Employee Voice: The Roles of Organizational Identification, Informational Justice and Power Distance

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree Master of Science in Management, at the Universidade Católica Portuguesa, January 2016.

STUDENT: MARC ANTHONY MAKENS

ADVISING PROFESSOR: DAVID PATIENT

ABSTRACT

Title:

Employee Voice: The roles of Organizational Identification, Informational Justice and Power Distance

Author:

Marc Anthony Makens

Abstract – Summary of Objectives and Findings:

Partnering with a non-profit organization located in the United States of America, we investigate the effect of organizational identification and information justice on employee voice intentions. In order to provide depth to our study we will investigate the moderation effect of power distance on these two variables and their relationship to employee voice intentions. Findings indicate that organizational identification and information justice positively relate to employee voice intentions, however we did not find that power distance had a significant moderation effect. We conclude that organizational identification and informational justice are antecedents of employee voice behaviors and discuss limitations of the study.

Em parceria com uma organização sem fins lucrativos localizada nos Estados Unidos da América, investigamos o efeito da identificação organizacional e da qualidade da informação prestada aos colaboradores sobre as opiniões expressadas por esses mesmos colaboradores. A fim de dar profundidade ao nosso estudo, vamos investigar o efeito de moderação da distância ao poder sobre estas duas variáveis e a relação dessas variáveis com opinião expressa pelos colaboradores. Os resultados indicam que a identificação organizacional e a qualidade da informação se relacionam positivamente com a expressão de opinião. No entanto, não encontrámos um efeito de moderação significativo por parte da distância ao poder. Concluímos que a identificação organizacional e a qualidade da informação são antecedentes dos comportamentos do colaborador em relação à expressão da sua opinião e discutimos limitações do estudo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks go to Professor David Patient, Dr. James Makens, and the non-profit organization which allowed the study to be conducted using its employees for the sample group. Professor David Patient has been critical to this study's success. His experience and guidance has given the author tremendous insight to the realm of organizational behavior and provided much needed coaching. Dr. James Makens also provided tremendous coaching and his revising and editing work for the final written document. His efforts were essential in presenting a well written and thorough study. Without the help of the non-profit we partnered with this study would not have been able to take form. The employees within the non-profit provided an excellent survey response rate and we are extremely thankful to them as well.

INTRODUCTION & SIGNIFICANCE

Today's organizational leadership faces more unique challenges than ever. Organizations undergoing significant growth or change are constantly in need of employee input in order to aid managers in the decision making process (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). It is more important now than ever for organizational leadership to understand what factors contribute to employees voluntarily giving input and positive communication behaviors. In particular, voice – the non-required communication of information intended to improve group or organizational functions and is not dependent on authority or hierarchical standing – has been a point of research for more than 60 years (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) and continues to provide insights to organizational leadership. Research has indicated that voice can facilitate management in creating a culture of continuous improvement and promotes change oriented behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). Over the last twenty years significant empirical research has been conducted, in a variety of disciplines, in order to better explain both the key antecedents of voice and outcomes. In particular past research has significantly focused on employee personality and demographics, employee attitudes, and organizational context (Detert & Burris, 2007; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Morrison & Milliken, 2000). In this study we seek to contribute to this volume of knowledge by exploring some of the more nuanced antecedents not previously explored by other researchers.

The importance of voice in an organization can clearly be seen in Morrison & Milliken's (2000) work outlining the effects of organizational silence, the "widespread withholding of information about potential problems or issues by employees" (Morrison & Milliken, 2000, p. 706). Their model outlines less effective organizational decision making, poor error detection and correction, less effective organizational change processes, low internal employee motivation, low employee satisfaction, employee withdrawal, increased turnover, sabotage/deviance, and increased employee stress as resulting factors of organizational silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). In contrast to the negatives of organizational silence, employee voice has been shown to increase managerial performance ratings, decrease turnover, increase employee motivation & satisfaction, better decision making, better problem solving, and facilitate in collective learning (Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). When looking at the stark contrast between the negatives of organizational silence and the

benefits of employee voice, it is clearly imperative for organizational leadership to understand the motivational, contextual, and personality factors behind employee voice.

Researchers have argued that since voice is a form of extra-role behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) it is directly influenced by employee attitude and organizational context. In the effort of furthering these two antecedent understandings we will focus on the specific impact of organizational identification, informational justice, and power distance on voice. Past research (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008) has shown there to be a relationship between organizational identification – "the extent to which employees feel oneness or belongingness with their organization and include attributes of the organization in their self-definition" (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008, p. 1190) - and voice in a moderation context, however there is a general lack of empirical work investigating the relationship between organizational identification and voice. Significant work has been done to study the relationship of procedural justice and voice (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010) however have not considered the relationship of informational justice – "explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion" (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001, p. 427) – and voice. Further, some researchers have focused on voice "up the hierarchy" (Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013; Detert & Burris, 2007; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Morrison & Milliken, 2000) yet have not focused on the employee perspective of power distance – "extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede & Hofstede) – within the hierarchy from the employee's perspective.

In order to further research in regards to these three variables we will investigate the effect of organizational identification and information justice on voice intentions. In order to provide depth to our study we will investigate the moderation effect of power distance on these two variables. By using organizational identification and informational justice, measured with the moderating effects of power distance, we hope to further explore the nuanced contextual and attitude relationships effecting employee voice intentions. This will provide implications for management in organizations regarding decisions of how to improve employee voice and create cultures of continuous learning.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND & HYPOTHESIS

Voice

Voice, as defined in this study, is the non-required communication of information intended to improve group or organizational functions and is not dependent on authority or hierarchical standing. Other authors have defined voice with greater detail or less detail, however all definitions contain a few central elements: 1. Voice is an extra-role behavior. 2. Voice is constructive in nature. 3. Voice is not meant to foster relationships as it is challenging in nature (Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Maas & Bos, 2011).

In addition to defining what voice is, some researchers have gone further by defining what voice is not. LePine & Van Dyne (1998) define the following as behaviors which do not constitute voice: 1. Principled organized dissent based on conscientious or moral principles. 2. Complaining (non-challenging and/or non-constructive criticism) and availability of complaint channels (availability/perceived access to grievance procedures). 3. Suggestions made by change agents or consultants (internal or external to the organization) as part of their job requirements. In order to provide continuity with past research we do not challenge these statements, and recognize them as important elements which must be considered when assessing voice in an organization. We believe our definition to incorporate all mentioned aspects by other authors and will provide continuity between past research and our study.

In conducting this study we must also recognize the work Morrison & Milliken (2000) performed in regards to organizational silence. Organizational silence is, “a paradox in which most employees know the truth about certain issues and problems within the organization yet dare not speak that truth to their supervisors” (Morrison & Milliken, 2000, p. 706). The work Morrison & Milliken (2000) conducted provides us with a model for predicted effects of organizational silence. They also note “the forces that motivate a sole individual to speak up may be quite different from the forces that compel all of the rest to remain silent” (Morrison & Milliken, 2000, p. 708). Given this, we feel it is not the purpose of this study to investigate why employees remain silent, but rather what some of the motivating and contextual factors may be for employees to speak up. However, it is worth noting that organizational leadership should consider both sides (organizational silence and

voice), how they impact an organization, and their predictors when encouraging employees to speak up, creating a culture of change, or when problem solving.

Past research regarding voice has focused on many different aspects of voice. LePine & Van Dyne (1998) focused their studies on voice antecedents in work groups. This study investigated "person centered (satisfaction with group, global self-esteem) and situational factors (group size, self-managed vs. traditional style of management)" (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998, p. 853) in their research and the effects of each variable on voice. When thinking conceptually about this work we focus on the antecedent of self-managed vs. traditional style of management work groups; in their study LePine & Van Dyne (1998) link the antecedent with increased levels of employee voice (moderated by global self-esteem and high satisfaction with their group). It is useful to conceptualize this variable in another way, as power distance (Hofstede & Hofstede); a self-managed group would indicate lower importance of hierarchy and thus rate lower in power distance. In this way we can form the idea that power distance may be a variable to consider when assessing voice predictors.

Other studies of voice antecedents have built off of LePine & Van Dyne's (1998) work, studying the effects of group inclusion on voice. Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos (2004) showed that individuals are more likely to participate in voice behaviors when included in groups, and when employees identify more strongly with the group, however research has not investigated the relationship between the organization as a whole and voice. Researchers have explored relationships linking influencing factors of organizational identification, but have not directly linked the relationship between organizational identification and voice (Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Maas & Bos, 2011; Adelman, 2012; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009).

Uncertainty and procedural justice have been linked to voice, showing that when uncertainty is high and procedural justice is low employees are less likely to participate in voice behaviors (Maas & Bos, 2011; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012). Informational justice is an area of organizational justice which we believe has been overlooked by past researchers as a predictor of voice. Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen (2010) showed that procedural justice linked to voice and individuals accepting carbon dioxide capture and storage technology policy implementation and its role in dispute resolution when using symbolic voice representors. However, didn't investigate the level of informational justice individuals

had received regarding the carbon dioxide capture and storage technology policy and its effects on voice (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010).

Outcomes of voice are an often studied area, Burris, Detert, & Romney (2013), highlighted many of the outcomes of employee voice as well as the empirical disagreement surrounding those outcomes. Their work attempts to give organizational leadership insight into two specific outcomes of voice: managerial performance ratings and involuntary turnover. They also state that "when employees feel heard, they may experience positive 'expressive' or attitudinal outcomes such as an enhanced sense of justice, motivation, or satisfaction" (Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013, p. 22). Given the employee attitudinal outcomes, one can expect an increase in employee voice to be positively related to increased operational effectiveness of the organization.

Past studies have measured voice from the perspective of the employee (voice intentions) (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), peer perspective of employee voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), and in observational group voice experiments (Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012; Maas & Bos, 2011). The types of studies used have various pros and cons regarding thoroughness, sample size, sample diversity, cost, complexity of analysis and available resources. Voice intentions would indicate motivation to display voice behaviors (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), and thus can be assumed to influence the amount of voice behaviors employees engage in. In our study we measure employee voice intentions rather than displayed voice behaviors.

Organizational Identification

It is impossible to talk about voice without mentioning the work Ashforth & Mael (1989; 1992) conducted. Organizational identification is social identity theory – "the antecedents and consequences of social identification" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 20) – applied to an organization. Rather than investigating how individuals identify with certain identity builders such as gender, age or religious affiliation, organizational identification studies how individuals intertwine organizational membership, organization successes (and failures) into their persona (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Ashforth & Mael, 1992; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008).

Organizational identification has been related to voice as a moderating variable in past studies (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008) and employee loyalty (a measure of organizational identification) has been linked with, "more loyal employees may prefer and use less formal methods to voice discontent" (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002, p. 1167), i.e. organizational identification is linked to employees using voice behaviors rather than filing formal complaints. Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar's (2011) study of voice in groups highlighted the relationship between voice and work group identification, however didn't study the impact of organizational identification on voice. Given the relative lack of research between the direct relationship of organizational identification and voice, we believe studying this relationship will provide new insights to organizational leadership and managing employee voice.

Research has shown that voice is significantly influenced by an employee's feeling of self-worth and security (Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Maas & Bos, 2011; Adelman, 2012; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). Because organizational identification is closely tied with the employee's feeling of self-worth and security (equating organization failures and successes with personal failures and successes) it can be reasoned that employees who identify with the organization have a compelling reason to speak up and assist in organizational success. Organizational identification has been positively linked with organizational commitment, satisfaction, loyalty, and job involvement (Jones & Volpe, 2010) given this impact of organizational identification; we can also assume that it will positively impact the extra-role behavior of voice. While we can draw these speculative conclusions, it is necessary directly assess the relationship between organizational identification and voice.

To summarize, past research of organizational identification has lead researchers to study organizational identification's impact on voice when it relates to small work groups (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). Organizational identification has been used as a moderating variable in past research, but not an independent variable (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Researchers have studied influencing factors of organizational identification and their relation to voice on an organization wide basis (Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Maas & Bos, 2011; Adelman, 2012; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) and have shown organizational identification has been shown to increase employee extra-role behavior. It is for these reasons why we chose to study the effect organizational identification (vs. small group identification)

on an employee's levels of voice as an independent variable; we believe organizational identification to be an important antecedent to voice and a relationship which has potential to be more fully explored. We expect there to be a significant relationship between our dependent variable (voice) and our dependent variable (organizational identification).

H1: The strength of employee's organizational identification will be positively related to the employee's voice intentions

Informational Justice

Informational justice – "explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion" (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001, p. 427) – was identified as the fourth main element to organizational justice in in Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng's (2001) work. The article provided empirical evidence supporting informational justice as its own distinct element of organizational justice; previous researchers (Bies & Moag, 1986) had clumped informational justice with interpersonal justice under the name "interactional justice". The four part model proposed by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng (2001) has become widely accepted within the research community, it has been further studied and validated by other researchers (Hess & Ambrose, 2010; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Given the validation this model has received, as well as the logical separation from interpersonal justice – "the degree to which people are treated with politeness, dignity, and respect by authorities or third parties involved in executing procedures or determining outcomes" (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001, p. 427) – we feel it is the correct model for use in our study.

Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng (2001) first established informational justice as its own distinct element of organizational justice; they also established there were significant correlations between procedural justice and both informational justice and interpersonal justice. Later researchers investigated other, more nuanced, aspects of the relationship between procedural justice and interpersonal justice. Interpersonal justice has been shown to impact employee voice as an element of psychological safety (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) and is an important antecedent to employees displaying voice behaviors. Procedural justice has been shown to affect interpersonal justice, that when interest groups or individuals were presented with an opportunity to utilize voice they perceived authority to be

more trustworthy (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010). Given the extent to which previous research has explored the relationship between interpersonal justice and voice, we will not study this relationship.

Previous research on informational justice has not involved its relationship with voice in organizations. Researchers have often focused on the relationship between aspects of procedural justice (voice, openness of reconstruction of organizational policies and procedures, recourse) and aspects of interpersonal justice (politeness, dignity, respect, safety); however we find it curious that the influence of informational justice on voice has not been well explored by other researchers (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010; Cobb, Folger, & Wooten, 1995; Bies R. J., 2001; Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012) (Bies R. J., 2010). After assessing relative lack of research between the relationship of informational justice and voice, we believe studying this relationship will provide significant knowledge to organizational decision makers managing employee voice.

During our investigation we found that Hess & Ambrose (2010) studied the effect of Colquitt, Et All, (2001) four factor model on customer complaint handling and showed it to be a superior fit. After establishing this model as being superior, they showed that informational justice "influences global or organizational centered outcomes such as repurchase intentions, trust with the organization, and negative word of mouth" (Hess & Ambrose, 2010, p. 9). When considering this element conceptually (in regards to employees in an organization) we can theorize that informational justice influences an employee's trust in the organization (and consequentially the supervisor), trust in the organization has been shown to influence employee voice (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010; Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000; Adelman, 2012), so informational justice influences voice. Although we can theorize as to the impact of informational justice on employee voice, it is necessary to conduct research into the direct relationship between informational justice and voice.

In summary, past research of organizational justice has led to the currently used four dimensional model (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001). Given the amount of validation this four dimensional model has received by other researchers we will utilize it rather than other previously proposed models. Informational justice and interpersonal justice were both identified by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng (2001) to have strong colorations with procedural fairness, however the majority of research has focused on the

relationship between interpersonal justice and procedural justice (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001; Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010; Cobb, Folger, & Wooten, 1995; Bies R. J., 2001; Prooijen, Wilke, & Bos, 2004; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012; Bies R. J., 2010). Hess & Ambrose (2010) further identified informational justice as an influencing factor of trust with an organization, which we can in turn theorize leads to increased voice. Given the lack of research present regarding the relationship of informational justice and voice, as well as the results drawn by Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng (2001) and by Hess & Ambrose (2010), we believe that the relationship between informational justice and voice is one in need of further exploration. We expect there to be a significant relationship between our dependent variable (voice) and independent variable (informational justice).

H2: The strength of informational justice will be positively related to the employee's voice intentions

Power Distance

Power distance is one of the original four (now six) cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede in his original study of IBM (Hofstede & Hofstede). Power distance is defined as the "extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede & Hofstede). It is central in analyzing inequality within a culture and is unique in the fact that it defines the inequality from the perspective of those below rather than above (Hofstede & Hofstede). In his original work, Hofstede, analyzed IBM employees in countries around the world analyzing the cultural differences seen country to country. Originally Hofstede analyzed four dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity; however later research has included long-term orientation and indulgence vs. restraint as additional dimensions (Hofstede & Hofstede). Hofstede's work has been widely accepted by the research community and forms the basis for which we analyze power distance within the organization.

Because power distance is being analyzed as a moderating variable in this study, it is necessary to understand how power distance interacts with each of our independent variables and our dependent variable. Elements of power distance have been researched in various capacities, Adelman (2012) demonstrated that executive approachability (aka: low power

distance) plays an important role in employee voice. “Approachability revolved strongly around regular face-to-face communication with the CEO; however, in this case, the CEO also placed emphasis on employees feeling welcome to come to administration and to approach any of the senior leaders at any time” (Adelman, 2012, p. 138). Detert & Burris (2007) also demonstrated that power distance plays a role in voice when their study concluded managerial openness was consistently related to voice. Psychological safety has been shown to influence employee voice as a mediating variable in Detert & Burris’s (2007) study of leadership behavior and employee voice. Walumbwa & Schaubroeck (2009) again found psychological safety to play a mediating role in voice in their study. Employee psychological safety is influenced by a number of factors, however relevant material to this study we found that executive visibility was linked employee psychological security, the more executives were visible to employees the more voice behaviors were demonstrated (Adelman, 2012). When analyzing each of these studies it becomes clear that psychological safety and executive openness/approachability is a result of low employee power distance perceptions, i.e. that it is safe for employees to speak up when hierarchy is not as important.

The relationship between organizational identification and power distance was inadvertently researched when Olson-Buchanan & Boswell (2002) studied employee loyalty (element of organizational identification) and its effect on employee’s formality in voicing discontent. The authors argued that “more loyal employees may prefer to use less formal methods to voice discontent” (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002, p. 1167). Viewed another way, employees who more strongly identify with the organization prefer less hierarchal ways of expressing voice discontent and employees who less strongly identify with the organization prefer more hierarchal ways of expressing voice discontent. Given the relationship between voice and hierarchy in the context of discontent (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002) we can then infer that this relationship will apply to employees providing constructive voice (or voice as defined in this study) to the organization. Power distance would then create a moderation effect on the relationship between organizational identification and voice, i.e. the assumed positive relationship between organizational identification and voice will be decreased in effect when power distance is high and increased in effect when power distance is low. This inferred relationship builds our foundation for studying the moderation effect of power distance on organizational identification and voice.

The relationship between procedural justice and power distance was studied in Lee, Pillutla, & Law’s (2000) study of Hong Kong employees. They found that “the relationship

between procedural justice and trust in supervisor was higher for those with low power-distance orientations" (Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000, p. 685). Linking power distance to informational justice requires additional examination of Hess & Ambrose's (2010) study. They found that informational justice "influences global or organizational centered outcomes such as repurchase intentions, trust in the organization, and negative word of mouth" (Hess & Ambrose, 2010, p. 9). Although these two ideas at first seem disconnected, upon further examination we can conclude the following: 1. Informational justice influences trust in supervisor. 2. Trust in the supervisor in turn influences voice (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010; Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000). 3. Power distance moderates the relationship between voice and trust in supervisor (Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000). 4. We can then infer that the relationship between informational justice and voice is moderated by power distance. In the course of this study we base the previously stated inferred relationship as our basis for studying the moderating effect of power distance on informational justice and voice.

Summarizing this section requires acknowledgement of the work Hofstede did when researching cultural variables in his original and subsequent studies, they have given us the tools to analyze the moderating effects of power distance on our independent variables (organizational identification and informational justice) and their relationship with our dependent variable (voice) (Hofstede & Hofstede). Power distance has been shown to influence voice when viewed in the context of organizational leadership openness/approachability and psychological safety (Adelman, 2012; Burris, Detert, & Romney, 2013; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009). Research has shown power distance to impact the way employees voice discontent within the organization, which it is a deciding factor in the way employees chose to voice discontent (Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2002). Drawing from that research we infer that assumed positive relationship between organizational identification and voice will be moderated by power distance. Informational justice influences trust in the supervisor, trust in the supervisor in turn influences voice (Terwel, Harinck, Ellemers, & Daamen, 2010; Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000). However, trust in the supervisor and voice is moderated by power distance (Lee, Pillutla, & Law, 2000), thus we infer that power distance has a moderating effect on the relationship between informational justice and voice. Using these inferred relationships forms the basis of our study of power distance as a moderating variable for our two independent variables (organizational identification and informational justice) and our dependent variable (voice).

H3: Power distance moderates the relationship between organizational identification and voice. Specifically, organizational identification will be more related to employee's voice intentions when power distance is low than when power distance is high.

H4: Power distance moderates the relationship between informational justice and voice. Specifically, informational justice will be more related to employee's voice intentions when power distance is low than when power distance is high.

METHODOLOGY

Sample & Procedure

To conduct this research we partnered with a non-profit organization operating in the United States. This organization has many business units operating within different departments and programs, sometimes with multiple departments operating out of one business unit and sometimes with one department per business unit. Previous work with the non-profit allowed us insight to the organizational leadership, current internal and external challenges facing the organization, and access to employees for our study sample. The organization is undergoing significant change and growth; this when combined with widely varying employee voice behaviors has led to a cultural divide. During our previous work with the non-profit it was observed that some employees identify with the organization while many others identify departmentally (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). In addition to this cultural division, managers and employees within the organization were observed to have widely differing views on the importance of hierarchy (i.e. Power Distance, (Hofstede & Hofstede)). As with any organization undergoing significant growth and change, informational justice (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005) takes many forms and in this organization has been observed to be present in widely varying degrees. Given these observed, but not empirically studied variables we found the non-profit to provide a perfect setting in which we could study our moderating, independent, and dependent variables. The non-profit provides an observed tapestry of employees who presumably have varying attitudes about organizational identification, different perspectives of power distance, have received varying levels of informational justice, and display different voice intentions. By investigating employee attitudes and organizational context in this non-profit, which is

undergoing significant change and growth, we have a rich environment to study employee voice and how it is affected by our variables.

The hypothesized relationships in this study are not limited by any type of employee, job, race or age; thus we administered an electronic self-report questionnaire to all employees in the non-profit. To ensure confidentiality we did not request any self-identifying information such as name, business unit, department, employee identification number, or contact information. Employees were given a cover letter explaining the general purpose of the study, stating that the questionnaire was completely confidential, individual responses were not used to identify employees or shared with the non-profit administration and only aggregated data would be used, that participation in the study is completely voluntary and thanking employees for their participation. Control variables included: employee tenure, supervisor/manager position (yes or no response), gender, employee role (general descriptors, e.g. client facing role, support role, upper management), age, employment status, education level, and ethnicity.

The questionnaire was distributed to all 360 employees within the non-profit. A total of 155 responses were received to the questionnaire; of those, 152 were usable (3 responses incomplete), translating to a usable response rate of 42%. In a number of regards the sample was well balanced in regards to representing the U.S. adult full-time workforce population, other measures the sample could have been more representative. Impact of sample demographics are discussed in Limitations. The following describes demographic breakdown seen in our study:

- Employment Status: 94% full-time, 6% part-time
- Role: 70% client facing, 15% support, 14% upper management
- Supervisor/Manager: 26% yes, 74% no
- Age: mean = 39 years, standard deviation = 11.23 years, minimum = 21 years, maximum 67 years
- Ethnicity: 1% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 1% Asian or Asian American, 23% Black or African American, 0% Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 5% Hispanic or Latino, 71% Non-Hispanic White.
- Education Level: 0% some high school, 2% high school degree or GED, 13% some college, 51% college graduate (bachelor degree), 34% graduate degree and/or professional licensure

- Gender: 14% Male, 86% Female
- Tenure: mean = 3.3 years, standard deviation = 3.85 years, minimum = 0 years, maximum = 24 years

Measures

Voice: We used a modification of LePine & Van Dyne's (1998) voice scale. Items were measured on a five point Likert-scale format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were adapted to measure voice intentions from the employee's perspective (1 = low voice intentions, 5 = high voice intentions). The scale included the following six items:

- "I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect my work group"
- "I speak up and encourage others in my group to get involved in issues that affect the group"
- "I communicate my opinion about work issues to others in my group even if my opinion is different and others in the group disagree with me"
- "I keep well informed about issues where my opinion might be useful to my group"
- "I get involved in issues that affect the quality of work life in my group"
- "I speak up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures"

Organizational Identification: We used a modification of Mael & Ashforth's (1992) organizational identification scale. Items were measured on a five point Likert-scale format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were adapted to measure organizational identification with the non-profit, not individual departments or business units (1 = low organizational identification, 5 = high organizational identification). The scale included the following six items:

- "When somebody criticizes (name of non-profit) it feels like a personal insult"
- "I am very interested in what others think about (name of non-profit)"
- "When I talk about (name of non-profit) I say 'we' rather than 'they'"
- "(Name of non-profit)'s successes are my successes,"
- "When somebody praises (name of non-profit) it feels like a personal compliment,"

- "If a story in the media criticized (name of non-profit), I would feel embarrassed"

Informational Justice: We used a modification of Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng's (2001) informational justice scale. Items were measured on a five point Likert-scale format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were adapted to be measured using agreement statements in keeping with form of other scales used in this study (1 = low informational justice, 5 = high informational justice). The scale included the following five items:

- "My supervisor has been candid (truthful, straightforward, frank) when communicating with me"
- "My supervisor explains decision-making procedures thoroughly"
- "My supervisors explanations regarding procedures were reasonable"
- "My supervisor has communicated details in a timely manner"
- "My supervisor has tailored communications to meet my individual needs"

Power Distance: We used a modification of Lee, Pillutla and Law's (2000) adaptation of Hofstede's power distance scale (reverse coded). Items were measured on a five point Likert-scale format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and were adapted to an organizational context in the case of some statements (1 = high power distance, 5 = low power distance). The scale included the following three items:

- "When a performance appraisal made by a supervisor does not fit with employees' expectations, the employees should feel free to discuss it with the supervisor"
- "In order to have efficient work relationships, it is often necessary to bypass hierarchical lines"
- "It is okay for employees to be critical of their supervisors and other administration"

Control Variables: We eight controls to account for alternative explanations of voice. Several studies, (e.g. (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer, 2012; Detert & Burris, 2007)) found personality and demographic characteristics to influence voice. LePine & Van Dyne (1998) showed relationships between voice and gender, ethnicity, and group. Detert & Burris (2007) found tenure, hours per week (employment status), gender,

Hispanic ethnicity, and job type to influence results on voice. Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer (2012) again supported the correlation between gender and voice in their study of leaders' procedural fairness. Data were collected on employee tenure, managerial position (yes or no response), gender, employee role (general descriptors, e.g. client facing role, support role, upper management), age, employment status (full-time, part-time, contract), education level, and ethnicity.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

We employed a multiple regression analysis to be able to model voice resulting from our independent variables while accounting for impact of control variables. We analyzed for normal distribution, outliers, and heteroscedasticity. Using this approach, we were able to estimate coefficients for independent variables and moderated effect of power distance.

Before using regression analysis it was necessary to test for the internal reliability of our scales. Using Cronbach's Alpha we were able to determine the strength of our scales and how closely related items within each scale were to each other. In most social science research a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered acceptable (UCLA, 2015), however a scale with a reliability coefficient of 1 is not desirable either as this indicates a scale with no diversity in measures. This is the standard used in our study when analyzing internal reliability of our scales, using 95% confidence, a table of all scale item internal reliability coefficients can be seen in Table 1. The voice scale tested to have an internal reliability coefficient of .91, using all 6 voice scale items; giving us a strong scale to create our dependent variable out of. Organizational identification tested to have an internal reliability coefficient of .87, using all 6 organizational identification scale items; giving us a strong scale for our first independent variable. Information justice had an internal reliability coefficient of .92, using all 5 information justice scale items; giving us a strong scale for our second independent variable.

Power distance originally included 3 scale items, when tested using all three items the internal reliability coefficient was .43. Given that this was not even close to being an acceptable internal reliability coefficient, it was necessary to evaluate which of the scale items were not as consistent with the other two. By testing all possible combinations of two power distance scale items we were able to determine which power distance scale item to drop. After dropping the unreliable item the internal reliability coefficient was raised to .6.

While still not reaching the Cronbach's alpha threshold of .7, this coefficient comes considerably closer (Using R for Psychological Research, 2015; UCLA, 2015). Implications of the power distance scale reliability are discussed in the limitations section.

Table 1

Voice							
Raw Alpha	Std. Alpha	G6 (smc)	Average R	S/N	ase	Mean	Standard Dev.
0.91	0.91	0.9	0.62	9.9	0.032	4	0.64
Organizational Identification							
Raw Alpha	Std. Alpha	G6 (smc)	Average R	S/N	ase	Mean	Standard Dev.
0.87	0.87	0.87	0.53	6.9	0.037	4	0.69
Informational Justice							
Raw Alpha	Std. Alpha	G6 (smc)	Average R	S/N	ase	Mean	Standard Dev.
0.92	0.92	0.91	0.7	12	0.036	4.1	0.82
Power Distance (First Item Removed)							
Raw Alpha	Std. Alpha	G6 (smc)	Average R	S/N	ase	Mean	Standard Dev.
0.6	0.6	0.43	0.43	1.5	0.13	2.8	0.86
Power Distance (All Items)							
Raw Alpha	Std. Alpha	G6 (smc)	Average R	S/N	ase	Mean	Standard Dev.
0.43	0.39	0.37	0.18	0.65	0.11	3.4	0.64

After testing for internal reliability and adjusting the power distance scale accordingly we created our organizational identification, information justice, voice, and power distance variables. In order to test hypothesis 3 and 4 it was necessary to create a "centered" moderation variable for each hypothesis (subtract the mean of power distance from each power distance variable response before multiplying by the independent variable). While centering does not affect our R^2 value in each model, it does correct the coefficients to be more accurate and avoid multicollinearity in the model.

When viewing our step correlation matrix of all variables (seen in Table 2) it is interesting note that power distance does not show significant correlation to voice, however it does to both organizational identification and informational justice (at 99% or, $p < .01$ level). Informational justice and organizational identification each showed to be significantly correlated to voice and to each other (all at 95% or greater level). Additionally, the initial correlation matrix showed voice to be significantly correlated with being a manager, being in a client facing role, being in upper management, having just a high school education and having a graduate level education (all at 95% or greater level).

Table 2

					Inter-Correlations			
		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Voice	152	4.043	0.635				
2	Org. Iden.	152	3.961	0.691	0.34***			
3	Info. Justice	152	4.121	0.820	0.17**	0.17**		
4	Power Distance	152	2.822	0.864	-0.08	-0.25***	-0.22***	
5	Tenure	152	3.303	0.853	0.01	0.07	0.07	-0.08
6	Manager	152	0.257	0.438	0.25***	0.35***	0.00	-0.06
7	Male	152	0.145	0.353	0.08	-0.16*	0.04	0.08
8	Client Role	152	0.704	0.458	-0.27***	-0.13*	0.06	-0.05
9	Support Role	152	0.151	0.360	0.13	-0.11	-0.07	0.12
10	Upper Management	152	0.145	0.353	0.22***	0.29***	-0.01	-0.06
11	Age	152	39.046	11.229	0.02	0.10	0.05	-0.16*
12	Full Time	152	0.941	0.237	0.05	0.14*	-0.11	0.03
13	High-School	152	0.020	0.140	-0.17**	0.03	-0.07	0.06
14	Some College	152	0.132	0.339	-0.03	-0.02	-0.14*	0.11
15	College	152	0.507	0.502	-0.09	-0.03	0.16*	-0.21***
16	Grad School	152	0.342	0.476	0.16**	0.04	-0.05	0.12
17	Asian	152	0.007	0.081	-0.07	0.06	0.01	-0.08
18	Native American	152	0.007	0.081	-0.01	-0.05	-0.07	0.02
19	Black	152	0.230	0.422	-0.01	-0.02	-0.03	0.10
20	Hispanic	152	0.046	0.210	-0.09	-0.05	0.05	0.08
21	White	152	0.711	0.455	0.07	-0.04	0.01	-0.12
		*** = p < .01	** = p < .05	* = p < .1				

Upon examining distribution of our independent, moderation and dependent variables, we found that by squaring our organizational identification and informational justice variables we were able to provide a more normal distribution. Using the log function for voice also aided in providing a normalized distribution for our dependent variables. This reflected in our regression models, when comparing non-adjusted variable regression models to models using our normalized adjusted variables the R^2 values increased. Moderated regression analysis was employed to examine the moderating effects of power-distance on the relationship between organizational identification and informational justice on employee voice intentions. Moderation tests have to include a term for the direct effect of the independent variables (organizational identification and informational justice, a term for the direct effect of the moderating variable (power-distance), and needs to use a term showing the interaction between the moderation and independent variables. According to Barron and Kenny (1986) and James and Brett (1984) the moderation hypothesis is supported if the interaction term is significant.

Final moderation regression models used and their results can be seen in Table 3. They show the coefficients, significance, variables, R^2 and standard error for each regression model. Model (1) is used to interpret hypothesis 1, model (2) is used to interpret hypothesis 2, model (3) is used to interpret hypothesis 3, and model (4) is used to interpret hypothesis 4. Variables are displayed in short-hand format, here we will clarify what each variable is: lvoice = Voice using log function, orgiden2 = Organizational Identification squared, infojustice2 = Informational Justice squared, powerdistance = Power Distance, oi.pd.mod2 = Organizational Identification squared & centered Power Distance interaction term, ij.pd.mod2 = Informational Justice squared & centered Power distance interaction term.

Hypothesis 1 predicted the strength of employee organizational identification would be positively related to employee voice intentions. Our final best-fit regression model used Log(Voice) as the dependent variable and organizational identification squared as the independent variable, the model included all control items. Results supported this hypothesis, that the greater an employee identified with the organization the higher their voice intentions were. Results showed that this relationship was significant at the 99% confidence level. The model had an R^2 value of .234, indicating that there were other variables explaining employee voice intentions.

Hypothesis 2 predicted the strength of informational justice would be positively related to employee voice intentions. Our final best-fit regression model used Log(Voice) as the dependent variable and informational justice squared as the independent variable, the model included all control items. Results supported this hypothesis, that the greater the level of perceived informational justice the higher voice intentions were. Results showed that this relationship was significant at the 95% confidence level. The model had an R2 value of .177, indicating that there were other variables explaining employee voice intentions.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that power distance would moderate the relationship between organizational identification and voice; that organizational identification would be more related to employee's voice intentions when power distance was low than when power distance was high. Our final best-fit regression model used Log(Voice) as the dependent variable, organizational identification squared as the independent variable, power distance as the moderation variable, the interaction term of organizational identification squared and centered power distance, the model included all control items. Results did not support hypothesis 3, according to Barron and Kenny (1986) and James and Brett (1984) the

moderation hypothesis is only supported if the interaction term of the independent variable and the moderation variable is shown to be significant. Our model did not show significance between the interaction term and voice, however continued to show that organizational identification was significant, further supporting hypothesis 1. Including the interaction term and power distance did not show a large difference in the model's R^2 value either (relative to model 1), with a value of .241.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that power distance would moderate the relationship between informational justice and voice; that informational justice would be more related to employee's voice intentions when power distance was low than when power distance was high. Our final best-fit regression model used Log(Voice) as the dependent variable, informational justice squared as the independent variable, power distance as the moderation variable, the interaction term of informational justice squared and centered power distance, the model included all control items. Results did not support hypothesis 4, according to Barron and Kenny (1986) and James and Brett (1984) the moderation hypothesis is only supported if the interaction term of the independent variable and the moderation variable is shown to be significant. Our model did not show significance between the interaction term and voice, however continued to show that informational justice was significant, further supporting hypothesis 2. Including the interaction term and power distance did not show a large difference in the model's R2 value either (relative to model 2), with a value of .181.

To summarize:

- Hypothesis 1 was supported as organizational identification was shown to have a significant positive effect on employee voice intentions.
- Hypothesis 2 was supported as informational justice was shown to have a significant positive effect on employee voice intentions.
- Hypothesis 3 was not supported and contrary to our predictions power distance was not shown to have a significant effect on employee voice intentions or have a moderation effect on the organizational identification and employee voice intentions relationship.
- Hypothesis 4 was not supported and contrary to our predictions power distance was not shown to have a significant effect on employee voice intentions or have a moderation effect on the informational justice and employee voice intentions relationship.

Table 3

Regression Models using Log Voice

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Organizational Identification ^2	0.011***		0.010***	
	(0.003)		(0.003)	
Informational Justice ^2		0.006**		0.005**
		(0.002)		(0.002)
Power Distance			-0.052	-0.039
			(0.046)	(0.051)
Organizational Identification & Power Distance Moderation Variable			0.003	
			(0.003)	
Informational Justice & Power Distance Moderation Variable				0.002
				(0.003)
Tenure	-0.0001	-0.001	0.0001	-0.001
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Manager	0.016	0.057	0.012	0.055
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.042)
Male	0.021	0.001	0.023	0.003
	(0.038)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.04)
Client Role	-0.032	-0.049	-0.032	-0.047
	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.051)	(0.053)
Support Role	0.054	0.025	0.059	0.029
	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.056)	(0.058)
Age	0.0003	0.001	0.0001	0.001
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Full Time	-0.037	0.002	-0.039	0.001
	(0.057)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.059)
High School	-0.258***	-0.196*	-0.257***	-0.193*
	(0.097)	(0.1)	(0.097)	(0.101)
Some College	-0.050	-0.025	-0.057	-0.023
	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.047)	(0.049)
College	-0.025	-0.027	-0.030	-0.028
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Native American	0.099	0.075	0.098	0.071
	(0.161)	(0.167)	(0.162)	(0.168)
Asian	-0.240	-0.185	-0.237	-0.196
	(0.165)	(0.17)	(0.165)	(0.172)
Black	0.008	0.003	0.003	0.001
	(0.031)	(0.032)	(0.032)	(0.033)
Hispanic	-0.028	-0.053	-0.037	-0.056
	(0.066)	(0.068)	(0.066)	(0.069)
Constant	1.263***	1.297***	1.434***	1.415***
	(0.107)	(0.113)	(0.188)	(0.184)
Observations	152	152	152	152
R2	0.234	0.177	0.241	0.191
Adjusted R2	0.150	0.086	0.145	0.077
Residual Std. Error	0.150 (df = 136)	0.161 (df = 136)	0.156 (df = 134)	0.162 (df = 134)
F Statistic	2.771*** (df = 15, 136)	1.951*** (df = 15, 136)	2.506*** (df = 17, 134)	1.746*** (df = 17, 134)
Note:	* p < 0.1	** p < 0.05	*** p < 0.01	

DISCUSSION

Drawing from organizational identification research, informational justice theory/research and power distance research, we investigated these individual attitude indicators and their influence on employee voice intentions. Although we theorized that power distance would provide a moderating effect on the relationship of our independent variables and dependent variable, results showed this theory to not be correct. However, our organizational identification regression model (model 1) was able to account for 23.4% of the variance in voice intentions. Informational justice also was strongly correlated to employee voice intentions, however only was able to account for 17.7% of the variance in employee voice intentions.

Although power distance was not significantly correlated to employee voice intentions as an independent variable or as a moderating variable, it is interesting to note this for future study. It would seem then that our study showed power distance is not an indicator of employee psychological safety (shown by other researchers to be a significant predictor of employee voice intentions and behaviors (Adelman, 2012; Detert & Burris, 2007; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) and is an important distinction to make for future research.

Given the focus of this study was primarily on employee attitudes, and did not focus on other areas shown to influence employee voice intentions and behaviors we are not surprised that our two significant variables accounted for 23.5% and 17.7% of the variance in employee voice intentions. Given the nature of this study, being the first to directly analyze the impact of organizational identification and informational justice on employee voice intentions, our findings suggest that understanding employee voice intentions and behaviors requires investigation into not only the personality, demographic and organizational context variables but greater research into possible attitude predictors. However, this study does provide a starting point for future researchers regarding these two attitude variables and uses empirical data to provide evidence of the hypothesized relationships.

LIMITATIONS & FUTURE RESEARCH

Throughout the course of research several limitations became apparent. First, we used voice intentions rather than observed voice behaviors in our study. Second, our sample size was not optimal and could have been more representative of the employed full time American population in regards to ethnic background, education level, gender distribution and tenure.

Third, our power distance scale did not show strong internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. Each of these limitations will be discussed, as well as implications for future research.

Our study measured voice intentions. While it can be reasoned that intentions lead to action, and that intentions are a good indicator of action, measuring just intentions does not paint a complete picture of voice behavior within an organization. Walumbwa and Schaubroeck (2009) used a study in which participants consisted of supervisors and direct reports. Their study used work groups (groups formed by direct report to supervisor relationships) to analyze both voice intentions from the individual and observed voice behaviors as reported by the supervisors. Additionally, their study collected data at two points in time over the course of 5 weeks in order to provide robustness to the study. By using measuring both intentions and behaviors they were able to create a study with superior reliability to our own. Due to time and resource constraints we were unable to conduct a study such as this, however we propose that in the future one such study should be used. The proposed study would then be able to provide empirical evidence further supporting (or disproving) the relationships between organizational identification, informational justice and voice, as well as any other variables worth considering during the study.

Our sample contained an interesting demographic breakdown. While it is not entirely representative of the employed full time American population, it was completely representative of the organization we conducted the study within. The specific demographical measures which were not representative of the employed full time American population are ethnic background, education level, gender distribution, and tenure. Data collected from the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics is compared to our sample data below and full sample demographic breakdown can be seen in Table 4:

- According to the US Census Bureau (Quick Facts United States, 2014), the United States population is 1% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 5% Asian, 13% Black or African American .2% Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 17% Hispanic or Latino, 62% Non-Hispanic White, 2.5% two or more races. When comparing our sample to the US Census Bureau statistics two things become apparent. 1. The US Census Bureau provided options for individuals to identify as multiple races, our study did not. 2. Regardless of the additional options for multiple races provided by the US Census Bureau, our study was

over-represented in Black or African American, over-represented in Non-Hispanic White, and under-represented in Asian or Asian American.

- According to the US Census Bureau (Quick Facts United States, 2014), 86% of persons 25 and older have a High School degree or higher and 28.8% have a Bachelor's degree or higher. These numbers, when compared to our sample (100% have High School degree or higher and 84% have a Bachelor's degree or higher), show that our sample size is more highly educated than the general United States adult population. This is likely due to the Non-Profit's requirement of a Bachelor's degree or higher for most positions within the organization.
- Female persons for the U.S. population were 50.8% in 2014 (Quick Facts United States, 2014); in our sample Females were over-represented. This is likely due to the sample's industry.
- Median tenure for U.S. wage and salary workers was 4.6 years in 2014 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014); our sample was below this number. This is likely due to recent changes in management within the organization and high turnover due to sample's industry.

Table 4

Demographic Question	Answer	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	Mean	Standard Deviation	Responses	Response %
Tenure	Years	0	24	3.3	3.85	152	
Managerial Position	Yes					39	26%
	No					113	74%
Gender	Male					22	14%
	Female					113	86%
Role in Organization	Client Facing					107	70%
	Support					23	15%
	Upper Management					22	14%
Age	Years	21	67	39.05	11.23	152	
Employment Status	Full Time					143	94%
	Part Time					9	6%
	Contract					0	0%
Education Level	Some High School					0	0%
	High School or GED					3	2%
	Some College					20	13%
	Bachelor Degree					77	51%
	Graduate School and/or Clinical License					52	34%
Race	American Indian or Alaskan Native					1	1%
	Asian or Asian American					1	1%
	Black or African American					35	23%
	Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					0	0%
	Hispanic or Latino					7	5%
	Non-Hispanic White					108	71%

Several past studies have shown the significance of certain demographic traits on voice behaviors. LePine & Van Dyne (1998) showed relationships between voice and gender, ethnicity, and group. Detert & Burris (2007) found tenure, hours per week (employment status), gender, Hispanic ethnicity, and job type to influence results on voice. Cornelis, Hiel, & Cremer (2012) again supported the correlation between gender and voice in their study of leaders' procedural fairness. Given these previously established relationships we consider our sample to not be completely representative. This is yet another limitation which should be considered for future research. Future research should consist of sampling from more than one organization, in more than one industry. Given the education requirements for most positions within the non-profit, gender distribution, tenure and ethnic background we feel that staying within one organization would inevitably lead to a less representative sample. By sampling from multiple organizations from multiple industries the sample could become much more representative. Given the significant relationships found between organizational identification, informational justice and employee voice intentions, we don't believe there would be a significant change in these relationships. However, having a more representative sample may have led to an increase in the explanation of variance in employee voice intentions, or R^2 values of our models.

Our power distance scale did not show strong internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. Including all scale items resulted in an alpha of .43 (with 95% confidence) and removing the first, most dissimilar item, resulted in an alpha of .6 (with 95% confidence). Although removing the first item of three from the scale resulted in a higher alpha, it did not reach the threshold coefficient of .7 (Using R for Psychological Research, 2015; UCLA, 2015) required to be considered to have strong internal reliability. First we must consider the reason for the low internal reliability coefficients; our scale only included three items to measure power distance. Relative to the other scales used in our study, this is low. Having fewer items in the scale results in less room to "maneuver" should some scale items not be consistent with other items; thus, when there are more scale items included we are able manipulate which scale items are included more easily and possibly increase the resulting internal reliability coefficient to an acceptable level. In addition to having fewer scale items to manipulate, when viewing our power distance scale items it becomes apparent that item one may be different enough from items two and tree in wording that a respondent could interpret it differently, resulting in a low internal reliability coefficient when item one is included. Second, we must consider how the low internal reliability coefficient of our power

index scale negatively affected the study and results. After creating and analyzing statistical models power distance was shown to not have a moderation effect or a direct effect on employee voice intentions. It can be reasoned that since the power distance scale had low internal reliability it did not accurately interface with the rest of our statistical model. Continuing with this assumption, it can be reasoned that this created inaccurate moderation models and thus we were unable to support hypotheses three and four. Future research should include more scale items for power distance and careful consideration of scale item wording. This would likely result in an increased internal reliability coefficient and allow for the creation of much more accurate moderation and direct effect models.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Our findings about organizational identification and informational justice as attitudes which predict employee voice intentions should be considered by management and how to cultivate these attitudes among employees.

Informational justice can be considered both a result of cultural tendencies within an organization as well as the result of policies and procedures. Although informational justice is a perception, or attitude from the employee, it stems from actual amounts and quality of information given to an employee. It then becomes a priority for management to establish policies and procedures which encourage high quality and quantity of information sharing to employees. In addition to considering policies and procedures, organizational leadership should place priority on creating a culture where it is common practice for information to be freely shared (not withstanding privacy considerations) with employees. The old adage is "knowledge is power" an employee who has more information and higher quality information shared with them will likely become more effective in their job, allowing for some increases in operation performance. Additionally, hypothesis two has been supported, and thus it can be reasoned that an employee with more and higher quality information will display more voice behaviors; again leading to possible increases in organization operational effectiveness.

Organizational identification is a factor largely influenced by organizational culture. An organization which cultivates "buy-in" from its employees will see greater organizational identification from its employees. Considering this from a management perspective, increasing organizational identification could be reasoned to result in decreased turnover and has been shown in our research to increase employee voice intentions; as stated previously,

increased employee voice intentions would likely result in increased displayed employee voice behaviors and increased operational efficiency.

Although employee voice and its predictors are still being actively researched, this study, as well as others, can provide organizational leadership with insight needed to increase operational efficiency, decrease employee turnover, and a host of other managerial considerations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adelman, K. (2012). Promoting Employee Voice and Upward Communication in Healthcare: The CEO's Influance. *Journal of Healthcare Management 57:2*, 133 - 147.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *Academy of Management Review 14:1*, 20 - 39.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1992). Alumni and their alma maters: A partial test of the reformulated model of Organizational Identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 103 - 123.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). Moderator-Mediator Variabes Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51 (6)*, 1173 - 82.

Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (In)Justice: The Sacred and the Profane.

Bies, R. J. (2010). Leading Change in the Era of Bad News: Dealing with Anger, Distrust, and Revenge in the Workplace. *Prosci Global Conference*.

Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Research on Negotiation in Oragnizations.

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.

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*, 81 - 102.

Cobb, A. T., Folger, R., & Wooten, K. (1995, Summer Issue). The Role Justice Plays in Organizational Change. *Public Administration Quarterly*, pp. 135 - 151.

Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng. (2001). Justice at the Millennium: a Meta-Analytic Review of 25 Years of Organizational Justice Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 425 - 445.

Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan. (2005). What is Organizational Justice? A Historical Overview. *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, 3-58.

Cornelis, I., Hiel, A. V., & Cremer, D. D. (2012). The Effect of Follower's Belongingness Needs on Leader's Procedural Fairness Enactment. *Journal of Personnel Psychology 11:1*, 31 - 39.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three Roads to Organizational Justice. *Research in Personnel and Human Reseources Management, 20*, 1 - 113.

de la Roche du Ronzet, M. (2015, August 13). Onboarding.

de la Roche du Ronzet, M. (2015, October 28). Presentation.

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.

Gilliland, S. W., & Chan, D. (2001). Justice in Organizations: Theor, Methods, and Applications. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran, *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology: Volume 2 Organizational Psychology* (pp. 143 - 165). London: SAGE Publications.

Hammer, M. (2007). The 7 Deadly Sins of Performance Measurement and How to Avoid them. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 19 - 28.

Hess, R. L., & Ambrose, M. (2010). The Four Factor Model of Justice: An Application to Customer Complaint Handling. *9th International Business and Economy Conference*.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (n.d.). *Dimensions of National Cultures*. Retrieved 11 2, 2015, from Geert Hofstede: http://geerthofstede.nl/dimensions-of-national-cultures

James, L. R., & Brett, J. M. (1984). Mediators, Moderators, and tests for mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69 (2)*, 307 - 321.

Jones, C., & Volpe, E. H. (2010). Organizational Identification: Extending our understanding of social identities through social networks. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The Discipline of Teams. *Harvard Business Review*.

Kernan, M. C., & Hanges, P. J. (2002). Survivor Reactions to Reorganization: Antecedents and Consequences of Procedural, Interpersonal, and Informational Justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology 87:5*, 916 - 928.

Kotter, J. P. (2007). Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail. *Harvard Business Review*.

Lee, C., Pillutla, M., & Law, K. (2000). Power-Distance, gender and organizational justice. *Journal of Management*, 685 - 704.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting Voice Behavior in Work Groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology 83:6*, 853 - 868.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What Should Be Done with Equity Theory? New Approaches to the Study of Fairness in Social Relationships. *National Science Foundation*, 27 - 55.

Maas, M., & Bos, K. v. (2011). Real Personal Uncertaininty Induced by Means of Task-Related Feedback: Effects on Reactions to voice and No-Voice Procedures. *Social Justice Res. 24*, 107 - 125.

Matos, M. G. (2015, 11 3). Thesis Help. (M. A. Makens, Interviewer)

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.

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*, 183 - 191.

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 Psycology 96:1*, 183 - 191.

Olson-Buchanan, J. B., & Boswell, W. R. (2002). The Role of Employee Loyalty and Formality in Voicing Discontent. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1167 - 1174.

Patient, D. (2015, July 17). Organizational Justice: Expert Insight. (M. A. Makens, Interviewer)

Patient, D. (2015, July 20). Organizational Justice: Expert Insight. (M. A. Makens, Interviewer)

Patient, D. (2015, October 23). Presentation Summary and Wrap-Up: Expert Insight. (M. A. Makens, Interviewer)

Phillips, B. (2015, September 4). Organization Cultural Development: Expert Insight. (M. A. Makens, Interviewer)

Prooijen, J.-W. v., Wilke, H. A., & Bos, K. v. (2004). Group Belongingness and Procedural Justice: Social Inclusion and Exclusion by Peers Affects the Psychology of Voice. *journal of Personality and Social Psychology 87:1*, 66-79.

Quick Facts United States. (2014). *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from Census.Gov: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html

RapidBI. (2012, October 10). How to Write an Internal Communications Plan and Strategy.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Exploring Nonlinearity in Employee Voice: The effects of Personal Control and Organizational Identification. *Academy of Management 51:6*, 1189 - 1203.

Terwel, B. W., Harinck, F., Ellemers, N., & Daamen, D. D. (2010). Voice in Political Decision-Making: The Effect of Group Voice on Perceived Trustworthiness of Decision Makers and Subsequent Acceptance of Decisions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied 16:2*, 173 - 186.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014, September 18). *Employee Tenure Summary*. Retrieved December 4, 2015, from United States Department of Labor: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/tenure.nr0.htm

UCLA. (2015). *SPSS FAQ: What does Cronbach's alpha mean?* Retrieved December 5, 2015, from idre: Institute for Digital Research and Education: http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq/alpha.html

Using R for Psychological Research. (2015). Retrieved December 1, 2015, from Personality Project: personality-project.org/r/r.guide.html#alpha

Venkataramani, V., & Tangirala, S. (2010). When and Why Do Central Employees Speak Up? An Examination of Mediating and Moderating Variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 582 - 591.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader Personality Traits and Employee Voice Behavior: Mediating Roes of Ethical Leadership and Work Group Psychological Safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology 94:5*, 1275 - 1286.

Whelan-Berry, K. S., & Somerville, K. A. (2010). Linking Change Drivers and the organizational Change Process: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Change Management 10:2*, 175 - 193.

Wikipedia. (n.d.). *Organizational Justice*. Retrieved September 9, 2015

Wylie, N., Sturdy, A., & Wright, C. (2014). Change Agency in Occupational Context: Lessons for HRM. *Human Resource Management Journal 24:1*, 95 - 110.

Zydziunaite, V., & Lepaite, D. (2009). Aspects of Social Processes with in a Business Organization for a Positive Development of Organizational Behavior. *Current Issues of Business and Law 4*, 103 - 121.