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Abstract

Employee perceptions of voice climate and behaviour have been linked with work-related outcomes that impact organisational effectiveness. This study explored the multi-dimensionality of voice climate and its relationship with affective organisational commitment, work engagement, neglect and exit. The perceived importance of voice behaviours was hypothesised to moderate these relationships. Questionnaires were completed by 119 employees from several organisations. As hypothesised, voice climate was found to be multi-dimensional, and to be significantly related to the work-related outcomes. Contrary to hypotheses, perceived importance of voice behaviour did not moderate these relationships. These findings shed light on new research avenues, and may assist employers in understanding how their organisations’ voice climate is associated with important work-related outcomes.
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Employees’ voice climate perceptions and perceived importance of voice behaviour: links with important work-related outcomes.

Affective organisational commitment, work engagement, neglect, and exit are important work-related outcomes that have been shown to impact organisational effectiveness. Affective organisational commitment and work engagement have been associated with increases in job satisfaction, retention, motivation, performance, quality of work, mental health, and positive attitudes towards the organisation (Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007, as cited in Seppala et al., 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007). Organisations with high levels of neglect are likely to have limited capacity for innovation and adaptation to change, as well as a reduced service quality (Travis, Gomez, & Mor Barak, 2011). Exit indicates that employees are more likely to quit their jobs, leading to replacement costs associated with rehiring and training, productivity loss, and possible safety issues, and damage to morale (O’Connell & Kung, 2007).

Increasing our understanding of how these work-related outcomes develop, and are influenced, is therefore important. Previous research indicates that positive organisational voice climates are likely to be associated with increased levels of affective organisational commitment and work engagement, and decreased levels of employee neglect and exit (Wuesterwald, 2012; Farndale et al., 2011; Kamal, 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; El-Salam, Ibrahim, Mohsen, & Hassenein, 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007; Kuokkanen et al., 2007; Bryson et al., 2006; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Miles, et al., 2002; Hagedoorn Yperen, van de Vliert, & Buunk, 1999; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Withey & Cooper, 1989).
The evidence that voice climate is associated with these work-related outcomes stems largely from research outside of the voice climate literature, in areas such as employee participation, empowerment, and dissatisfaction (Wuesterwald, 2012; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; El-Salam, Ibrahim, Mohsen, & Hassenein, 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007; Kuokkanen et al., 2007; Miles, et al., 2002; Allen & Meyer, 1990). Furthermore, the construct of voice climate itself if fairly ambiguous, with no unanimously accepted conceptualisation and a number of variations in the way it has been measured (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Wilkinson & Fay, 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; Frazier, 2009).

Research suggests that voice climate perceptions may involve three components: encouragement, safety, and efficacy (Farndale, Van Ruiten, Kelliher, & Hope-Hailey, 2011; Morrison et al., 2011; Landau, 2009; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; Frazier, 2009). However, no studies to date have conceptualised voice climate as entailing all three of these components, or explored the extent to which the three components can be differentiated from one another. If voice climate perceptions involve three interdependent components, then utilising this multi-dimensional conceptualisation may result in the formulation of more accurate hypotheses regarding the links between voice climate and work-related outcomes.

Research has suggested that the links between voice climate and work-related outcomes are complex—involving moderating variables such as group conflict, perceived outcome favourability, and self esteem (Peterson, 1999; Brocker et al., 1998; Hunton, Hall, & Price, 1998; van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1996; Cropanzano & Konovsky, 1996). The theory of job satisfaction
suggests that the potential for organisational factors (e.g. voice climate) to influence work-related outcomes among employees is likely to depend on how important those factors are considered to be (Vroom, 1964; as cited in Avery & Quinones, 2004; Brockner et al., 1998). However, only one study to date has examined this idea, in relation to the work-related outcome ‘procedural fairness’ (Avery & Quinones, 2004).

The current study seeks to contribute to the voice climate literature in three ways: firstly, by exploring the extent to which voice climate is a multi-dimensional construct entailing the three components: encouragement, safety, and efficacy; secondly, by examining the links between voice climate and the work-related outcomes affective organisational commitment, work engagement, neglect, and exit; and finally, by assessing the extent to which perceived importance of voice behaviour moderates the links between voice climate and the work-related outcomes.

**Voice Climate: a Multi-Dimensional Construct**

Researchers have defined, conceptualised, and measured voice climate in a number of ways (Morrison et al., 2011; Wilkinson & Fay, 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; Frazier, 2009). This study defines voice climate as: employees’ perceptions and beliefs about the extent to which voice behaviour is encouraged, safe, and efficacious in the workplace (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009). Voice climate is distinct from voice behaviour, which is ‘the discretionary communication of ideas, suggestions, or opinions intended to improve organisational or unit functioning’ (Morrison et al, 2011, p. 183). Previous researchers have used the term ‘voice’ interchangeably to mean voice
behaviour and voice climate. It is therefore important to note the distinction between voice behaviour, as the act of communicating; and voice climate, as the perceptions and beliefs about views and practices surrounding voice behaviour in the workplace.

The perceptions that employees develop about their organisations’ voice climate may be derived from the behaviour of their superiors who actively encourage or discourage employees to provide input; or, from previous events that provide clues about the likely consequences of voice behaviour (Morrison et al., 2011). There is some conceptual overlap between a positive voice climate and an empowering climate as employees perceive that they are encouraged and able to contribute their views within both (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009; Park & Rainey, 2007). However, to say that a climate is empowering is different to saying that a voice climate is positive. While voice climate relates only to perceptions about the acceptability or likely consequences of speaking out or providing input, empowering climates allow employees to have some discretionary authority or power, particularly in relation to decision making (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009; Park & Rainey, 2007).

Voice climate can be seen as a continuum—with positive voice climate, in which voice behaviour is encouraged and perceived to be safe and efficacious at one end, and negative voice climate (referred to as a silence climate) at the other (Morrison et al., 2011). Two previous studies form the basis on which voice climate can be conceptualised as involving three components, i.e. encouragement, safety, and efficacy (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009); and the current study is the first to adopt this conceptualisation.
The encouragement component of the current study’s definition of voice climate relates to employees’ perceptions about the extent to which voice behaviour is encouraged by their superiors at work (Frazier, 2009). For example, in a positive voice climate, the perception that voice behaviour is encouraged may develop if employees are often asked about their opinions, to provide input about work related issues by their superiors, or given ample opportunity to provide that input. Unless they feel encouraged to provide input, employees who have had no previous indication of the potential outcomes of voice behaviour, such as its safety or efficacy, tend to presume that their speaking out will have negative consequences (Milliken, Morrison & Hewlin, 2003). In this way, encouragement is an important component as it works with the other components to determine the extent to which particular voice climates are perceived to be facilitative of voice behaviour (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009).

Encouragement perceptions may work as quite accurate indicators of employees’ perceptions of their voice climate (Frazier, 2009). While there are organisational mechanisms designed to facilitate voice behaviour, including meetings, open door policies, and grievance processes; employee awareness of these mechanisms does not provide any indication of their quality (Wilkinson & Fay, 2011). For example, employees might know about appropriate communication channels for grievances, while at the same time, feel discouraged from using these channels, or find they are ineffective. In contrast, employees who feel that voice behaviour is encouraged are perceiving their voice climate as positive, irrespective of the accuracy of those perceptions.
In the only study to date to include encouragement perceptions as an essential component of voice climate, voice climate was found to be significantly positively related to voice behaviour—suggesting that employees are aware of whether or not they work within a climate that is encouraging of voice behaviour (Frazier, 2009). If encouragement perceptions form a part of employees’ voice climate perceptions, then hypotheses regarding the links between voice climate and work-related outcomes will likely be more accurate when encouragement is taken into consideration.

The safety and efficacy components of voice climate are forms of outcome expectancies (Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit & Dutton, 1998) as they relate to employees’ expectations about the consequences of voice behaviour in their workplace. The safety component of voice climate relates to employees’ beliefs about the likelihood that voice behaviour will result in negative consequences such as reprimand (Morrison et al., 2011). For example, in a negative voice climate, employees may feel they will be reprimanded for speaking up about issues that they, or others, perceive as sensitive (Morrison et al., 2011). These employees may develop the expectation that voice behaviour is unsafe. The more reason employees have to expect that voice behaviour will result in positive consequences the more positive the safety component of their voice climate is perceived to be (Morrison et al., 2011). Employees often perceive voice behaviour to be risky, as confrontations with superiors can be emotionally difficult and to speak out may incur retaliation (Morrison et al., 2011; Withey & Cooper, 1989). As a result, employees tend to weigh up the likely costs and potential benefits of voice behaviour before speaking out (Morrison et al., 2011; Withey & Cooper, 1989).
Only one study to date, examining the influence of voice climate on voice behaviour, has included safety expectations as a part of employees’ voice climate perceptions (Morrison et al., 2011). In this study, voice climate (conceptualised as entailing both safety and efficacy components) explained a significant amount of variance in voice behaviour (32 percent), beyond that explained by other variables such as satisfaction and workgroup identification (Morrison et al., 2011). Therefore, predictions made about voice climate are likely to be more accurate where employees’ expectations about safety related consequences of voice behaviour are included as an integral component of the voice climate measure.

The efficacy component of voice climate relates to how effective employees believe their voice behaviour is likely to be, i.e. whether their contributions will be heard and acted upon (Morrison et al., 2011). For example, in a negative voice climate, employees may previously have made numerous suggestions regarding procedural changes, but found that no change has occurred. These employees may develop the expectation that their voicing efforts are unlikely to be effective and are therefore not worthwhile. In contrast, employees who have consistently had their contributions listened to and acted upon can be said to be working within an efficacy-positive voice climate (Morrison et al., 2011).

A number of researchers have included employees’ voice behaviour efficacy expectations in their voice climate measures—with the suggestion that the existence of organisational mechanisms designed to facilitate voice behaviour (e.g. grievance systems, meetings, open door policies, suggestion boxes) are unlikely to have positive effects on work-related outcomes, if employees perceive that those mechanisms are ineffectual (Farndale et al., 2011;
Morrison et al., 2011; Landau, 2009; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009). In 2009, Landau conducted a study examining the importance of voice behaviour achieving its intended outcomes. The results of that study indicated that employees who were satisfied with the effects of their voice behaviour in the past, were more likely to have higher levels of affective commitment, view their supervisors more favourably, and have lower levels of exit, than employees with negative experiences of their voice behaviour’s effectiveness (Landau, 2009). This finding adds weight to the idea that past experiences help shape future expectations about the efficacy of voice behaviour (Morrison et al., 2011). Therefore, predictions made about the links between voice climate and work-related outcomes are likely to be more accurate where efficacy expectations are measured as a component of voice climate perceptions.

Employees’ perceptions about their organisation’s voice climate can be complex, as employers often provide their employees with mixed messages about their position on voice behaviour (Landau, 2009). Therefore, in order to make accurate hypotheses about the potential links between voice climate and work-related outcomes, it is important that measures of voice climate are broad enough to provide accurate insights into all aspects of voice climate. Although the three components of voice climate have been shown to be conceptually distinct from related constructs such as psychological safety, general group efficacy, and involvement climate (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009), the extent to which they can be differentiated from one another has not been examined. The current study will therefore explore the extent to which voice climate is a multidimensional construct entailing the three components of encouragement, safety, and efficacy.
Affective Organisational Commitment

Affective commitment is the only component of organisational commitment to have been consistently identified by researchers as being related to constructs that have some conceptual overlap with voice climate (e.g. Allen & Meyer, 1999; Park & Rainey, 2007; Farndale et al., 2011). Organisational commitment has been conceptualised as consisting of three components: affective, normative, and continuance (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Park & Rainey, 2007; Ali, Ul Haq, Ramay, & Azeem, 2010). Affectively committed employees feel involved and emotionally attached to their organisation, identify with its goals and values, and therefore remain with the organisation because they want to (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In contrast, normative commitment refers to employees’ beliefs that they have a responsibility or obligation to their organisation (Park & Rainey, 2007) and remain because they feel they ought to (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Finally, continuance commitment refers to the commitment employees develop toward their organisation based on the costs and rewards associated with leaving (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Employees high on continuance commitment remain with their organisation because they need to (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The three components are not entirely independent of one another; working together to contribute to increases in job satisfaction, retention, motivation, performance, and quality of work (Park & Rainey, 2007). However, employees can experience varying degrees of each of the components (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and research suggests that different antecedents may be responsible for the development of each of the components (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Park & Rainey, 2007).
In a study involving full-time employees from three organisations \((N = 337)\), 11 antecedents were hypothesised as being related to affective commitment alone (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Among these antecedents were two voice climate related antecedents, i.e. employee participation in work-related decision making, and the receptiveness of management to employee input. Participation \((r = .51)\) and receptiveness \((r = .48)\) were found to be positively correlated with affective commitment.

Voice climate and affective organisational commitment have been shown to be positively related (e.g. Farndale et al., 2011 \((r = .51-.56)\); Vakola & Bouradas, 2005 \((r = .36)\)). Vakola and Bouradas conceptualised voice climate as involving employee perceptions of managers’ and supervisors’ attitudes toward voice, and communication opportunities. Similarly, Farndale et al. (2011) conceptualised voice climate as employee perceptions of how well managers respond to voice behaviour, and how well managers provide opportunity for employee voice behaviour. The perceived responses and attitudes of managers toward voice behaviour can be seen as reflecting the efficacy and safety components of voice climate, in that they are forms of outcome expectancies. The provision of opportunity for voice behaviour can be seen as reflecting the encouragement component, in that it pre-empts voice behaviour and may encourage it.

Previous research indicates that when employees feel they are permitted to provide input; that their voice behaviour is likely to be well received; or, that they are empowered, they are likely to have higher levels of affective commitment (Farndale et al., 2011; Park & Rainey, 2007; Vakola & Bouradas,
It is therefore hypothesised that voice climate will be positively related to affective organisational commitment (H1).

Work Engagement

Researchers have defined work engagement in a number of ways, and currently, there is no single agreed upon definition (Shuck, 2011; Kular et al., 2008). In line with a number of previous researchers, the current study defines work engagement 'as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterised by vigor, dedication, and absorption' (Schaufeli et al., 2002b, as cited in Seppala et al., 2008, p. 460). Employees working with vigor are working with high energy levels and are willing to invest effort into their work; dedicated employees experience feelings of enthusiasm, pride and significance while working; and employees are said to be absorbed when their work engrosses them deeply and they have trouble detaching (Seppala et al., 2008).

Encouraging work engagement among employees can benefit organisations in a number of ways, as it has been associated with improved performance, reduced turnover (Kular et al., 2008), intrinsic motivation, mental health, and positive attitudes toward the organisation (Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007, as cited in Seppala et al., 2008).

Previous researchers have differentiated work engagement from job satisfaction, job involvement, organisational commitment, and organisational citizenship behaviours (OCB) (Kular et al., 2008; Saks, 2006; Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Kahn, 1990). While job satisfaction refers only to how employees feel about their work and job roles, work engagement is expressed in the behavioural components of vigor, dedication, and absorption (Rothmann,
Job involvement differs from work engagement is that it tends to include close involvement in professional relationships, while work engagement does not (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). As its name implies, organisational commitment is concerned with employees’ attachment and attitude toward the organisation itself, while work engagement is concerned with how attentive and absorbed employees are in their work tasks (Saks, 2006). Finally, while OCB and work engagement both involve elements of enthusiasm and an investment of effort at work, OCB is concerned with extra role behaviours, while work engagement is concerned with attitude and performance in relation to formal job roles (Saks, 2006).

Research regarding the predictors of work engagement is limited (Kular et al., 2008), particularly in relation to voice climate. Brown and Leigh (1996) examined the links between organisational climate and job involvement, which overlaps conceptually with work engagement (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). Their results indicated that if employees felt confident that they would not be reprimanded for expressing their true feelings, and that they were making significant contributions which were recognised by their employers, then they would be more likely to identify with their jobs, and be more involved.

It has been suggested that organisations with high levels of work engagement tend to contain employees that are not reluctant or fearful to take initiative or communicate their ideas; and that communication opportunity may be a key factor in driving work engagement (Kular et al., 2008). These ideas were evidenced by Wuesterwald (2012), who examined the relationships between participation, socio-moral climate, and work engagement among police officers ($N = 1891$) in the United States. Results indicated that as employees
participate in organisational decisions, their perception of the organisational climate as open, trusting, and supportive increases. These perceptions of the organisational climate were then found to be positively related to the vigor and dedication components of work engagement (Wuesterwald, 2012).

Positive voice behaviour outcome expectancies have been linked to job involvement (Brown & Leigh, 1996) which is conceptually similar to work engagement (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). Also, research has linked participation in organisational decision making to work engagement, through the development of organisational climates perceived as open, trusting and supportive (Wuesterwald, 2012). It is therefore hypothesised that voice climate will be positively related to work engagement (H2).

**Neglect**

In line with a number of previous researchers, the current study defines neglect as the intentional failure by employees to perform to the best of their ability at work (Travis et al., 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009). Organisations with high levels of employee neglect are likely to have a limited capacity for innovation and adaptation to change, as well as a reduced service quality (Travis et al., 2011). The majority of research involving neglect has limited the construct to fairly passive behaviours such as chronic lateness, non-medical absenteeism, the personal use of company resources, shirking, and disengagement from work tasks (Hagedoorn et al., 1999; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; van Iterson, Naus, & Roe, 2007).

Neglect can be differentiated from the withdrawal of goodwill. Employees expressing goodwill toward their organisation may be performing their duties
beyond expectations; while withdrawal of this goodwill may result in adequate performance that is certainly not neglectful (Allen & Tuselmann, 2009). Contrastingly, neglectful employees intentionally perform below the standard that is expected of them.

Employees often feel dissatisfied when working within negative voice climates (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005), and a number of studies have identified neglect as a likely response to dissatisfying workplace situations. The vast majority of these researchers have based their studies on an employee response typology originally proposed by Hirschman in 1970 (Si & Li, 2012; Mellahi, Budwarm & Li, 2010; Si, Wei, & Li, 2008; van Iterson et al., 2007; Turnley & Feldman, 1999a; Withey & Cooper, 1989). This well established typology currently identifies exit, voice behaviour, loyalty, and neglect (EVLN) as four possible responses to dissatisfying work situations (Si & Li, 2012).

Research has suggested that, in order to achieve its’ desired outcomes, employee voice behaviour may depend on the receptiveness and response within the organisation (Bryson et al., 2006). This idea was evidenced in a longitudinal study by Travis et al. (2011), which examined the links between voice behaviour and neglect. The results of this study found that voice behaviour and neglect were positively related when measured at the same point in time; while voice behaviour measured at baseline was negatively related to neglect measured six months later. In response to the finding that voice behaviour is not immediately related to a reduction in neglect; Travis et al. suggested that employees may have begun to reduce their neglectful behaviours only as the organisation began to process, and then respond to, the message that was voiced. This suggests that the negative relationship between voice behaviour and
neglect may exist only in the context of a positive organisational voice climate. In other words, when employees are dissatisfied they are likely to be speaking up, but it is not this act of voice behaviour itself that reduces levels of neglect, but rather, it is the response of the organisation to that voice behaviour. It is therefore hypothesised that voice climate will be negatively related to neglect (H3).

Exit

Researchers are fairly consistent in their definition of employee exit as including: resigning, seeking alternative employment, or simply considering leaving the organisation (Withey & Cooper, 1989; Hagedoorn et al., 1999; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; Mellahi et al., 2010). This conceptualisation allows researchers to gain some insight into how employees are feeling about remaining with the organisation, even when they perceive that quitting is not an option. When employees do quit, organisations are left with replacement costs associated with rehiring and training, and may also incur productivity loss, safety issues, and damage to morale (O’Connell & Kung, 2007).

There is no research to date examining the links between voice climate and exit. However, employees often feel dissatisfied when working within a negative voice climate (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005), and the results of a number of studies have found significant positive relationships between employee dissatisfaction and exit (Withey & Cooper, 1989; Hagedoorn et al., 1999; Kamal, 2011). In addition, in their 2009 discussion of the links between dissatisfaction and exit, voice behaviour, loyalty, and neglect, Allen and Tuselmann suggested that employees are even more likely to respond to
dissatisfaction with exit in situations where they perceive that voice behaviour is either too costly, or unlikely to improve their situation. It is therefore hypothesised that voice climate will be negatively related to neglect (H4).

**Work-Related Outcomes: Interactions**

*Affective organisational commitment and work engagement.* Organisational commitment and work engagement have been shown to be empirically distinct constructs (Kantse, 2011; Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006), which complement each other in that they are both positive work-related attitudes (Kantse, 2011). However, organisational commitment, and affective commitment specifically, has been shown to be significantly positively related to work engagement (Field & Buitendach, 2011; Kantse, 2011). It is therefore hypothesised that affective organisational commitment and work engagement will be positively related (H5).

*Affective organisational commitment and neglect.* Organisational commitment has been found to be negatively related to neglect (Kidwell & Bennet, 2001), suggesting that employees with high levels of organisational commitment are less likely to neglect their work than those who are not committed to their organisation. In addition, affective organisational commitment has been found to mediate the links between human resource management practices (performance management and compensation management) and employee neglect (Si & Li, 2012). It is therefore hypothesised that affective organisational commitment and neglect will be negatively related (H6).
Affective organisational commitment and exit. Researchers have found job involvement and organisational commitment to interact significantly to predict employee turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989), and, that organisational commitment and exit are significantly negatively related (Cohen & Hudecek, 1993; Blau, Boal, 1989). In addition, several studies have found that affective organisational commitment mediates the links between proposed exit antecedents (such as pay satisfaction, and distributive and procedural justice) and exit (Poon, 2012; Vandenberghe, 2008). It is therefore hypothesised that affective organisational commitment and exit will be negatively related (H7).

Work engagement and neglect. A consideration of the definitions of work engagement and neglect provides some indication as to how they may be related to one another. The current study defines neglect as the intentional failure by employees to perform to the best of their ability at work (Travis, Gomez, & Mor Barak, 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009); while part of the definition of work engagement includes working with vigor (Seppala et al., 2008). Employees working with vigor are working with high energy levels and are willing to invest effort into their work (Seppala et al., 2008). It is therefore hypothesised that work engagement and neglect will be negatively related (H8).

Work Engagement and Exit. Burnout is generally recognised as being the ‘negative’ opposite of work-engagement (Seppala et al., 2008; Kular et al., 2008). Both cross-sectional and longitudinal research has found burnout and exit to be positively related (Jourdain & Chenevert, 2010; Drake & Yadama, 1996). In addition, both burnout and work engagement were found to be significantly related to exit in a study examining the predictive ability of the burnout-work engagement continuum (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). As predicted, burnout and
exit were positively related to each other, with work engagement and exit having a significant negative relationship (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010). It is therefore hypothesised that work engagement and exit will be negatively related (H9).

Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour: A Moderator

Voice climate researchers have previously found that situational variables such as group conflict and perceived outcome favourability; and, individual differences such as self-esteem and voice climate expectations can moderate the effects of voice climate on work-related outcomes (Peterson, 1999; Brocker et al., 1998; Hunton, Hall, & Price, 1998; van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1996; Cropanzano & Konovsky, 1996). For example, Brockner et al. (1998) found that employees working within a positive voice climate are more likely to trust and identify with their organisation, be motivated, intend to remain, and feel satisfied, when their self-esteem was high.

The links between voice climate and work-related outcomes are complex, as they can be influenced by a number of moderating variables (e.g. self-esteem, and perceived outcome favourability) (Peterson, 1999; Brocker et al., 1998; Hunton, Hall, & Price, 1998; van den Bos, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1996; Cropanzano & Konovsky, 1996). One such moderator, which has been hypothesised to influence the effect of voice climate but has received very little attention to date, is employee perceptions about the importance of voice behaviour (Avery & Quinones, 2004).

The theory of job satisfaction suggests that the capacity for certain features of organisations to increase job satisfaction differs, depending on the extent to
which those organisational features are important to employees (Vroom, 1964, as cited by Avery & Quinones, 2004). Also, if employees consider something to be important, they are more likely to consider its presence in their evaluations of their organisation (Avery & Quinones, 2004; Brockner et al., 1998). For example, voice climate perceptions, i.e. employees’ perceptions and beliefs about the extent to which voice behaviour is safe, efficacious, and encouraged in the workplace (Morrison, et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009), may be more likely to increase satisfaction among employees, if that opportunity to contribute is something they consider important. In contrast, voice climate perceptions are less relevant to those employees who have no desire to contribute anything beyond the completion of their work tasks—with voice climate therefore less likely to influence how they feel at work.

The only paper to date to examine individuals’ perceptions of the importance of voice behaviour labelled these perceptions ‘value of voice’, but provided no specific definition for the construct (Avery & Quinones, 2004). In the current study, perceived importance of voice behaviour is defined as: the importance employees place on being able to successfully communicate ‘ideas, suggestions, or opinions intended to improve organisational or unit functioning’ (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011, p. 183).

Voice behaviour can be beneficial, not only for organisations (e.g. aiding process improvement and innovation, and decreasing accidents and corruption), but also for employees (e.g. increasing engagement, and decreasing stress and associated physiological problems) (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). These differing aspects of importance (for individual employees and for organisations) are therefore likely to form part of employees’ perceptions about the importance
of voice behaviour. The current definition includes the perceived importance of successful communication, rather than simply the importance of the act of communicating. Employees’ have been shown to develop expectations about the likely successfulness (i.e. efficacy and safety) of their voice behaviour through their perceived voice climate (Morrison et al., 2011). The conceptualisation of perceived importance of voice behaviour in the current study therefore includes the idea that part of what is perceived to be important about voice behaviour is its potential to be successful, i.e. to result in some change without negative consequences.

Only one study to date has examined the ability of perceived importance of voice behaviour to moderate the relationship between voice climate and a work-related outcome (Avery & Quinones, 2004). Avery and Quinones (2004) hypothesised that employees would differ in their ‘value of voice’ perceptions (i.e. how important they considered voice behaviour to be), and that these perceptions would moderate the link between voice climate and procedural fairness perceptions.

The Avery and Quinones (2004) study differs from the current research in a number of ways. Firstly, Avery and Quinones’ (2004) voice climate variable was narrower than the current study, asking only two questions about voice behaviour, relating to opportunity and response. Secondly, their ‘value of voice’ construct, which focused on importance of voice behaviour to individual employees, was broadened in the current study to also include perceived importance of voice behaviour for organisations, and the perceived importance of successful voice behaviour, i.e. for voice behaviour to be safe and efficacious; as these elements form a part of what employees consider in their
evaluations of the importance of voice behaviour (Morrison et al., 2011; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Thirdly, procedural fairness perceptions was the only work-related outcome measured in Avery and Quinones’ study, while the current research is interested in four work-related outcomes (affective commitment, work engagement, neglect, and exit). These work-related outcomes are important for organisations as they can affect job satisfaction, retention, motivation, performance, work and service quality, mental health, attitudes towards the organisation, innovation and adaptation to change, safety, and employee morale (Travis et al., 2011; Kular et al., 2008; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007; as cited by Seppala et al., 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007; O’Connell & Kung, 2007).

The Avery & Quinones (2004) study found that perceived importance of voice behaviour moderated the relationship between voice climate and procedural justice perceptions among diverse samples, with the perceived importance-voice climate interaction term explaining an additional 4% of the variance in procedural fairness than voice climate alone (Avery & Quinones, 2004). This provides support for the current study’s hypothesis that perceived importance of voice behaviour will moderate the links between voice climate and the four work-related outcomes (i.e. affective organisational commitment (H10), work engagement (H11), neglect (H12), and exit (H13)).

Method

Participants

The sample (N = 119) was composed of 94 females and 24 males (with one participant not reporting their gender), and ranged in age from 18 to 64 years (M
Participants were full-time (51%), part-time (16%), casual (26%), and contracted (3%) employees, (with 3% unspecified). Approximately 23 percent of the participants were employed in a manager or supervisor position. Participants were employed in a number of areas, based primarily in Western Australia. The majority of participants worked in either government departments (62%), or in retail (25%). Participants had worked in their current positions anywhere from less than six months to 25 years (\(M = 5.1, SD = 6.19\)).

**Procedure**

Participants were invited to complete the questionnaire via emailed requests to researchers’ personal contacts, an advertisement in the Murdoch University Alumni Newsletter (Appendix A), and the Murdoch University School of Psychology’s On-line Subject Pool. Participants invited as personal contacts were emailed information about voluntary participation and results (Appendix B). Participants recruited via subject-pool received 30 minutes subject-pool credit. After being invited to participate, participants could complete the questionnaire online.

**Measures**

**Voice climate.** In order to ensure all three components of the voice climate construct (encouragement, safety, and efficacy) were measured, the current study combined two previous voice climate measures (Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009) (Appendix C). Both original measures were adapted versions of LePine and Van Dyne’s (1998) voice behaviours scale. The encouragement component was measured with Frazier’s (2009) voice climate measure (\(\alpha = .93\)). Examples of items include: ‘Employees here are encouraged to speak up with
new ideas or changes in procedures,’ and ‘Employees here are encouraged to keep well informed about issues where our opinions might be useful to the group’. The safety ($\alpha = .89$) and efficacy components ($\alpha = .93$) of voice climate were measured with an adapted version of Morrison et al.’s (2011) voice climate measure. Examples of safety items include: ‘Employees can get involved in issues that affect the quality of their work-life, without fear of reprimand or reprisal,’ and ‘Employees can safely speak up and get others involved in issues that affect the group, without fear of reprimand or reprisal. Examples of efficacy items include: ‘It is worthwhile for employees to develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group,’ and ‘It is worthwhile for employees to communicate their opinions about work issues, even if those opinions are different and others disagree’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Affective organisational commitment.** Allen and Meyer’s (1990) affective organisational commitment measure was used (Appendix D), which has a high reliability ($\alpha = .87$). The original measure was adapted in order to reduce the overall questionnaire length. The researchers selected the five items which loaded highest on the affective commitment factor in Allen and Meyer’s (1990) study. Examples of items include: ‘I feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organisation,’ and ‘This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Work engagement.** The 9-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Appendix D) was used (Seppala et al., 2008). Cronbach’s Alpha for this scale has been found to range from .85 to .92 (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). Examples of items include: ‘At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy,’ and ‘I am
immersed in my work’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Neglect.** The current study used the five neglect items ($\alpha = .79$) from Hagedoorn et al.’s (1999) ‘five categories of responses to problematic events’ (Appendix E). Examples of items include: ‘Now and then, do not put enough effort into your work,’ and ‘Come in late because you do not feel like working’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Exit.** The current study used the six exit items ($\alpha = .92$) from Hagedoorn et al.’s (1999) ‘five categories of responses to problematic events’ (Appendix E). Examples of items include: ‘Actively look for a job elsewhere within your field,’ and ‘Intend to change employers’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Perceived importance of voice behaviour.** Avery and Quinones’ (2004) 4-item ‘value of voice’ measure has a reliability score ($\alpha$) of .85, and was used in conjunction with six additional items, which were created for the current study (Appendix F). The additional items were designed to broaden the original construct to include perceptions about potential consequences of voice behaviour i.e. whether it should be safe and effective (Morrison et al., 2011), as well as the perceived potential importance to the organisation (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), in addition to personal importance. Examples of items include: ‘My ideas should be given serious consideration,’ ‘I should be able to express my ideas/opinions without being reprimanded,’ and ‘My ideas can be valuable to the organisation’. Response scales ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).
Results

Data Analysis

The analysis of data includes descriptive statistics and reliabilities of scales, principal component analysis, correlation analyses, and hierarchal multiple regression. Visual inspection of the histograms indicated that neglect and exit were not normally distributed. This was expected however, due to the nature of these variables, i.e. the expectation that the majority of people do not intentionally neglect their work duties nor are seeking to leave their current employment. All other variables, except perceived importance of voice behaviour, which appeared negatively skewed, appeared to have acceptable normal distribution on visual inspection. Shapiro-Wilkes test of normality indicated that four of the six variables (i.e. voice climate, perceived importance of voice behaviour, neglect, and exit) were not normally distributed (Appendix G). A square root transformation (Fields, 2005) resulted in normal distribution for only one of these four variables. The original variable scores were retained for this reason. Non-parametric analyses were used where applicable, and steps were taken (removal of multivariate outliers, examination of data plots) to reduce problems associated with non-normal data (Osborne & Waters, 2002). An alpha level of .05 was used for all analyses unless otherwise specified.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities

As indicated in Table 1, neglect (α = .64), was the only measure with a reliability score below the generally acceptable level of .70 (Bernardi, 1994). As this score could not be increased to an acceptable level with removal of any individual items, the original measure was retained.
Table 1

*Mean, Standard Deviation, and Cronbach’s Alpha for all Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice Climate</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Climate - Encouragement</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Climate - Safety</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Climate - Efficacy</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Min (1), Max (7)*

**Principal Component Analysis of Voice Climate**

As shown in Table 1, the expected three components of voice climate (encouragement, safety, and efficacy), as described in the literature review, were found to have acceptable reliability scores. To investigate the underlying structure of the 18-item measure assessing voice climate perceptions, data were subjected to principal component analysis with oblimin rotation (Table 2). This method of analysis was selected as it allows the components to correlate, and is recognised as being psychometrically sound (Fields, 2005). Three components with Eigenvalues exceeding 1 were identified as constituting the underlying component structure of the 18 items (Fields, 2005). All items loaded on their
expected components (encouragement, safety, and efficacy) and there was no evidence of cross-loadings above .30. In total, the three components accounted for 82 percent of the variance in the voice climate measure.
Table 2

*Oblimin Rotated Component Structure of the 18-Item Voice Climate Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAF</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>ENC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees can communicate opinions about work issues with others without fear of reprimand or reprisal, even if their opinion is different and others disagree.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can safely speak up and get others involved in issues that affect the group, without fear of reprimand or reprisal.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group, without fear of reprimand or reprisal.</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can safely speak up with new ideas or changes in procedures, without fear of reprimand or reprisal.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can get involved in issues that affect the quality of their work-life, without fear of reprimand or reprisal.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can keep well informed about issues where their opinions might be useful to the group, without fear of reprimand or reprisal.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees to keep well informed about issues where their opinions might be useful.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees speaking up with new ideas or changes in procedures.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees to develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees getting involved in issues that affect the quality of life here at work.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees to communicate their opinions about work issues, even if those opinions are different and others disagree.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is worthwhile for employees speaking up and getting others involved in issues that affect the group.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees here are encouraged to speak up and get others involved in issues that affect the group.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees here are encouraged to communicate opinions about work issues with others even if that opinion is different and others disagree.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employees in my work section are encouraged to get involved in issues that affect the quality of life here at work.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employees in my work section are encouraged to speak up with new ideas or changes in procedures.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees here are encouraged to develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The employees in my work section are encouraged to keep well informed about issues where our opinions might be useful to the group.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Variance</td>
<td>49.67%</td>
<td>22.33%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations

The size and direction of the zero-order relationships between variables was examined using Kendall’s tau-b correlations (Table 3). Correlations supported the hypotheses that voice climate would be positively related to affective organisational commitment (H1) and work engagement (H2), and negatively related to neglect (H3) and exit (H4). Also supported were the hypotheses that affective organisational commitment would be positively related to work engagement (H5); and, negatively related to neglect (H6) and exit (H7). And finally, that work engagement would be negatively related to neglect (H8) and exit (H9).

This method of examining correlation (Kendall’s tau-b) was selected over Pearson’s correlation as Shapiro-Wilkes statistics indicated four of the six variables were not normally distributed (Fields, 2005; Allen & Bennett, 2008). Although both Kendall’s tau-b and Spearman’s rho can be used with data that is not normally distributed, Kendall’s tau-b provides a more accurate estimate of the population correlation and more accurate generalisations can therefore be made from the results (Fields, 2005).
Table 3

*Kendall’s tau-b Correlations between Voice Climate, Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour and Work-Related Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Voice climate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived importance of voice behaviour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affective commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neglect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Exit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, * p < .05

*Hierarchal Multiple Regressions*

Hierarchal multiple regression analyses were conducted according to the procedure described by Frazier, Barron, and Tix (2004) in order to assess the hypotheses that perceived importance of voice behaviour would moderate the links between voice climate (predictor variable) and the dependent variables affective organisational commitment (H10), work engagement (H11), neglect (H12), and exit (H13). These regression analyses were also used to further explore the hypotheses that voice climate would be positively related to affective organisational commitment (H1) and work engagement (H2), and negatively related to neglect (H3) and exit (H4).

The predictor and moderator variables were mean-centred prior to analysis in order to reduce problems associated with multicollinearity (Cohen, Cohen,
An interaction term was created by multiplying the centred predictor and moderator variables together. In each of the analyses Mahalanobis distance exceeded the critical $\chi^2$ for $df = 3$ (at $\alpha = .001$) of 16.27, and three multivariate outliers were identified and removed. Following this, relatively high tolerances in the final regression models, together with visual inspection of all normal probability plots of standardised residuals and scatterplots of standardised residuals against standardised predicted values indicated that multicollinearity would not interfere with interpretation of results; and, that the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals were met (Appendix H).

**Affective organisational commitment.** In support of hypothesis 1, voice climate accounted for around 41 percent of the variability in affective organisational commitment, a statistically significant proportion of variance, $F(1, 114) = 78.59, p < .001$, with $\beta$ coefficients indicating that more positive perceptions of voice climate were associated with increases in affective organisational commitment. At Step 2, the model accounted for around 42.3 percent of the variance, $F(2, 113) = 41.44, p < .001$, with perceived importance of voice behaviour accounting for around 2 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{\text{change}}(1, 113) = 2.95, p = .09$. Although not a significant change, the $\beta$ coefficients indicated that an increase in perceived importance of voice behaviour was associated with a decrease in affective organisational commitment. At Step 3, the model accounted for around 43 percent of the variance, $F(3, 112) = 28, p < .001$. However, contrary to hypothesis 10, the interaction term accounted for around 1 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{\text{change}}(1, 112) = 1.07, p = .3$.  

West, & Aiken).
Work engagement. In support of hypothesis 2, voice climate accounted for around 36 percent of the variability in work engagement, a statistically significant proportion of variance, $F(1, 114) = 63.66, p < .001$, with $\beta$ coefficients indicating that more positive perceptions of voice climate were associated with increases in work engagement. At Step 2, the model accounted for around 38 percent of the variance, $F(2, 113) = 34.19, p < .001$, with perceived importance of voice behaviour accounting for only around 2 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 113) = 3.39, p = .07$. Although not a significant change, the $\beta$ coefficients indicated that an increase in perceived importance of voice behaviour was associated with an increase in work engagement. At Step 3, the model still accounted for around 38 percent of the variance, $F(3, 112) = 23, p < .001$. However, contrary to hypothesis 11, the interaction term accounted for less than half a percent of the additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 112) = .76, p = .39$.

Neglect. In support of hypothesis 3, voice climate accounted for around 11 percent of the variability in neglect, a statistically significant proportion of variance, $F(1, 114) = 14.72, p < .001$, with $\beta$ coefficients indicating that more positive perceptions of voice climate were associated with decreases in neglect. At Step 2, the model accounted for around 13 percent of the variance, $F(2, 113) = 8.31, p < .001$, with perceived importance of voice behaviour accounting around 1 percent of the additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 113) = 1.81, p = .18$. Although not a significant change, the $\beta$ coefficients indicated that an increase in perceived importance of voice behaviour was associated with a decrease in neglect. At Step 3, the model accounted for around 14 percent of the variance, $F(3, 112) = 5.82, p = .001$. 
However, contrary to hypothesis 12, the interaction term accounted for around 1 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 112) = .85, p = .36$.

**Exit.** In support of hypothesis 4, voice climate accounted for around 17 percent of the variability in exit, a statistically significant proportion of variance, $F(1, 114) = 23.47, p < .001$, with $\beta$ coefficients indicating that more positive perceptions of voice climate were associated with decreases in exit. At Step 2, the model accounted for around 18 percent of the variance, $F(2, 113) = 12.64, p < .001$, with perceived importance of voice behaviour accounting for around 1 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 113) = 1.68, p = .20$. Although not a significant change, the $\beta$ coefficients indicated that an increase in perceived importance of voice behaviour was associated with an increase in exit. At Step 3, the model accounted for around 19 percent of the variance, $F(3, 112) = 8.92, p < .001$. However, contrary to hypothesis 13, the interaction term accounted for around 1 percent additional variability, a non-significant incremental increase, $F_{change}(1, 112) = 1.39, p = .24$.

**Additional Analyses**

Voice climate was found to be correlated with all four work-related outcomes as hypothesised, and to be made up of three components. In order to add to these findings, the links between the three components of voice climate and the work-related outcomes were examined. For details of this analysis, see Appendix I.

As perceived importance of voice behaviour was not found to moderate the links between voice climate and the work-related outcomes in its original form as
a continuous variable, it was converted to a dichotomous variable by creating two percentile groups, and hierarchal regressions testing for moderation were rerun. The moderator effect was still found to be non-significant. The underlying structure of perceived importance of voice behaviour was also examined, as the first step to assessing the potential moderating influence of any possible sub-components of the variable. For details of this analysis, see Appendix J.

Discussion

This study was interested in: the extent to which voice climate is a multi-dimensional construct entailing three components (encouragement, safety, and efficacy); the first order relationships between voice climate and work-related outcomes (affective organisational commitment, work engagement, neglect, exit); and, perceived importance of voice behaviour as a moderator between voice climate and these work-related outcomes. Results supported the conceptualisation of voice climate as multi-dimensional, and that positive voice climate perceptions promote improvements in work-related outcomes among employees. Contrasting hypotheses, employees’ perceived importance of voice behaviour was not found to moderate the relationships between voice climate and the work-related outcomes.

Voice Climate: a Multi-Dimensional Construct

Results of the current study support the idea that voice climate is a multidimensional construct entailing the three components of encouragement, safety, and efficacy. The finding that voice climate perceptions involve three components, adds further support to previous research that has found encouragement, safety, and efficacy perceptions to be related to voice behaviour
(Morrison et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009). Also, the findings add weight to the idea that voice climate perceptions are complex, involving awareness of whether or not voice behaviour is encouraged, and the tendency to weigh up the expected costs and effectiveness of voice behaviour in the workplace (Morrison et al., 2011; Farndale et al., 2011; Frazier, 2009). If three distinct components of voice climate are perceived by employees, organisational improvements to only one of these components may not be enough to ensure positive voice climate perceptions. For example, although employees may appreciate not being reprimanded for speaking up, they may still feel discouraged from doing so, or perceive that doing so tends not to be effective.

Additional analyses (Appendix I) indicated that the three components are significantly positively related to one another, suggesting that organisations positive in one aspect of voice climate tend to be positive in the others. The strongest inter-component correlation was between encouragement and safety, suggesting either that perceptions about the likelihood of voice behaviour resulting in reprimand is an important part of what contributes to employees’ perceptions of whether voice behaviour is encouraged, vice versa, or both. As a result, positive perceptions of safety should still play a vital role in the development of work-related outcomes that may be most strongly influenced by encouragement. The three components were differentially related to the work-related outcomes, with feelings of encouragement found to be most strongly related to the outcomes overall. The finding that encouragement was most strongly related to the outcomes is interesting as only one study to date has conceptualised encouragement as the primary feature of voice climate perceptions (Frazier, 2009).
Taken together, these findings suggest that organisational mechanisms such as grievance systems, meetings, and open door policies may be limited in their ability to improve voice climate perceptions alone. Employees are likely to be aware of the extent to which those mechanisms may be unsafe or ineffectual, and may be particularly influenced by the extent to which they feel encouraged to utilise these mechanisms (Morrison et al., 2011; Farndale et al., 2011; Morrison et al., 2011; Landau, 2009; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009; Withey & Cooper, 1989).

Voice Climate and the Work-Related Outcomes

The current study provides support for the hypotheses that employees with positive voice climate perceptions are likely to also have high levels of affective commitment (H1) and work engagement (H2), and are less likely to neglect their work duties (H3) or intent to leave their job (H4). These findings add weight to the idea that organisations can benefit by ensuring that work climates are facilitative of employee voice behaviour (Wuesterwald, 2012; Farndale et al., 2011; Kamal, 2011; Allen & Tuselmann, 2009).

The finding that affective organisational commitment was the work-related outcome most strongly associated with voice climate supports previous research which has found direct links between aspects of voice climate (i.e. perceptions about whether voice behaviour is permitted and if it is likely to be well received) and their affective commitment (Farndale et al., 2011; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Positive outcome expectancies about voice behaviour have been linked to job involvement (Brown & Leigh, 1996), which is conceptually similar to work engagement, but not to work engagement itself (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). Also, it is primarily through their shared link with dissatisfaction that voice
climate perceptions were hypothesised as relating to neglect and exit (Si & Li, 2012; Kamal, 2011; Mellahi, Budwarm & Li, 2010; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Hagedoorn et al., 1999; Withey & Cooper, 1989). The fact that voice climate and affective organisational commitment were most strongly related is noteworthy for employers. High levels of affective commitment are associated with increases in job satisfaction, retention, motivation, performance, and quality of work (Park & Rainey, 2007).

Additional analyses (Appendix I) indicated that all three components of voice climate were significantly related to each of the work-related outcomes, other than efficacy to exit. Exit was most strongly negatively related to safety, followed by encouragement. It therefore seems that the perception that speaking up would make a difference was not very important for the desire to remain, but rather, employees were less likely to seek alternative employment when they did not expect to be reprimanded, and perceived speaking up as encouraged.

The strongest link found in the additional analyses (Appendix I) was the positive relationship between encouragement and affective organisational commitment. Encouragement also had a stronger positive relationship with work engagement, and negative relationship with neglect, than the other two components. It may be that perceptions of voice behaviour as safe and efficacious contribute to the perception that it is encouraged, and in this way encouragement perceptions were a stronger indication of a positive climate overall, than either safety or efficacy on their own.

Taken together, these findings have practical implications for employers, as they suggest that by making organisational changes to ensure employees feel
voice behaviour is safe, efficacious, and particularly that it is encouraged, employers are likely to be able to improve important work-related outcomes among their employees.

Work-Related Outcomes: Interactions

Results provided support for the idea that employees who are affectively committed to their organisation are likely to also be engaged in their work (H5). Also, support was provided for the idea that employees who are affectively committed to their organisation, or highly engaged in their work, are less likely to neglect their work duties (H6 and H8) or wish to leave their current job (H7 and H9).

These findings suggest that organisations do not necessarily need to have a number of independent strategies for improving levels of these work-related outcomes among their employees, as changes in one work-related outcome is likely to have a flow-on effect among the others.

Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour

Contrary to hypotheses, perceived importance of voice behaviour did not moderate the relationship between employees’ voice climate perceptions and their work-related outcomes (affective organisational commitment (H10), work engagement (H11), neglect (H12), and exit (H13)). This finding is inconsistent with the theory of job satisfaction which suggests that the potential for organisational factors (e.g. voice climate) to influence work-related outcomes among employees is likely to depend on how important those factors are considered to be (Vroom, 1964, as cited by Avery & Quinones, 2004). It also
differs from the previous findings of Avery and Quinones (2004), who found that placing a high value on voice behaviour strengthened the relationship between voice climate and employees’ fairness perceptions.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, responses to the perceived importance of voice behaviour measure were not normally distributed, with a significant negative skew; suggesting that the vast majority of participants tended to perceive voice behaviour to be very important. This small range of responses limits the ability to detect a moderation effect (Frazier et al., 2004). Second, while hierarchal regression is commonly used to test for moderation, concerns have been raised with regards to its low power (Frazier et al., 2004). This is of particular concern for non-experimental designs, or when any of the continuous variables used have a limited range, as is the case in the current study (Frazier et al., 2004). Third, there may have been an additional loss of power in testing for moderation, due to the fact that the dependent variables were measured with the same response options (7-point) as the predictor and moderator variables (Frazier et al., 2004). Fourth, self-report measures were used, and participants may have hoped to provide the answers they thought researchers were seeking (Haslam & McGarty, 2003). Therefore, some responses may not accurately reflect participants’ true perceptions. Finally, a cross-sectional design was used. This type of observational study does not enable assessment of causation and therefore, researchers can only speculate about the directional relationships between variables (Flanders, Lin, Pirkie, & Caudill, 1992).
**Future Research**

Future researchers may wish to further explore the three components of voice climate identified in the current study. For example, differential antecedents of the three components could be explored; and, the extent to which the components differ in their ability to influence individual work-related outcomes, in particular, voice behaviour. Developing this understanding may assist employers in their ability to make organisational improvements which are targeted at specific problem areas within their organisations. For example, in targeting high levels of employee neglect, it may be more important for employers to encourage voice behaviour and ensure it is actioned, than to focus solely on ensuring employees feel voice behaviour is safe. Utilisation of this multi-dimensional conceptualisation of voice climate by researchers may ensure measures are broad enough to provide accurate insights into the extent to which all aspects of voice climates are perceived as positive, and thereby increase the accuracy of hypotheses regarding the antecedents or consequences of voice climate perceptions.

Future research could develop the finding that voice climate was strongly related to four important work-related outcomes. For example, longitudinal designs could be utilised to explore the impact of interventions designed to improve different components of voice climate, in order to then explore, the impact of voice climate interventions designed to improve work-related outcomes within organisations. Also, researchers could explore voice climate perceptions and their affects among different occupational and demographic groups, perhaps in order to find out whether certain groups are particularly vulnerable to working within negative voice climates, or react to them in some
unique way. For example, apprentices may generally work within negative voice climates, and expect to, because they are just starting out and therefore working under the assumption that they will not have anything to contribute. Perhaps then, this negative voice climate may not have detrimental effects to the same extent as it would among university graduates beginning their careers.

A more sensitive perceived importance of voice measure could be developed, in order to add to the currently limited literature regarding the importance employees place on voice behaviour (Avery and Quinones, 2004). Continuing the research into this area is important as a positive voice climate may not be a commodity for all employees, and therefore, interventions aimed at improving voice climates may not always be an effective method for improving work-related outcomes (Avery & Quinones, 2004).

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study revealed that voice climate perceptions are composed of three components and that, individually and as a whole, these components are strongly related to the work-related outcomes affective organisational commitment, work engagement, neglect, and exit. These findings add weight to the idea that organisations can benefit by ensuring that work climates are facilitative of employee voice behaviour. Nevertheless, future researchers may wish to expand on these findings using longitudinal design, in order to assess the impact of interventions designed to improve the components of voice climate, and assess the ability of voice climate interventions for improving work-related outcomes. This study sheds lights on future research opportunities, and could assist employers in understanding how their
organisations’ voice climate is linked to work-related outcomes that have been associated with increases in job satisfaction, motivation, performance, mental health, positive attitudes towards the organisation, retention (Kular, Gatenby, Rees, Soane, & Truss, 2008; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2007, as cited in Seppala et al., 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007), and therefore, reductions in replacement costs associated with rehiring and training, productivity loss and damage to morale (O’Connell & Kung, 2007).
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Appendix A

We would like to invite all interested individual employees and organisations as a whole to participate in research about employee Voice!

The Importance of Voice
Voice is the ‘discretionary communications of ideas, suggestions, or opinions intended to improve organisational or unit functioning’ (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011, p 183). There are a number of reasons why a strong presence of Voice is desirable for organisations. For example, as levels of Voice increase, more knowledge and experience is diffused throughout the organisation (Wilkinson & Fay, 2011). This spreading of information can improve managerial systems as it assists in activities such as process improvement (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008).

Research Focus
The current research is interested in examining how employees’ differing views about the importance of Voice (Perceived Importance of Voice) and employees’ perceptions about how facilitative their organisation is of Voice (Voice Climate), interact to affect important work-related outcomes (Work Engagement, Affective Organisational Commitment, Neglect, and Exit).

Details
Participation involves completion of an online questionnaire (approx 15 mins). The research is being conducted by Dr Graeme Ditchburn and Kate Hames at Murdoch University. In addition to providing feedback to your organisation, the results will be used as part of a Psychology Honours Thesis. Organisations and participants taking part in the research will be able to receive feedback by November, 2012.

Link to the questionnaire

Contact
Chief Investigator/Supervisor:
Dr Graeme Ditchburn CPsychol AFBPsS
Ph: 9360 2775
Email: Graeme.Ditchburn@murdoch.edu.au
Student Investigator:
Katie Hames
Ph: 0405388299
Email: katehames@hotmail.com

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2012/068). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University’s Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 (for overseas studies, +61 8 9360 6677) or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix B

Voluntary Participation Withdrawal and Privacy
Your involvement in this study is entirely voluntary. While we would be pleased to have you participate, we respect your right to decline. There are no consequences if you decide not to participate. If you decide to discontinue participation at any time, you may do so without providing an explanation. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.

Your participation in this study and any information will be treated in a confidential manner. Your name and specific information that could be used to identify you will not be collected. However, once you have completed the questionnaire we will not be able to remove your data due to the lack of identifiable information. Following the study the data will be kept in a locked cabinet in the office of the Chief Investigator/Supervisor.

Results
If you would like to view a copy of the summary findings from this study please visit:
http://www.psychology.murdoch.edu.au/researchresults/research_results.html
Or email katehames@hotmail.com and a copy will be provided to you via email upon completion (sometime in November, 2012).
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Voice Climate
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

Employees here are encouraged to develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group

Employees here are encouraged to speak up and get others involved in issues that affect the group

Employees here are encouraged to communicate opinions about work issues with others, even if those opinions are different and others disagree

Employees here are encouraged to keep well informed about issues where our opinions might be useful to the group

Employees here are encouraged to get involved in issues that affect the quality of life here at work

Employees here are encouraged to speak up with new ideas or changes in procedures

Employees can develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group, without fear of reprisal or reprisal

Employees can safely speak up and get others involved in issues that affect the group, with fear of reprisal or reprisal

Employees can communicate opinions about work issues with others without fear of reprisal, even if their opinion is different and others disagree

Employees can keep well informed about issues where their opinions might be useful to the group, without fear of reprisal or reprisal

Employees can get involved in issues that affect the quality of life here at work, without fear of reprisal or reprisal

Employees can safely speak up with new ideas or changes in procedures, without fear of reprisal or reprisal

It is worthwhile for employees to develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect the group

It is worthwhile employees speaking up and getting others involved in issues that affect the group

It is worthwhile for employees to communicate their opinions about work issues, even if those opinions are different and others disagree

It is worthwhile for employees to keep well informed about issues where their opinions might be useful

It is worthwhile employees getting involved in issues that affect the quality of life here at work

It is worthwhile employees speaking up with new ideas or changes in procedures
### Affective Organisational Commitment

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy discussing my organisation with people outside it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation has a great deal of Personal meaning to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work Engagement

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my job, I feel strong and vigorous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am enthusiastic about my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job inspires my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I get up in the morning, I feel like Going to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy when I am working intensely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of the work that I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed in my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get carried away when I am working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Neglect
Please indicate the extent to which the following statements accurately describe your activities during the last six months, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report sick because you do not feel like working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come in late because you do not feel like working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put less effort into your work than may be expected of you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and then, do not put enough effort into your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss out on meetings because you do not feel like attending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exit
Please indicate the extent to which the following statements accurately describe your activities during the last six months, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider possibilities to change jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively look for a job outside your field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend to change employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively look for a job elsewhere within your field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look for job advertisements in newspapers to which you could</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intend to change your field of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Perceived Importance of Voice**
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements, circling only one number for each question. 1 = strongly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 7 = strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voicing my opinions is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to provide input for improving tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the opportunity to speak my mind about how things should be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated when my opinions are not listened to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ideas should be given serious consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should be able to express my ideas/opinions without being reprimanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for an organisation to improve, employees must be able to contribute their opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ideas can be valuable to the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that employees do not bother Supervisors with their ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the best way for employees to contribute to the organisation is by doing what they are told and getting their job done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Shapiro-Wilkes statistics indicated that four of the six variables were not normally distributed.

*Shapiro-Wilkes statistics for all variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice Climate</td>
<td>.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour</td>
<td>.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>.95**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01
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Dependent Variable: Affective Organisational Commitment

### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cenPIV</td>
<td>-.136&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-1.719</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cenVCx cenPIV</td>
<td>.078&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cenVCx cenPIV</td>
<td>.074&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC
- b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC, cenPIV
- c. Dependent Variable: AC

---

### Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual

**Dependent Variable: AC**

![Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual](attachment:image.png)

### Scatterplot

**Dependent Variable: AC**

![Scatterplot](attachment:image.png)
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Dependent Variable: Work Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Minimum Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cenPIV</td>
<td>.151a</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cenVCxcenP IV</td>
<td>.060a</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cenVCxcenP IV</td>
<td>.065b</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC, cenPIV
c. Dependent Variable: WE

Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual

Dependent Variable: WE

Scatterplot
Dependent Variable: WE
## Appendix H (cont.)

Dependent Variable: Neglect

### Excluded Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Minimum Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cenPIV</td>
<td>-.131a</td>
<td>-1.344</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cenVCxcen</td>
<td>.085a</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cenVCxcen</td>
<td>.082b</td>
<td>.923</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC, cenPIV
c. Dependent Variable: Neglect

![Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual](image)

![Scatterplot](image)
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Dependent Variable: Exit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Correlation</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Minimum Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cenPIV</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cenVCxcenP</td>
<td>-104</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>1.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>cenVCxcenP</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), cenVC, cenPIV
c. Dependent Variable: Exit

[Graphs of Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual and Scatterplot]
Visual inspection of the histograms indicated that all three components of voice climate were negatively skewed, and Shapiro-Wilkes statistics indicated that the three components were not normally distributed (Table 1). Therefore, the size and direction of correlations between the components of voice climate and the work-related outcomes was assessed using Kendall’s tau-b (Table 2).

Table 1.
Shapiro-Wilkes statistics for the three components of voice climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.94**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Table 2.
Kendall’s tau_b correlations between voice climate components and work-related outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encouragement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective Commitment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Engagement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neglect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01, * p < .05

As shown in Table 2, the encouragement component of voice climate was more strongly related to the work-related outcomes than the safety or efficacy components. While encouragement and safety were most strongly correlated with affective organisational commitment, efficacy was most strongly correlated with work engagement.
Appendix J

To investigate the underlying structure of the 10-item measure assessing perceived importance of voice behaviour, the data was subjected to principal component extraction with oblimin rotation. This method of analysis was selected as it allows the components to correlate, and is recognised as being psychometrically sound (Fields, 2005).

Three components with Eigenvalues exceeding 1 were identified as constituting the underlying component structure of the 10 items (Table 1). In total, these components accounted for 64.97 percent of the variance in the measure.

Table 1. Oblimin Rotated Component Structure of the 10-Item Perceived Importance of Voice Behaviour Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Loadings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ideas can be valuable to the organisation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important that employees don’t bother supervisors with their ideas</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ideas should be given serious consideration</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order for an organization to improve, employees must be able to contribute their opinions</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should be able to express my ideas/opinions without being reprimanded</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated when my opinions are not listened to</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the best way for employees to contribute to the organization is by doing what they’re told and getting their job done</td>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voicing my opinion is important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value the opportunity to speak my mind about how things should be done</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to provide input for improving tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Variance

|                     | 44% | 10.70% | 10.24% |

Given the sample size of the current study, loading scores of .51 and above should be considered significant at an alpha level of .01 (Fields, 2005). Three items loaded onto component 1 above this level of significance without cross-loading, one item onto component 2, and three items onto component 3. Component 1 was based around the importance of employees’ ideas, while component 3 was based around the importance of being able to speak up and provide input. These two multi-item components had acceptable reliability (Table 2).
Appendix J (cont.)

Table 5.
Cronbach’s Alpha for the Ideas and Speaking-up components of perceived importance of voice behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking-up</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shapiro-Wilkes statistics indicated that ideas and speaking-up components of perceived importance of voice behaviour were not normally distributed (Table 3), and visual inspection of the histograms indicated that responses at the lower end of the 7-point scale (i.e. 1-4) were rare. Due to this lack of response at the lower end of the scale, these components were not expected to moderate the links between voice climate and the work-related outcomes. Therefore, no further analyses were conducted on perceived importance of voice behaviour as a moderator.

Table 3.
Shapiro-Wilkes statistics for the ideas and speaking-up components of perceived importance of voice behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$W$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking-up</td>
<td>.88**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < .01$