specific challenge to management.</p> <p data-bbox="946 919 1341 1050"><i>Related Constructs</i> Whistleblowing (Miceli & Near, 1985) Upward dissent (Kassing, 1998)</p>
Breadth	<p data-bbox="602 1155 722 1188" style="text-align: center;"><i>Initiating</i></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="459 1228 862 1356"><i>Definition:</i> Expression of a variety of ideas or suggestions for improving organizational functioning.</p> <p data-bbox="459 1392 857 1556"><i>Representative Behaviors</i> Suggests an array of ideas to improve work procedures. Communicates a vast number of ideas to be more productive.</p> <p data-bbox="459 1591 802 1686"><i>Related Constructs</i> Creativity (Zhou & George, 2001)</p>	<p data-bbox="1084 1155 1205 1188" style="text-align: center;"><i>Patrolling</i></p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="946 1228 1317 1356"><i>Definition:</i> Expression of a variety of issues or problematic work factors that harm organizational functioning.</p> <p data-bbox="946 1392 1328 1556"><i>Representative Behaviors</i> Expresses concern about dysfunctions in the workplace. Calls attention to work-related problems that could be fixed.</p> <p data-bbox="946 1591 1328 1661"><i>Related Constructs</i> Complaining (Kowalski, 1996)</p>

Table 2

Summary of Hypotheses

Variable	Promotive Voice		Prohibitive Voice	
	Championing	Initiating	Alarming	Patrolling
H2 Personal Initiative	+	+	+	+
H3 Felt Responsibility	+	+	+	+
H4 Promotion Focus	+	+		
H5 Prevention Focus			+	+
H6 Positive Affect	+	+	-	-
H7 Positive Affect	+	<	+	
H8 Negative Affect	-	-	+	+
H9 Negative Affect			+	< +
H10 Cognitive Complexity	-	+	-	+
H11 Learning Goal Orientation		+		+
H12 Performance Goal Orientation	+		+	
H13 Voice Endorsement	+	-	+	-
H14 Interpersonal Liking	+	+	-	-
H15 Active Listening	+	+	-	-
H16 Promotability	+	+	-	-
H17 Job Performance	+	+	-	-

Table 3

Item Generation Assessment

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Burris, 2012	Challenging Voice	I give suggestions to my District Manager about how to make this restaurant better, even if others disagree.
Promotive	Burris, 2012	Challenging Voice	I speak up to my District Manager with ideas to address employees' needs and concerns.
Promotive	Howell, Shea, & Higgins 2005	Champion Behavior	Enthusiastically promotes the innovation's advantages.
Promotive	Howell et al., 2005	Champion Behavior	Expresses confidence in what the innovation can do.
Promotive	Howell et al., 2005	Champion Behavior	Expresses strong conviction about the innovation.
Promotive	Howell et al., 2005	Champion Behavior	Points out reasons why the innovation will succeed.
Promotive	Howell et al., 2005	Champion Behavior	Sells the innovation to key people.
Promotive	Howell et al., 2005	Champion Behavior	Sells the need to top management.
Promotive	Dulaimi, Nepal, & Park 2005	Championing Behavior	Enthusiastically promotes the advantages of new ideas and solutions.
Promotive	Choi, 2007	Change-Oriented OCB	I frequently come up with new ideas or new work methods to perform my task.
Promotive	Choi, 2007	Change-Oriented OCB	I often suggest changes to unproductive rules or policies.
Promotive	Choi, 2007	Change-Oriented OCB	I often suggest work improvement ideas to others.
Promotive	Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014	Constructive Voice	Frequently makes suggestions about how to do things in new or more effective ways at work.
Promotive	Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014	Constructive Voice	Frequently makes suggestions about how to improve work methods or practices.
Promotive	Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014	Constructive Voice	Often suggests changes to work projects in order to make them better.
Promotive	Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014	Constructive Voice	Regularly proposes ideas for new or more effective work methods.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Whiting, Maynes, Podsakoff, & Podaskoff, 2012	Constructive Voice	His/her comments are likely to enhance the performance of his/her work team.
Promotive	Whiting et al., 2012	Constructive Voice	His/her comments were constructive.
Promotive	Wang, Hsieh, Tsai, & Cheng 2012	Cooperative Voice	Communicate my opinions about work issues even if others disagree.
Promotive	Wang et al., 2012	Cooperative Voice	Develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the organization.
Promotive	Wang et al., 2012	Cooperative Voice	Express solutions to problems with the cooperative motive of benefiting the organization.
Promotive	Wang et al., 2012	Cooperative Voice	Speak up with ideas for new projects that might benefit the organization.
Promotive	Wang et al., 2012	Cooperative Voice	Suggest ideas for change based on constructive concern for the organization.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Comes up with creative solutions to problems.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Comes up with new and practical ideas to improve performance.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Is a good source of creative ideas.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Often has new and innovative ideas.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Suggests new ways of performing work tasks.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Suggests new ways to achieve goals or objectives.
Promotive	Zhou & George 2001	Creativity	Suggests new ways to increase quality.
Promotive	Tierney, Farmer, & Graen 1999	Employee Creativity	Generated ideas revolutionary to our field.
Promotive	Tierney et al., 1999	Employee Creativity	Generated novel, but operable work-related ideas.
Promotive	Tierney et al., 1999	Employee Creativity	Took risks in terms of producing new ideas in doing job.
Promotive	Tierney et al., 1999	Employee Creativity	Tried out new ideas and approached to problems.
Promotive	Binnewies & Gromer 2012	Idea Promotion	I introduced my ideas to others.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Binnewies & Gromer 2012	Idea Promotion	I made a suggestion to change things at work.
Promotive	Binnewies & Gromer 2012	Idea Promotion	I proposed to do things differently.
Promotive	Holman, Totterdell, Axtell, Stride, Port, Svensson, Zibarras 2012	Idea Promotion	Attempted to get support from others for your ideas.
Promotive	Holman et al., 2012	Idea Promotion	Got involved in persuading others to adopt your proposals for doing things differently.
Promotive	Holman et al., 2012	Idea Promotion	Tried to get approval for improvements you suggested.
Promotive	Binnewies, Ohly, Sonnentag 2007	Idea-related Communication	I informed my colleagues or supervisor how I could address the task in a different way.
Promotive	Binnewies et al., 2007	Idea-related Communication	I presented my idea to my colleagues or supervisor.
Promotive	Binnewies et al., 2007	Idea-related Communication	I told my colleagues or supervisor about my new idea.
Promotive	Moorman & Blakely 1995	Individual Initiative	Encourages others to try new and more effective ways of doing their job.
Promotive	Moorman & Blakely 1995	Individual Initiative	Frequently communicates to co-workers suggestions on how the group can improve.
Promotive	Moorman & Blakely 1995	Individual Initiative	Often motivates others to express their ideas and opinions.
Promotive	Scott & Bruce 1994	Innovative Behavior	Generates creative ideas.
Promotive	Scott & Bruce 1994	Innovative Behavior	Promotes and champions ideas to others.
Promotive	Janssen 2001	Innovative Job Performance	Creating new ideas for improvements.
Promotive	Janssen 2001	Innovative Job Performance	Generating original solutions to problems.
Promotive	Janssen 2001	Innovative Job Performance	Introducing innovative ideas into the work environment in a systematic way.
Promotive	de Jong & den Hartog 2010	Innovative Output	Make suggestions to improve current products or services.
Promotive	de Jong & den Hartog 2010	Innovative Output	Produce ideas to improve work practices.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton 1998	Issue selling credibility	I am known as a successful issue seller.
Promotive	Ashford et al., 1998	Issue selling credibility	I have a positive track record for selling issues.
Promotive	Ashford et al., 1998	Issue selling credibility	I have been successful in the past in selling issues in this organization.
Promotive	Korsgaard & Roberson 1995	Non-instrumental Voice	Make suggestions about how your job might be done differently.
Promotive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization.
Promotive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I speak with my supervisor or someone in management when I question workplace decisions.
Promotive	Bateman & Crant 1993	Proactive Personality	I love being a champion for my ideas, even against others' opposition.
Promotive	Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012	Promotive Voice	Make constructive suggestions to improve the unit's operation.
Promotive	Liang et al., 2012	Promotive Voice	Proactively develop and make suggestions for issues that may influence the unit.
Promotive	Liang et al., 2012	Promotive Voice	Proactively suggest new projects which are beneficial to the work unit.
Promotive	Liang et al., 2012	Promotive Voice	Proactively voice out constructive suggestions that help the unit reach its goal.
Promotive	Liang et al., 2012	Promotive Voice	Raise suggestions to improve the unit's working procedure.
Promotive	Lipponen, Bardi, & Haapamäki, 2008	Suggestion-Making	I have made suggestions to the supervisor (of the day-care centre) regarding how to develop the functioning of the day-care centre.
Promotive	Lipponen et al., 2008	Suggestion-Making	I have told my ideas to my coworkers regarding how to improve our work.
Promotive	Axtell, Holman, Unsworth, Wall, Waterson, & Harrington 2000	Suggestions	Proposed new information or recording systems.
Promotive	Axtell et al., 2000	Suggestions	Proposed new methods to achieve work targets.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Axtell et al., 2000	Suggestions	Proposed new products or product improvements.
Promotive	Axtell et al., 2000	Suggestions	Proposed new targets or objectives.
Promotive	Axtell et al., 2000	Suggestions	Proposed new working methods or techniques.
Promotive	Morrison & Phelps 1999	Taking Charge	This person often makes constructive suggestions for improving how things operate within the organization.
Promotive	De Dreu & Van Vianen 2001	Voice	Team members express their opinions and ideas.
Promotive	De Dreu & Van Vianen 2001	Voice	Team members give their opinion when it concerns important issues.
Promotive	Detert & Burris 2007	Voice	I give suggestions to my supervisor about how to make this organization better.
Promotive	Detert & Burris 2007	Voice	I speak my mind to my supervisor about the way things are around here.
Promotive	Detert & Burris 2007	Voice	I speak up to my supervisor with ideas about doing things differently.
Promotive	Farh, Hackett, & Liang 2007	Voice	Actively brings forward suggestions that may help the organization run more efficiently or effectively.
Promotive	Farh et al., 2007	Voice	Actively raises suggestions to improve work procedures or processes.
Promotive	Farh, Zhong, Organ, 2004	Voice	Makes constructive suggestions.
Promotive	Farrell 1983; Withey & Cooper, 1989	Voice	Talking to supervisor to try and make things better.
Promotive	Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous 1988	Voice	I have an idea that I think will improve the feedback system, and I will make a serious effort to implement it.
Promotive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I want to suggest changes in the procedures by which work is assigned or evaluated.
Promotive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I want to talk things over with my co-workers to get their help in changing working conditions.
Promotive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I want to talk to my supervisor about the difficulty of the job and/or the nature of the feedback.
Promotive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	When I think of an idea that will benefit my company I make a determined effort to implement it.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Promotive	Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn 1982	Voice	I would suggest things that I thought would help us.
Promotive	Van Dyne & LePine 1998	Voice	This particular co-worker communicates his/her opinions about work issues to others in this group even if his/her opinion is different and others in the group disagree with him/her.
Promotive	Van Dyne & LePine 1998	Voice	This particular co-worker develops and makes recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group.
Promotive	Van Dyne & LePine 1998	Voice	This particular co-worker speaks up and encourages others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group.
Promotive	Van Dyne & LePine 1998	Voice	This particular co-worker speaks up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures.
Prohibitive	Burris, 2012	Challenging Voice	I challenge my District Manager to deal with problems around here.
Prohibitive	Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014	Constructive Voice	Often speaks up with recommendations about how to fix work-related problems.
Prohibitive	Moorman & Blakely 1995	Individual Initiative	For issues that may have serious consequences, expresses opinions honestly even when others may disagree.
Prohibitive	Korsgaard & Roberson 1995	Non-instrumental Voice	Tell your manager about problems you were having on the job.
Prohibitive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management.
Prohibitive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I hardly ever complain to my coworkers about workplace problems.
Prohibitive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I make certain everyone knows when I'm unhappy with work policies.
Prohibitive	Kassing 1998	Organizational Dissent	I tell management when I believe employees are being treated unfairly.
Prohibitive	Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012	Prohibitive Voice	Advise other colleagues against undesirable behaviors that would hamper job performance.
Prohibitive	Liang et al., 2012	Prohibitive Voice	Dare to point out problems when they appear in the unit, even if that would hamper relationships with other colleagues.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Prohibitive	Liang et al., 2012	Prohibitive Voice	Dare to voice out opinions on things that might affect efficiency in the work unit, even if that would embarrass others.
Prohibitive	Liang et al., 2012	Prohibitive Voice	Proactively report coordination problems in the workplace to the management.
Prohibitive	Liang et al., 2012	Prohibitive Voice	Speak up honestly with problems that might cause serious loss to the work unit, even when/though dissenting opinions exist.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Group together with co-workers and take safety concerns to the supervisor.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Remind co-workers to take precautions.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Speak to co-workers at risk and encourage them to fix safety problems.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Talk to the owner about safety concerns.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Tell the supervisor about hazardous work.
Prohibitive	Tucker & Turner 2011	Safety Voice	Tell the supervisor about the consequences of dangerous working conditions.
Prohibitive	Tucker, Chmiel, Turner, Hershcovis, & Stride 2008	Safety Voice	I discuss new ways to improve safe driving with my colleagues or boss.
Prohibitive	Tucker et al., 2008	Safety Voice	I inform the union/boss when I notice a potential driving hazard.
Prohibitive	Tucker et al., 2008	Safety Voice	I make suggestions about how safety can be improved.
Prohibitive	Tucker et al., 2008	Safety Voice	I report to my boss if my colleagues break any safety rules.
Prohibitive	Tucker et al., 2008	Safety Voice	I tell my colleague who is doing something unsafe to stop.
Prohibitive	Premeaux & Bedeian 2003	Speaking Up	Remains quiet rather than say what's on his/her mind in discussion of controversial issues.
Prohibitive	Premeaux & Bedeian 2003	Speaking Up	Speaks up if he/she feels a plan or idea won't work.
Prohibitive	Premeaux & Bedeian 2003	Speaking Up	Speaks up when workplace happenings conflict with his/her sense of what is appropriate.
Prohibitive	Farh, Zhong, Organ, 2004	Voice	Speaks up to prohibit behavior harmful to the organization.

Voice Type	Study	Construct	Item
Prohibitive	Farrell 1983; Withey & Cooper, 1989	Voice	Putting a note in the suggestion box hoping to correct the problem.
Prohibitive	Farrell 1983; Withey & Cooper, 1989	Voice	Writing a letter to a government agency to find out what can be done to help the problem.
Prohibitive	Knoll & van Dick 2013	Voice	I would address the problem even if speaking up entailed disadvantages.
Prohibitive	Knoll & van Dick 2013	Voice	I would discuss the problem with someone who is able to alter the situation.
Prohibitive	Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, & Mainous 1988	Voice	I have at least once contacted an outside agency (e.g., union) to get help in changing working conditions here.
Prohibitive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I sometimes discuss problems at work with my employer.
Prohibitive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I would go to my immediate supervisor to discuss the problem.
Prohibitive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	I would try to solve the problem by suggesting changes in the way work was supervised in the office.
Prohibitive	Rusbult et al., 1988	Voice	When things are seriously wrong and the company won't act, I am willing to "blow the whistle."
Prohibitive	Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn 1982	Voice	I would talk to my partner about what was bothering me.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities of Study 1 Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Championing	3.15	1.07	(.94)					
2. Initiating	3.34	1.01	.72*	(.92)				
3. Alarming	2.92	1.09	.66*	.51*	(.93)			
4. Patrolling	3.04	1.03	.56*	.57*	.62*	(.93)		
5. Personal Initiative	3.83	.73	.41*	.51*	.33*	.28*	(.89)	
6. Felt Obligation	3.42	.99	.42*	.55*	.27*	.38*	.52*	(.92)
7. Promotion Focus	3.96	.76	.25*	.31*	.12*	.09	.54*	.44*
8. Prevention Focus	2.72	1.03	.07	-.02	.20*	.28*	-.29*	-.04
9. Positive Affect	3.27	.89	.44*	.44*	.25*	.22*	.58*	.49*
10. Negative Affect	1.60	.78	.05	-.04	.15*	.16*	-.19*	-.06
11. Cognitive Complexity	3.44	.86	.19*	.31*	.13*	.25*	.49*	.27*
12. LGO	3.84	.80	.37*	.46*	.24*	.28*	.65*	.45*
13. PPGO	3.30	.93	.31*	.36*	.33*	.37*	.28*	.32*
14. PAGO	2.70	1.03	.01	-.10	.02	.07	-.28*	-.04
15. Voice Endorsement	3.61	.70	.46*	.55*	.30*	.35*	.58*	.52*
16. Interpersonal Liking	4.02	.68	.27*	.26*	.06	.07	.47*	.40*
17. Active Listening	3.94	.69	.29*	.35*	.16*	.10	.54*	.39*
18. Promotability	4.01	.73	.33*	.42*	.17*	.19*	.65*	.43*
19. Performance	3.97	.73	.32*	.41*	.22*	.20*	.65*	.38*
20. Promotive Voice	3.61	.96	.59*	.76*	.40*	.48*	.65*	.71*
21. Prohibitive Voice	3.29	.98	.54*	.67*	.48*	.57*	.59*	.57*
22. Voice Concentration	3.16	.99	.57*	.45*	.48*	.41*	.30*	.33*

Note. $N = 301$; * $p < .05$; LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation.

Table 4 continued

Variable	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7. Promotion Focus	(.86)							
8. Prevention Focus	-.25*	(.89)						
9. Positive Affect	.41*	-.23*	(.91)					
10. Negative Affect	-.19*	.47*	-.02	(.94)				
11. Cognitive Complexity	.27*	-.21*	.32*	-.16*	(.82)			
12. LGO	.49*	-.24*	.50*	-.15*	.74*	(.90)		
13. PPGO	.26*	.24*	.26*	.12*	.21*	.37*	(.86)	
14. PAGO	-.18*	.50*	-.06*	.40*	-.37*	-.33*	.27*	(.90)
15. Voice Endorsement	.33*	-.08	.45*	-.09	.38*	.55*	.27*	-.21*
16. Interpersonal Liking	.41*	-.23*	.38*	-.21*	.14*	.34*	.09	-.19*
17. Active Listening	.38*	-.19*	.35*	-.19*	.18*	.38*	.16*	-.22*
18. Promotability	.62*	-.30*	.48*	-.26*	.29*	.52*	.26*	-.25*
19. Performance	.51*	-.31*	.43*	-.30*	.27*	.46*	.21*	-.32*
20. Promotive Voice	.39*	-.09	.51*	-.12*	.40*	.59*	.37*	-.15*
21. Prohibitive Voice	.28*	-.01	.45*	-.01	.36*	.50*	.33*	-.13*
22. Voice Concentration	.13*	.23*	.33*	.20*	.05	.20*	.38*	.16*

Note. $N = 301$; * $p < .05$; LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation.

Table 4 continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
15. Voice Endorsement	(.85)							
16. Interpersonal Liking	.49*	(.90)						
17. Active Listening	.56*	.75*	(.86)					
18. Promotability	.54*	.61*	.61*	(.82)				
19. Performance	.53*	.62*	.59*	.80*	(.88)			
20. Promotive Voice	.69*	.39*	.46*	.53*	.52*	(.93)		
21. Prohibitive Voice	.58*	.28*	.38*	.41*	.46*	.75*	(.91)	
22. Voice Concentration	.39*	.14*	.21*	.23*	.22*	.47*	.48*	(.88)

Note. $N = 301$; * $p < .05$.

Table 5

Convergent Validity CFAs of Constructive Voice Models (Study 1)

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA	$\Delta\chi^2$
Model 1: Four factors	205.46	98	.98	.03	.06	
Model 2: Four factors (higher-order latent)	240.97	100	.97	.05	.07	35.51
Model 3: Two factors (promotive, prohibitive)	1144.34	103	.77	.08	.18	938.88
Model 4: Two factors (concentration, breadth)	1315.11	103	.74	.09	.20	1,109.66
Model 5: One factor	1,660.29	104	.66	.10	.22	1,454.83

Note. All χ^2 and $\Delta\chi^2$ values are significant at $p < .01$. $N = 301$.

Table 6

Constructive Voice Items and Factor Loadings

Items	Study 1	Study 2
<i>Championing</i> (average variance explained)	(.78)	(.72)
This employee		
1. Repeatedly suggests one innovative workplace practice.	.88	.84
2. Regularly speaks up with the same procedural recommendation to enhance the organization.	.87	.84
3. Routinely promotes one new work method that could benefit the organization.	.90	.89
4. Often suggests pursuing a specific project to improve the company.	.88	.83
<i>Initiating</i> (average variance explained)	(.74)	(.72)
This employee		
1. Proposes a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods.	.92	.88
2. Raises an array of original suggestions to improve future work procedures.	.90	.93
3. Suggests a wide variety of unrelated ideas for upcoming work projects.	.73	.71
4. Speaks up with many new approaches to execute work more effectively.	.89	.85
<i>Alarming</i> (average variance explained)	(.77)	(.71)
This employee		
1. Expresses concern about one problematic work method over and over again.	.88	.81
2. Repeatedly tells others about one worrisome workplace procedure.	.83	.84
3. Speaks up quite often about one particularly problematic organizational practice.	.90	.86
4. Vocally opposes a specific poorly functioning work project time after time.	.89	.87
<i>Patrolling</i> (average variance explained)	(.77)	(.69)
This employee		
1. Advises against many adverse work methods he/she has seen at work.	.85	.81
2. Alerts others to all sorts of hurtful work practices.	.88	.80
3. Warns against various problems with organizational procedures.	.87	.90
4. Cautions others about a wide variety of harmful work projects.	.92	.80

Note. All factor loadings are significant at $p < .01$. Study 1 $N = 301$; Study 2 $N = 207$.

Table 7

Discriminant Validity CFAs of Constructive Voice Models (Study 1)

Model	χ^2	<i>df</i>	CFI	SRMR	RMSEA	$\Delta\chi^2$
Model 1: Seven factors	705.17	356	.96	.06	.04	
Model 2: Seven factors (higher-order latent)	896.21	370	.94	.07	.07	191.04
Model 3: Four factors (concentration, breadth, promotive, prohibitive)	2,169.95	371	.78	.13	.08	1,464.78
Model 4: Three factors (promotive, prohibitive, and narrowness)	2,724.76	374	.71	.15	.10	2,019.59
Model 5: One factor	3,487.08	377	.62	.17	.11	2,781.91

Note. All χ^2 and $\Delta\chi^2$ values are significant at $p < .01$. $N = 301$.

Table 8

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 2 and 3 (Study 1)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b(SE)</i>	Initiating <i>b(SE)</i>	Alarming <i>b(SE)</i>	Patrolling <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	.63	.34	.96	1.30
Independent Variables				
Personal Initiative	.38* (.10)	.43* (.10)	.38* (.10)	.15 (.11)
Felt Obligation	.31* (.08)	.40* (.07)	.15 (.08)	.34* (.08)
R ²	.23* (.05)	.37* (.05)	.12* (.04)	.16* (.04)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

* $p < .05$; † $p < .10$. $N = 301$.

Table 9

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 4-9 (Study 1)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b(SE)</i>	Initiating <i>b(SE)</i>	Alarming <i>b(SE)</i>	Patrolling <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	.21	.71	.51	.66
Independent Variables				
Promotion Focus	.17* (.08)	.22* (.09)	.12 (.09)	.09 (.09)
Prevention Focus	.22* (.06)	.15* (.07)	.28* (.07)	.36* (.06)
Positive Affect	.52* (.07)	.46* (.07)	.34* (.07)	.32* (.07)
Negative Affect	-.03 (.07)	-.10 (.07)	.06 (.08)	.01 (.07)
R ²	.24* (.04)	.23* (.05)	.14* (.04)	.17* (.04)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

* $p < .05$; † $p < .10$. $N = 301$.

Table 10

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 10-12 (Study 1)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b(SE)</i>	Initiating <i>b(SE)</i>	Alarming <i>b(SE)</i>	Patrolling <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	.75	.91	1.23	.71
Independent Variables				
Cognitive Complexity	-.19 [†] (.10)	-.05 (.10)	-.12 (.10)	.19 [†] (.11)
LGO	.60* (.12)	.49* (.11)	.28* (.12)	.11 (.12)
PPGO	.18* (.09)	.26* (.08)	.33* (.08)	.32* (.09)
PAGO	.06 (.07)	-.05 (.07)	-.02 (.07)	.08 (.07)
R ²	.19* (.04)	.25* (.05)	.13* (.04)	.18* (.05)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

* $p < .05$; [†] $p < .10$. $N = 301$.

Table 11

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 13-17 (Study 1)

Variables	Dependent Variable				
	Voice Endorsement <i>b(SE)</i>	Interpersonal Liking <i>b(SE)</i>	Active Listening <i>b(SE)</i>	Promotability <i>b(SE)</i>	Job Performance <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	2.28	3.51	3.22	3.06	3.00
Independent Variables					
Championing	.10* (.05)	.18* (.05)	.09 [†] (.05)	.09 (.06)	.05 (.06)
Initiating	.32* (.05)	.14* (.06)	.25* (.06)	.29* (.06)	.30* (.06)
Alarming	-.04 (.04)	-.11* (.05)	-.00 (.05)	-.05 (.05)	.01 (.05)
Patrolling	.02 (.04)	-.07 (.05)	-.13* (.05)	-.05 (.05)	-.07 (.05)
R ²	.32* (.05)	.11* (.04)	.15* (.04)	.19* (.04)	.18* (.04)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

**p* < .05; [†]*p* < .10. *N* = 301.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities of Study 2 Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Championing	2.84	.83	(.91)					
2. Initiating	2.76	.82	.71*	(.90)				
3. Alarming	2.52	.77	.35*	.31*	(.90)			
4. Patrolling	2.78	.83	.45*	.67*	.49*	(.91)		
5. Personal Initiative	3.84	.67	.31*	.17*	.16*	.13	(.89)	
6. Felt Obligation	3.54	.70	.19*	.13	-.03	.05	.49*	(.87)
7. Promotion Focus	3.64	.74	.12	-.01	-.03	-.03	.69*	.49*
8. Prevention Focus	3.02	.80	-.07	.02	-.13	-.08	-.11	.04
9. Positive Affect	3.48	.82	.14	.10	.03	.07	.52*	.52*
10. Negative Affect	1.89	.78	-.26*	-.17*	-.14	-.19*	-.23*	-.19*
11. Cognitive Complexity	3.09	.59	.13	.08	.08	.03	.47*	.43*
12. LGO	3.64	.75	.21*	.05	.01	-.01	.63*	.56*
13. PPGO	3.13	.76	.10	.10	-.00	.04	.15*	.27*
14. PAGO	2.55	.76	.02	-.06	-.00	.05	-.43*	-.24*
15. Voice Endorsement	3.28	.72	.20*	.19*	-.02	.01	-.04	.04
16. Interpersonal Liking	4.07	.75	.29*	.20*	-.01	.09	.08	.17*
17. Active Listening	3.93	.59	.50*	.44*	.12	.25*	.33*	.26*
18. Promotability	3.42	.92	.64*	.61*	.11	.36*	.23*	.14
19. Performance	3.95	.84	.59*	.54*	.09	.33*	.19*	.11

Note. $N = 170$ to 237 ; * $p < .05$; LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation.

Table 12 continued

Variable	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
7. Promotion Focus	(.88)							
8. Prevention Focus	.03	(.75)						
9. Positive Affect	.50*	.02	(.94)					
10. Negative Affect	-.14	.11	-.06	(.90)				
11. Cognitive Complexity	.51*	-.16*	.44*	.01	(.65)			
12. LGO	.61*	-.08	.52*	-.11	.67*	(.91)		
13. PPGO	.22*	.32*	.15*	.02	.33*	.30*	(.84)	
14. PAGO	-.23*	.31*	-.26*	.20*	-.31*	-.44*	.17*	(.86)
15. Voice Endorsement	-.01	.13	.05	-.06	-.04	-.03	-.03	.04
16. Interpersonal Liking	.11	.01	.15*	-.22*	.06	.08	-.06	.04
17. Active Listening	.19*	-.08	.18*	-.35*	.10	.28*	.08	-.18*
18. Promotability	.08	.00	.14	-.28*	.02	.15*	.01	-.06
19. Performance	.08	-.01	.10	-.33*	-.03	.09	-.03	-.06

Note. $N = 170$ to 237 ; * $p < .05$; LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation.

Table 12 continued

Variable	15	16	17	18	19
15. Voice Endorsement	(.88)				
16. Interpersonal Liking	.59*	(.97)			
17. Active Listening	.15*	.33*	(.83)		
18. Promotability	.24*	.41*	.50*	(.80)	
19. Performance	.26*	.37*	.58*	.76*	(.95)

Note. $N = 170$ to 237 ; * $p < .05$.

Table 13

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 2 and 3 (Study 2)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b(SE)</i>	Initiating <i>b(SE)</i>	Alarming <i>b(SE)</i>	Patrolling <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	1.92	2.21	2.11	2.42
Controls				
Organization	.68* (.15)	.30 [†] (.16)	.07 (.15)	.22 (.17)
Independent Variables				
Personal Initiative	.17 (.10)	.06 (.11)	.25* (.10)	.12 (.11)
Felt Obligation	.03 (.09)	.06 (.10)	-.16 [†] (.09)	-.04 (.10)
R ²	.18* (.05)	.04 (.03)	.04 (.03)	.03 (.02)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

* $p < .05$; [†] $p < .10$. $N = 178$.

Table 14

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 4-9 (Study 2)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b(SE)</i>	Initiating <i>b(SE)</i>	Alarming <i>b(SE)</i>	Patrolling <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	2.83	2.76	3.09	3.30
Controls				
Organization	.69* (.15)	.30† (.16)	.15 (.15)	.19 (.16)
Independent Variables				
Promotion Focus	.03 (.09)	-.11 (.10)	-.09 (.09)	-.12 (.10)
Prevention Focus	-.04 (.08)	.08 (.08)	-.08 (.07)	-.05 (.08)
Positive Affect	.04 (.08)	.08 (.09)	.04 (.08)	.09 (.09)
Negative Affect	-.15* (.08)	-.13 (.08)	-.11 (.07)	-.17* (.08)
R ²	.19* (.05)	.06† (.04)	.04 (.03)	.06 (.03)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

**p* < .05; †*p* < .10. *N* = 170.

Table 15

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 10-12 (Study 2)

Variables	Dependent Variable			
	Championing <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Initiating <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Alarming <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Patrolling <i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Intercept	1.69	2.65	2.31	2.57
Controls				
Organization	.77* (.15)	.43* (.15)	.23 (.14)	.41* (.16)
Independent Variables				
Cognitive Complexity	.09 (.13)	.13 (.14)	.20 (.13)	.14 (.14)
LGO	.09 (.11)	-.17 (.12)	-.13 (.11)	-.15 (.12)
PPGO	.02 (.09)	.15 [†] (.09)	-.02 (.08)	.04 (.09)
PAGO	.11 (.08)	-.10 (.09)	.01 (.08)	.04 (.09)
R ²	.18* (.05)	.06 [†] (.04)	.03 (.02)	.04 (.03)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. LGO = Learning Goal Orientation; PPGO = Performance Prove Goal Orientation; PAGO = Performance Avoid Goal Orientation. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

**p* < .05; [†]*p* < .10. *N* = 180.

Table 16

Maximum Likelihood Estimation Results for Hypotheses 13-17 (Study 2)

Variables	Dependent Variable				
	Voice Endorsement <i>b(SE)</i>	Interpersonal Liking <i>b(SE)</i>	Active Listening <i>b(SE)</i>	Promotability <i>b(SE)</i>	Job Performance <i>b(SE)</i>
Intercept	2.94	3.67	3.19	1.56	2.38
Controls					
Organization	-.10 (.10)	.55* (.09)	.58* (.07)	.37* (.11)	.22* (.10)
Independent Variables					
Championing	.11 (.10)	.16 [†] (.09)	.12* (.06)	.43* (.09)	.42* (.09)
Initiating	.27* (.12)	.04 (.11)	.14 [†] (.08)	.32* (.12)	.22* (.11)
Alarming	-.02 (.08)	-.14 [†] (.08)	-.07 (.05)	-.21* (.08)	-.18* (.07)
Patrolling	-.22* (.10)	-.02 (.09)	-.02 (.06)	.04 (.10)	.05 (.09)
R ²	.10* (.05)	.18* (.04)	.37* (.05)	.44* (.05)	.36* (.05)

Note. *SE* = Standard error. Organization is Dummy Coded: 1 = insurance organization and 0 = manufacturing organization. The values reported for R² indicate the variance explained in the dependent variable by the independent variables.

**p* < .05; [†]*p* < .10.

Table 17

Summary of Hypothesized Findings

	Relationship	Study 1	Study 2
H1	Four Types of Constructive Voice	Y	Y
H2a	Personal Initiative and Championing	Y	N
H2b	Personal Initiative and Initiating	Y	N
H2c	Personal Initiative and Alarming	Y	Y
H2d	Personal Initiative and Patrolling	N	N
H3a	Felt Responsibility and Championing	Y	N
H3b	Felt Responsibility and Initiating	Y	N
H3c	Felt Responsibility and Alarming	Y	N
H3d	Felt Responsibility and Patrolling	Y	N
H4a	Promotion Focus and Championing	Y	N
H4b	Promotion Focus and Initiating	Y	N
H5a	Prevention Focus and Alarming	Y	N
H5b	Prevention Focus and Initiating	Y	N
H6a	Positive Affect and Championing	Y	N
H6b	Positive Affect and Initiating	Y	N
H6c	Positive Affect and Alarming	N	N
H6d	Positive Affect and Patrolling	N	N
H7	Positive Affect and Initiating > Positive Affect and Championing	N	N
H8a	Negative Affect and Championing	N	Y
H8b	Negative Affect and Initiating	N	N
H8c	Negative Affect and Alarming	N	N
H8d	Negative Affect and Patrolling	N	N
H9	Negative Affect and Patrolling > Negative Affect and Alarming	N	N
H10a	Cognitive Complexity and Championing	Y	N
H10b	Cognitive Complexity and Initiating	N	N
H10c	Cognitive Complexity and Alarming	N	N
H10d	Cognitive Complexity and Patrolling	Y	N
H11a	Learning Goal Orientation and Initiating	Y	N
H11b	Learning Goal Orientation and Patrolling	N	N

H12a	Performance Prove Goal Orientation and Championing	Y	N
H12b	Performance Avoid Goal Orientation and Alarming	N	N
H13a	Voice Endorsement and Championing	Y	N
H13b	Voice Endorsement and Initiating	N	N
H13c	Voice Endorsement and Alarming	N	N
H13d	Voice Endorsement and Patrolling	N	Y
H14a	Interpersonal Liking and Championing	Y	Y
H14b	Interpersonal Liking and Initiating	Y	N
H14c	Interpersonal Liking and Alarming	Y	Y
H14d	Interpersonal Liking and Patrolling	N	N
H15a	Active Listening and Championing	Y	Y
H15b	Active Listening and Initiating	Y	Y
H15c	Active Listening and Alarming	N	N
H15d	Active Listening and Patrolling	Y	N
H16a	Promotability and Championing	N	Y
H16b	Promotability and Initiating	Y	Y
H16c	Promotability and Alarming	N	Y
H16d	Promotability and Patrolling	N	N
H17a	Job Performance and Championing	N	Y
H17b	Job Performance and Initiating	Y	Y
H17c	Job Performance and Alarming	N	Y
H17d	Job Performance and Patrolling	N	N

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL



APPROVAL: EXPEDITED REVIEW

Jeffery LePine
 Management
 480/965-8652
 Jeff.LePine@asu.edu

Dear Jeffery LePine:

On 6/28/2017 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Voice Scope
Investigator:	Jeffery LePine
IRB ID:	STUDY00006422
Category of review:	(7)(b) Social science methods, (7)(a) Behavioral research
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field Sample Measures.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • MTurk Measures.pdf, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Consent Field Sample.pdf, Category: Consent Form; • Recruitment Script Field Sample.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Recruitment Script MTurk.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Voice Scope Protocol.docx, Category: IRB Protocol; • Clean Consent MTurk.pdf, Category: Consent Form;

The IRB approved the protocol from 6/28/2017 to 6/27/2018 inclusive. Three weeks before 6/27/2018 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 6/27/2018 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the "Documents" tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Daniel Newton
Jeffery LePine
Daniel Newton

APPENDIX B

SCALE DEVELOPMENT STUDY SURVEY ITEMS

Newton, D.W. (2017). Items under development.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Championing

Advocates the change of a specific work method.	1	2	3	4	5
Frequently promotes an innovative solution that could benefit the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
Keeps talking about a new way of doing things even though others may disagree.	1	2	3	4	5
Makes recommendations about a workplace improvement over and over again.	1	2	3	4	5
Proactively suggests pursuing a specific opportunity to improve the company.	1	2	3	4	5
Promotes a specific idea that could help the organization be more productive.	1	2	3	4	5
Voices the same repeated idea that could enhance performance.	1	2	3	4	5

Initiating

Speaks up with many new approaches to execute tasks.	1	2	3	4	5
Discusses ideas for a lot of new projects.	1	2	3	4	5
Generates a seemingly limitless number of solutions to be more productive.	1	2	3	4	5
Communicates a large number of work-related ideas that enhance effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5
Proposes a variety of ideas for more effective work methods.	1	2	3	4	5
Raises an array of suggestions to improve work procedures or processes.	1	2	3	4	5
Suggests many different ideas for new projects.	1	2	3	4	5

Alarming

Persists in telling others about an alarming workplace practice.	1	2	3	4	5
Raises the same worry about how things are done around here.	1	2	3	4	5
Repeatedly expresses concern about a specific practice that could harm the company.	1	2	3	4	5
Reports about a specific workplace coordination problem to management.	1	2	3	4	5
Seems to always be talking about the same issue that affects efficiency at work.	1	2	3	4	5

Speaks up like a “broken record” about a particular organizational challenge.	1	2	3	4	5
Vocalizes against a problematic work factor to be avoided.	1	2	3	4	5

Patrolling

Advises against all of the undesirable behaviors he/she sees at work.	1	2	3	4	5
Communicates the many issues that exist throughout the workplace.	1	2	3	4	5
Reports on a variety of faulty work procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
Expresses concern about all sorts of practices that could hurt the company.	1	2	3	4	5
Gives recommendations about how to fix many work-related problems.	1	2	3	4	5
Mentions all the wrongs the organization could make right.	1	2	3	4	5
Points out workplace challenges everywhere they arise.	1	2	3	4	5

Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(2), 139-161.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Personal Initiative

I actively attack problems.	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever something goes wrong, I search for a solution immediately.	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever there is a chance to get actively involved, I take it.	1	2	3	4	5
I take initiative immediately even when others don't.	1	2	3	4	5
I use opportunities quickly in order to attain my goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Usually I do more than I am asked to do.	1	2	3	4	5
I am particularly good at realizing ideas.	1	2	3	4	5

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.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Felt Obligation for Constructive Change

I owe it to the organization to do whatever I can to come up with ideas/solutions to achieve its goal.	1	2	3	4	5
I have an obligation to the organization to voice out my own opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel a personal obligation to produce constructive suggestions to help the organization achieve its goals.	1	2	3	4	5
I owe it to the organization to do what I can to come up with brilliant ideas, to ensure that our customers are well served and satisfied.	1	2	3	4	5
I would feel an obligation to take time from my personal schedule to generate ideas/solutions for the organization if it is needed.	1	2	3	4	5

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 854-864.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Promotion Focus

I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about how I will achieve work success.	1	2	3	4	5
My major goal at work right now is to achieve my ambitions.	1	2	3	4	5
I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my "ideal self"-- to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.	1	2	3	4	5
In general, I am focused on achieving positive outcomes in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
I often imagine myself experiencing good things that I hope will happen to me.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure.	1	2	3	4	5

Prevention Focus

In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
I am anxious that I will fall short of my responsibilities and obligations.	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future.	1	2	3	4	5

I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my work goals.	1	2	3	4	5
I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me.	1	2	3	4	5
I frequently think about how I can prevent failures in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
I am more oriented toward preventing losses than I am toward achieving gains.	1	2	3	4	5
My major goal at work right now is to avoid becoming a failure.	1	2	3	4	5
I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to become the self I “ought” to be--to fulfill my duties, responsibilities, and obligations.	1	2	3	4	5

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form. Unpublished manuscript, University of Iowa.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at All	A Little	Somewhat	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal

Positive Affect

Inspired	1	2	3	4	5
Alert	1	2	3	4	5
Excited	1	2	3	4	5
Enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
Determined	1	2	3	4	5
Active	1	2	3	4	5
Attentive	1	2	3	4	5
Interested	1	2	3	4	5
Proud	1	2	3	4	5
Strong	1	2	3	4	5

Negative Affect

Afraid	1	2	3	4	5
Scared	1	2	3	4	5
Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
Jittery	1	2	3	4	5
Irritable	1	2	3	4	5
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5
Guilty	1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5
Upset	1	2	3	4	5
Distressed	1	2	3	4	5

Spengler, P. M. & Strohmer, D. C. (1994). Stability of a 4 x 6 repertory grid for measuring cognitive complexity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 7(2), 137-145.

						1. Mother
						2. Friend of opposite gender
						3. Person with whom you feel most uncomfortable
						4. Supervisor
Outgoing	Adjusted	Decisive	Calm	Interested in others	Cheerful	
Shy	Maladjusted	Indecisive	Excitable	Self-absorbed	Ill humored	

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Feinstein, J. A., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 197-253.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Cognitive Complexity

I would prefer complex to simple problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to think about small and daily projects to complicated and long-term ones.	1	2	3	4	5
I really enjoy a task that involves coming with solutions to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.	1	2	3	4	5
The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.	1	2	3	4	5

VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 995-1015.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Learning Goal Orientation

I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.	1	2	3	4	5
I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills.	1	2	3	4	5
For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.	1	2	3	4	5

Performance-Prove Goal Orientation

I'm concerned with showing that I can perform better than my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5
I try to figure out what it takes to prove my ability to others at work.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy it when others at work are aware of how well I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to work on projects where I can prove my abilities to others.	1	2	3	4	5

Performance-Avoid Goal Orientation

I would avoid taking on a new task if there was a chance that I would appear rather incompetent to others.	1	2	3	4	5
Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill.	1	2	3	4	5
I'm concerned about taking on a task at work if my performance would reveal that I had low ability.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to avoid situations at work where I might perform poorly.	1	2	3	4	5

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.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Promotive Voice

Proactively develop and make suggestions for issues that may influence the work unit.	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

Proactively suggest new projects which are beneficial to the work unit.	1	2	3	4	5
Raise suggestions to improve the unit's working procedure.	1	2	3	4	5
Proactively voice out constructive suggestions that help the unit reach its goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Make constructive suggestions to improve the unit's operations.	1	2	3	4	5

Prohibitive Voice

Advise other colleagues against undesirable behaviors that would hamper job performance.	1	2	3	4	5
Speak up honestly with problems that might cause serious loss to the work unit, even when/though dissenting opinions exist.	1	2	3	4	5
Dare to voice out opinions on things that might affect efficiency in the work unit, even if that would embarrass others.	1	2	3	4	5
Dare to point out problems when they appear in the unit, even if that would hamper relationships with other colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
Proactively report coordination problems in the workplace to management.	1	2	3	4	5

Voice Concentration

I repeat suggestions about a small set of issues.	1	2	3	4	5
I make recommendations related to the same few topics.	1	2	3	4	5
I share ideas regarding a very limited number of subjects.	1	2	3	4	5

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interaction: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487-499.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Interpersonal Liking

Others like me as a coworker.	1	2	3	4	5
Others get along well with me.	1	2	3	4	5
I am a pleasure to work with.	1	2	3	4	5
Others think I would make a good friend.	1	2	3	4	5

Drollinger, T., Comer, L. B., & Warrington, P. T. (2006). Development and validation of the active empathetic listening scale. *Psychology & Marketing*, 23(2), 161-180.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Active Listening

Others assure me that they are listening by using verbal acknowledgements.	1	2	3	4	5
Others assure me that they are receptive to my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
Others ask questions that show they understand my positions.	1	2	3	4	5
Others show me that they are listening by their body language (e.g., head nods).	1	2	3	4	5

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Voice Endorsement

Others take my comments to my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
Others support my comments when talking with my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
Others think my comments should be implemented.	1	2	3	4	5
Others agree with my comments.	1	2	3	4	5
My comments are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5

Thacker, R. A., & Wayne, S. J. (1995). An examination of the relationship between upward influence tactics and assessments of promotability. *Journal of Management*, 21(4), 739-756.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Promotability

I believe that I will have a successful career.	1	2	3	4	5
If I had to select a successor for my position, it would be someone like me.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that I have high potential.	1	2	3	4	5

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 123-150.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Job Performance

All things considered, I am outstanding at my job.	1	2	3	4	5
I am one of the best at what I do.	1	2	3	4	5
I am very good at my daily job activities.	1	2	3	4	5
In general, I am a good performer.	1	2	3	4	5

Demographics

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your highest level of education?
 - a. High School
 - b. Some College
 - c. College Graduate
 - d. Graduate Degree
4. What race or ethnicity do you consider yourself to be?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Asian
 - c. Indian (Indian subcontinent)
 - d. Black/African American
 - e. Native American or Alaskan Native
 - f. Hispanic or Latino
 - g. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - h. Some other race/ethnicity
5. How long have you been in your current role?
6. How long have you been with your current organization?
7. How many years of work experience do you have?

APPENDIX C
FIELD STUDY SURVEY ITEMS

Wave 1 Surveys (Subordinates)

Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(2), 139-161.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Personal Initiative

I actively attack problems.	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever something goes wrong, I search for a solution immediately.	1	2	3	4	5
Whenever there is a chance to get actively involved, I take it.	1	2	3	4	5
I take initiative immediately even when others don't.	1	2	3	4	5
I use opportunities quickly in order to attain my goals.	1	2	3	4	5
Usually I do more than I am asked to do.	1	2	3	4	5
I am particularly good at realizing ideas.	1	2	3	4	5

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.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Felt Obligation for Constructive Change

I owe it to the organization to do whatever I can to come up with ideas/solutions to achieve its goal.	1	2	3	4	5
I have an obligation to the organization to voice out my own opinions.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel a personal obligation to produce constructive suggestions to help the organization achieve its goals.	1	2	3	4	5
I owe it to the organization to do what I can to come up with brilliant ideas, to ensure that our customers are well served and satisfied.	1	2	3	4	5
I would feel an obligation to take time from my personal schedule to generate ideas/solutions for the organization if it is needed.	1	2	3	4	5

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 854-864.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Promotion Focus

I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about the person I would ideally like to be in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
I typically focus on the success I hope to achieve in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
My major goal at work right now is to achieve my ambitions.	1	2	3	4	5
Overall, I am more oriented toward achieving success than preventing failure.	1	2	3	4	5

Prevention Focus

In general, I am focused on preventing negative events in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about the person I am afraid I might become in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
I often worry that I will fail to accomplish my work goals.	1	2	3	4	5
I often imagine myself experiencing bad things that I fear might happen to me.	1	2	3	4	5
My major goal at work right now is to avoid becoming a failure.	1	2	3	4	5

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form. Unpublished manuscript, University of Iowa.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at All	A Little	Somewhat	Quite a Bit	A Great Deal

Positive Affect

Inspired	1	2	3	4	5
Alert	1	2	3	4	5
Excited	1	2	3	4	5
Enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5
Determined	1	2	3	4	5
Active	1	2	3	4	5
Attentive	1	2	3	4	5
Interested	1	2	3	4	5

Proud	1	2	3	4	5
Strong	1	2	3	4	5

Negative Affect

Afraid	1	2	3	4	5
Scared	1	2	3	4	5
Nervous	1	2	3	4	5
Jittery	1	2	3	4	5
Irritable	1	2	3	4	5
Hostile	1	2	3	4	5
Guilty	1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed	1	2	3	4	5
Upset	1	2	3	4	5
Distressed	1	2	3	4	5

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., Feinstein, J. A., & Jarvis, W. B. G. (1996). Dispositional differences in cognitive motivation: The life and times of individuals varying in need for cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 197-253.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Cognitive Complexity

I would prefer complex to simple problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to think about small and daily projects to complicated and long-term ones.	1	2	3	4	5
I really enjoy a task that involves coming with solutions to problems.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve.	1	2	3	4	5
The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.	1	2	3	4	5

VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 995-1015.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Learning Goal Orientation

I am willing to select a challenging work assignment that I can learn a lot from.	1	2	3	4	5
I often look for opportunities to develop new skills and knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy challenging and difficult tasks at work where I'll learn new skills.	1	2	3	4	5
For me, development of my work ability is important enough to take risks.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to work in situations that require a high level of ability and talent.	1	2	3	4	5

Performance-Prove Goal Orientation

I'm concerned with showing that I can perform better than my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5
I try to figure out what it takes to prove my ability to others at work.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy it when others at work are aware of how well I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to work on projects where I can prove my abilities to others.	1	2	3	4	5

Performance-Avoid Goal Orientation

I would avoid taking on a new task if there was a chance that I would appear rather incompetent to others.	1	2	3	4	5
Avoiding a show of low ability is more important to me than learning a new skill.	1	2	3	4	5
I'm concerned about taking on a task at work if my performance would reveal that I had low ability.	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to avoid situations at work where I might perform poorly.	1	2	3	4	5

Newton, D.W. (2017). Items under development.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Championing

I repeatedly suggest one innovative workplace practice.	1	2	3	4	5
I regularly speak up with the same procedural recommendation to enhance the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
I routinely promote one new work method that could benefit the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
I often suggest pursuing a specific project to improve the company.	1	2	3	4	5

Initiating

I propose a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods.	1	2	3	4	5
I raise an array of original suggestions to improve future work procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
I suggest a wide variety of unrelated ideas for upcoming work projects.	1	2	3	4	5
I speak up with many new approaches to execute work more effectively.	1	2	3	4	5

Alarming

I express concern about one problematic work method over and over again.	1	2	3	4	5
I repeatedly tell others about one worrisome workplace procedure.	1	2	3	4	5
I speak up quite often about one particularly problematic organizational practice.	1	2	3	4	5
I vocally oppose a specific poorly functioning work project time after time.	1	2	3	4	5

Patrolling

I advise against many adverse work methods I have seen at work.	1	2	3	4	5
I alert others to all sorts of hurtful work practices.	1	2	3	4	5
I warn against various problems with organizational procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
I caution others about a wide variety of harmful work projects.	1	2	3	4	5

Demographics

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your highest level of education?
 - a. High School
 - b. Some College
 - c. College Graduate
 - d. Graduate Degree
4. What race or ethnicity do you consider yourself to be?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Asian
 - c. Indian (Indian subcontinent)
 - d. Black/African American
 - e. Native American or Alaskan Native
 - f. Hispanic or Latino
 - g. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - h. Some other race/ethnicity
5. How long have you been in your current role?

6. How long have you been with your current organization?
 7. How many years of work experience do you have?

Wave 2 Surveys (Supervisors)

Newton, D.W. (2017). Items under development.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Championing

Repeatedly suggests one innovative workplace practice.	1	2	3	4	5
Regularly speaks up with the same procedural recommendation to enhance the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
Routinely promotes one new work method that could benefit the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
Often suggests pursuing a specific project to improve the company.	1	2	3	4	5

Initiating

Proposes a variety of innovative ideas for more effective work methods.	1	2	3	4	5
Raises an array of original suggestions to improve future work procedures.	1	2	3	4	5
Suggests a wide variety of unrelated ideas for upcoming work projects.	1	2	3	4	5
Speaks up with many new approaches to execute work more effectively.	1	2	3	4	5

Alarming

Expresses concern about one problematic work method over and over again.	1	2	3	4	5
Repeatedly tells others about one worrisome workplace procedure.	1	2	3	4	5
Speaks up quite often about one particularly problematic organizational practice.	1	2	3	4	5
Vocally opposes a specific poorly functioning work project time after time.	1	2	3	4	5

Patrolling

Advises against many adverse work methods I have seen at work.	1	2	3	4	5
Alerts others to all sorts of hurtful work practices.	1	2	3	4	5
Warns against various problems with organizational procedures.	1	2	3	4	5

Cautions others about a wide variety of harmful work projects. 1 2 3 4 5

Demographics

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your highest level of education?
 - a. High School
 - b. Some College
 - c. College Graduate
 - d. Graduate Degree
4. What race or ethnicity do you consider yourself to be?
 - a. White/Caucasian
 - b. Asian
 - c. Indian (Indian subcontinent)
 - d. Black/African American
 - e. Native American or Alaskan Native
 - f. Hispanic or Latino
 - g. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 - h. Some other race/ethnicity
5. How long have you been in your current role?
6. How long have you been with your current organization?
7. How many years of work experience do you have?

Wave 3 Surveys (Subordinates)

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affect, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interaction: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 487-499.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Interpersonal Liking

[Coworker] is someone I like as a coworker.	1	2	3	4	5
[Coworker] is someone I get along well with.	1	2	3	4	5
[Coworker] is a pleasure to work with.	1	2	3	4	5
[Coworker] is someone I think would make a good friend.	1	2	3	4	5

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

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Voice Endorsement

I take this person's comments to my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
I support this person's comments when talking with my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
I think this person's comments should be implemented.	1	2	3	4	5
I agree with this person's comments.	1	2	3	4	5
This person's comments are valuable.	1	2	3	4	5

Wave 3 Surveys (Supervisors)

Drollinger, T., Comer, L. B., & Warrington, P. T. (2006). Development and validation of the active empathetic listening scale. *Psychology & Marketing, 23*(2), 161-180.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Active Listening

I assure them that I am listening by using verbal acknowledgements.	1	2	3	4	5
I assure them that I am receptive to their ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
I ask questions that show my understanding of their positions.	1	2	3	4	5
I show them that I am listening by my body language (e.g., head nods).	1	2	3	4	5

Thacker, R. A., & Wayne, S. J. (1995). An examination of the relationship between upward influence tactics and assessments of promotability. *Journal of Management, 21*(4), 739-756.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
---------------------------	---------------	--------------	------------	---------------------

Promotability

I believe that this employee will have a successful career.	1	2	3	4	5
If I had to select a successor for my position, it would be this subordinate.	1	2	3	4	5
I believe that this employee has high potential.	1	2	3	4	5

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1991). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salespersons' performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 123-150.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

Job Performance

All things considered, they are outstanding at their job.	1	2	3	4	5
They are one of the best at what they do.	1	2	3	4	5
They are very good at their daily job activities.	1	2	3	4	5
In general, they are a good performer.	1	2	3	4	5