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ABSTRACT

This study has two aims: (1) to investigate a mediated relationship between experienced employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate; and (2) to examine the moderation effect of Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions – power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity – on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. A cross-level investigation of employee voice perception involving 487 employees within 22 organizations from multiple organizations in South Korea was conducted. The results showed that employee voice practices are indirectly positively related to employee perception of both voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate. Collectivism and masculinity weakened the positive effect of participative climate on employee perception of voice efficacy, although a strengthening effect of masculinity had been expected. These findings are discussed to identify the study’s contribution to theory and practice.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Employee voice is recognized as a behavior that may contribute to organizational effectiveness. Van Dine and LePine (1998) define voice as “promotive behavior that emphasizes expression of constructive challenge intended to improve rather than merely criticize” (p. 109). Due to the importance of voice, organizations have used various methods to elicit employees’ diverse opinions and ideas that could contribute to the organization’s success. One such method is establishing employee voice practices, which are defined as “organization practices that create opportunities for employees to be involved in the organization’s decision-making process, particularly regarding issues related to work” (Kwon, Farndale, & Park, 2016, p. 328).

Employee voice features prominently in the human resource management (HRM), industrial relations (IR), and organizational behavior (OB) literatures, among others, as it is deemed to have a positive impact on workplace performance in terms of organizational performance and employee morale (Klaas, Olson-Buchanan, & Ward, 2012; Morrison, 2011, 2014; Mowbray, Wilkinson, & Tse, 2015). Research, therefore, has focused on exploring the agency behind what makes employees speak out versus remaining silent. To date, such studies have focused on micro-level individual antecedents of voice (Morrison 2011, 2014; Mowbray et al., 2015), or meso-level organizational moderators or mediators of voice (Gollan & Xu, 2014; Klaas et al., 2012; Morrison, 2011, 2014), while little attention has been paid to macro-contextual factors. This oversight is problematic, as no organization or individual operates in a vacuum, and organizations and individuals both are subject to institutionalized norms and standards from the broader
context (Johns, 2006). Moreover, employee voice studies have been developed with distinct conceptualizations in HRM/IR disciplines and OB discipline, which has created academic silos. In this study, I focus on bridging these academic silos and the influence of macro-level cultural values on employee voice perception, reviewing and extending extant voice literature to hypothesize and test empirically a multilevel framework of the antecedents of voice from a cross-cultural perspective.

Employee voice practices refer to the organizational opportunity given to employees to have their opinions heard in the organization (Kwon et al., 2016), although, over time, the actual voice practices preferred by organizations have changed from indirect to direct voice mechanisms in line with developments in organizational employee representation mechanisms. This recent trend means that voicing opinions has become more frequently an employee’s individual choice rather than being part of a formally required process (Kwon et al., 2016). In addition, employee voice can be seen easily as behaviors against or challenging organizations; therefore, employees might think that speaking out would be risky. Arguably it may be more difficult to make the voice of an individual heard, or for that voice to have a significant impact on workplace decisions, compared to the impact that collective voice could have.

Morrison (2014) proposes that employees should perceive two considerations when deciding to speak out: (a) whether engaging in voice is expected to be effective in bringing about the desired result, and (b) whether speaking out is expected to be safe. Furthermore, according to self-protective implicit voice theories (Detert & Edmondson, 2011), employees can remain silent even after determining that speaking out might be
effective and safe if they are influenced by taken-for-granted automatic processes, such as fear and beliefs.

Merely implementing employee voice practices only represents the intention of the organization (Nishii & Wright, 2008), and this may not align with employee perceptions of whether speaking out is safe and effective. A participative organizational climate is particularly relevant to encouraging employee voice, as it “supports employee participation in work-planning, decision-making, and on-the-job problem solving” (Tesluk, Vance, & Mathieu, 1999, p. 275).

Additionally, national culture has been acknowledged to influence individuals’ perceptions of voice safety and efficacy when making decisions to speak out, but to date, this has only been explored from the perspective of power distance. Power distance has a negative relationship with voice since high power distance cultures accept unequal power distribution whereby only people in more senior positions have the right to voice (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005; Kwon et al., 2016; Landau, 2009). Cultural differences in voice are, however, likely to extend beyond power distance alone (Morrison, 2014). Consistent with the emerging trend of examining individual level cultural values (Zhong, Wayne, & Liden, 2015), this study projects societal culture to the individual level and argues that individual cultural orientations are equally expected to influence voice perceptions. In this study, I focus on four dimensions of cultural value: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity based on their direct relevance to employee voice (Hofstede, 1980). I explore how each dimension is likely to interact with participative organizational climate and hence influence employee perceptions of voice consequences.
In summary, developed and tested in this study are hypotheses about contextual antecedents of employee perceptions of voice safety and efficacy. The study especially stresses meso-level mechanisms of how participative organizational climates mediate the relationship between implemented voice practices and employee perception of voice safety and efficacy. In addition, tested in this study is how macro-level contexts which are manifested in micro-level (individual) cultural values, in this case four different cultural value dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – interact with participative organizational climate to influence employee perception of voice safety and efficacy.

**Research Problems**

Since employee voice was conceptualized in the seminal work of Hirschman (1970), a great deal of subsequent research from a variety of perspectives has followed. However, a few important questions remain to be explored. First, few studies have examined the role of employee voice practices as an antecedent of actual employee voice. As voice studies have developed with different foci in different disciplines such as OB, HRM, and IR, voice channels have also remained distinctive according to the field of study. OB scholars largely focus on direct, informal voice, arguing that “formal mechanisms for individual and collective employee input are not considered as discretionary voice behavior, nor the cause or consequences of this behavior” (Morrison, 2011, p. 381). Conversely, IR scholars define employee voice by focusing on collective mechanisms designed to correct employee dissatisfaction (Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington, & Ackers, 2004). With diminishing union density in advanced economies, voice forms in organizations have, however, shifted away from collective and
representative channels to more individual and direct channels (Wilkinson, Dundon, Donaghey, & Freeman, 2014). With this transition, HRM scholars have focused on direct forms of voice and argue that the role of employee voice is to create opportunities for employees to be involved in decision-making processes in work-related and organizational affairs with the purpose of enhancing organizational performance and employee work experiences (Harley, 2014).

I specify the scope of employee voice practices to direct and formal voice channels, both of which are included within the field of HRM as one component of high performance work systems (HPWS). Given this modeling, most studies have attempted to observe whether voice mechanisms contribute to organizational performance (Harley, 2014), rather than whether implementing voice practices directly influences employee perceptions of voice.

Employee voice perceptions have been studied most frequently in the field of OB, with a widely-used six-item measure of employee voice created by Van Dyne and LePine (1998). With employee voice perceptions as the outcome variable, many studies have attempted to uncover individual level predictors of voice such as job attitudes, personality, performance, and role definitions, as well as context level predictors of voice such as organizational structure, organizational culture, collective-level beliefs, supervisor openness, relationship with supervisor, and leadership style (Morrison, 2011). However, no study has investigated the relationship between employee voice practices and employee voice perceptions, because OB scholars do not include formal voice channels/mechanisms within the scope of their research, and HRM/IR scholars have paid less attention to voice perceptions. By connecting two very closely related but under-
explored concepts – employee voice practices and employee voice perceptions – I aim to cut across the silos of voice research.

Organizational context has been studied as a critical antecedent by both OB and HRM scholars. Further, organizational climate has been studied quite extensively, but only limited studies have explored a mediating role of organizational climate linking antecedents of employee voice to employee voice perception or behavior (e.g. Frazier & Bowler, 2015; Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Huang et al., 2005). In addition, macro-level contextual conditions, e.g. cultural values that influence the mechanisms that link organizational climate and employee voice perceptions, have not been widely studied. Employee voice frameworks to date have largely failed to consider the influence of cultural values on the perceived consequences of voice, or where this has been included, the focus has only been on power distance, as noted earlier (Klaas et al., 2012; Morrison, 2014). Cultural differences in voice are, however, likely to extend beyond this single dimension (Morrison, 2014), shaping the automatic processes of individual employees in the workplace, as these values have been socially constructed over a long period of time in a specific context (Hofstede, 1980). By incorporating how cultural values can influence voice mechanisms, I aim to introduce a novel level of theorizing to the voice discussion.

**Purpose of Study**

**Rationale**

The primary purpose of this study is, first, to theoretically consolidate the definition of employee voice, which has been developed in parallel across three different disciplines: human resource management, industrial relations, and organizational
behaviors. Second, another aim of this study is to demonstrate empirically the influence of employee voice practices on the creation of employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate. Third, the association of four cultural dimensions – power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity – are examined as moderators of the relation of participative climate to employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety.

No research exists on the relationship between formal practices and policies implemented in order to encourage employees to speak out and employee’s perception of whether they can speak out with a belief that their voice will be processed properly and thus generate desired changes, as well as whether their voice behavior would jeopardize their interpersonal and job security. In addition, because the influence of cultural values on employee voice has focused exclusively on power distance, many scholars have called for expanded research on other cultural dimensions (including collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity) as factors that might influence employee voice perception.

A quantitative research method is used in this study to test these mediation and moderation relationships among the addressed variables. Furthermore, multilevel analysis is used to test the hypothesized models, since this study aims to demonstrate the cross-level influence of organizational level independent variable and mediator – shared perception of organizational voice practices and shared perception of participative climates, respectively on individual level dependent variables – employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety, as well as to examine cross-level interaction of organizational level independent variable – participative climate and individual level moderators – power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity on
individual level dependent variables – employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety.

This study particularly considers the South Korean context for several reasons. First, since the economic crisis in 1997, Korean society, especially the Korean corporate environment, has faced a rapid transition from business operations based on traditional values to business operations following neo-liberal values (Rowley & Bae, 2004). Because this transformation has been driven by external forces rather than internal discretion, strategic responses to the change vary according to various characteristics of corporations. Therefore, organizational climate might develop differently based on an organization’s strategy for reacting to rapid external changes. As a result, the role of participative climate in the relationship of employee voice practices to employee voice perception will be manifested clearly in Korean society.

Second, as rapid external and internal changes have driven organizations to adapt to those changes in order to survive, individuals working in organizations have likewise had to respond to those changes. This rapid transition has influenced the younger generations to accept the new values and life style easily, while older generations who have not been influenced by these changes have kept their traditional values. Consequently, a relatively huge generation gap in terms of cultural values has been created, and thus there is more variance in each cultural value. The role of individual cultural dimension on employee voice perception will be discernible. In addition, most Korean corporations with over 30 employees are required to adopt certain kinds of employee voice practices (Lee, 2011). For these reasons, South Korea is a good context for observing the function of organizational climates and cultural values as a mediator.
and moderators on the relations between employee voice practices and employee voice perceptions.

By examining how employees’ perceptions of voice practices influence employees’ overall perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in the South Korean context, this study can help reveal the hidden mechanism that creates employee perceptions of voice. This understanding will be useful for organizations to obtain intended consequences by implementing the employee voice practices. The importance of the participative climate also helps South Korean organizations prepare what they need before and during the implementation of voice practices. Finally, by studying a context where traditional values of cultural dimension and neo-liberal values are mixed, this study will help countries in a similar situation, especially Asian countries, to understand how the mechanisms for employee’s voice perceptions work.

**Research Questions**

Based on the research problem, this study poses three main research questions:

1. How do employee voice practices that are implemented by an organization influence employee voice perceptions?

2. How does a participative organizational climate mediate the relationship between employee voice practices and employee voice perceptions?

3. How do an individual’s cultural values – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – influence the creation of employee voice perceptions?
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of theories and studies related to this research. In order to select reliable literature, especially current research, key words related to the subject of this study are used. The main keywords are “employee voice,” “organizational behavior,” “human resource management,” and “industrial relations,” “employee voice and climate,” “employee perception,” and “employee voice and national culture.” The following databases were used to select literature: Social Science Field on ProQuest (http://search.proquest.com/socialsciences), ABI/INFORM Complete (http://search.proquest.com.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/abicomplete), and Google Scholar (http://scholar.google.com/schhp). Moreover, a few key articles were detected while reading previously found articles and investigating citations in those articles.

The first section of this chapter reviews the development of theoretical perspectives on employee voice from different disciplines and introduces organizational policies and practices for employee voice. The second section outlines the conceptualization of employee perception, presents factors affecting employee perception, and introduces employee perception of voice efficacy and safety. The third section includes a discussion of the literature pertaining to participative climate and the relationship with affective factors. The next section reviews literature related to four cultural values -- power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity -- and their interactive relation with participative climate on employee perception of voice
efficacy and voice safety. This chapter concludes with a theoretical framework and the hypotheses for this study.

**Employee Voice**

**Conceptualization of Employee Voice**

Studies of employee voice emerge across a range of disciplines, including HRM, IR, OB, political science, economics, psychology, and law (Wilkinson et al., 2014), yet few studies adopt an interdisciplinary approach (Wilkinson & Barry, 2016). I focus in this paper on perspectives of employee voice from the fields of HRM, IR, and OB in order to integrate an understanding of employee voice in the management domain.

In the field of management, the conceptualization of employee voice by Hirschman (1970) is the most influential classic theory. In his seminal work, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*, which proposed customer’s potential responses against dissatisfied products and companies (Allen, 2014), Hirschman defined voice as follows:

Any attempt at all to change, rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority with the intention of forcing a change in management, or through various types of actions and protests, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion. (p. 30)

Hirschman (1970) argues that customers respond to dissatisfaction through one of two ways, either by exiting or using voice. He argues that loyalty to the company could influence a customer’s choice between exit and voice; more loyal customers have a desire to change a company’s practices, policies and outputs through voice (Hirschman, 1970). His argument indicates that the voice behavior might be the result of a customer’s positive attachment to the company.
Since Hirschman first published his theory, voice literature in the management field expanded his model until the 1990s, when a division between HRM/IR and OB disciplines started to develop. Farrell (1983) applies Hirschman’s theory to employees and includes *Neglect* as another dimension. He demonstrates that responses of dissatisfied workers include four theoretical categories – exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect, which characterize more specific behaviors such as turnover, absenteeism, lateness, talking to supervisors, or requesting a transfer. Freeman and Medoff (1984) apply the theory to the IR discipline by arguing that unions could improve workplaces through voice. Spencer (1986) examines employee voice from HRM/IR and OB perspectives by demonstrating the negative relationship between employee voice and retention. Whitney and Cooper (1989) attempt to identify predictors of voice behavior, but conclude that it is very difficult to predict why employees voice with dissatisfaction.

Since the 1990s, employee voice research has been developed in HRM, IR and OB disciplines with different foci. Scholars in the IR field have conceptualized employee voice as including employees’ complaints about work-related issues. They intensely studied collective mechanisms such as trade unions and collective bargaining as organizational methods to correct employee dissatisfaction as well as to secure employees’ influence in organizational affairs that influence their working conditions. In response to the trend of diminishing union density in advanced economies and the increasing importance of HRM in organizations, McCabe and Lewin (1992) incorporate participation to the voice concept that had previously dealt only with grievance procedures. With this trend, formal voice channels in organizations have, however, shifted away from collective and representative channels to more individual and direct
channels (Bryson, 2004; Wilkinson et al., 2014). Therefore, HRM scholars focus on
direct forms of voice and argue that the role of employee voice is to create opportunities
for employees to participate in organizational and unit-level decision-making processes in
work-related and organizational affairs, often as part of a high performance work system
(HPWS) with the purpose of enhancing organizational performance and employee work
experiences (Boxall & Purcell, 2011; Harley, 2014). However, this view has been
criticized by IR scholars such that this type of voice is “voice without muscle,” because
the main player who decides whether or not employees have a voice is management
(Kaufman & Taras, 2010).

In contrast, OB scholars have narrowed the voice construct by identifying
employee voice only as challenging and promotive extra-role behaviors. Van Dyne and
LePine (1998) define employee voice as follows:

Voice is promotive behavior that emphasizes expression of constructive challenge
intended to improve rather than merely criticize. Voice is making innovative
suggestions for change and recommending modifications to standard procedures
even when others disagree. (p. 109)

Based on this definition, Van Dyne and LePine (1998) developed a measurement scale to
measure employee voice empirically. Numerous studies in the OB discipline have
adopted this perspective as well as the measurement scale and have demonstrated the role
of employee voice in the organization.

**Definitions of Employee Voice**

As a result of the fractured development of the voice concept, HRM/IR scholars
have developed a broad perspective of employee voice (Barry & Wilkinson, 2016;
Mowbray et al., 2015; Wilkinson & Barry, 2016; Wilkinson et al., 2014). They define
employee voice as including both in-role behavior (i.e., task-based participation and quality circles) and extra-role behavior (i.e., suggestion schemes and employee representation) via formal mechanisms, with the intention of benefiting individual employees by eliminating their dissatisfaction, as well as the organization by introducing new ideas (Mowbray et al., 2015; Wilkinson et al., 2014). For example, Dundon and colleague (2004) combined perspectives developed from both HRM and IR disciplines and provided incorporated definition of employee voice as:

1. articulation of individual dissatisfaction to rectify a problem with management or prevent deterioration in relations,
2. expression of collective organization to provide a counterbalancing source of power to management,
3. contribution to management decision making to seek improvements in work organization, quality, and productivity, and
4. demonstration of mutuality and cooperative relations to achieve long-term viability for organization and its employees. (p. 1153)

In a similar vein, Lavelle, Gunnigle, and McDonnell (2010) define employee voice as “any type of mechanism, structure, or practice, which provides an employee with an opportunity to express an opinion or participation in decision-making within their organization” (p. 396).

Compared to HRM/IR perspective of employee voice that emphasizes formal organizational-level mechanisms benefiting both employees and organizations, OB scholars narrowly define employee voice by focusing on individual-level motivation and channels for organizational improvement. Morrison (2014) consolidates the definition of employee voice as: “informal and discretionary communication by an employee of ideas, suggestions, concerns, information about problems, or opinions about work-related issues to persons who might be able to take an appropriate action, with the intent to bring about improvement or change” (p. 174). This definition focuses on an employee’s prosocial
motivation with the intent of organizational improvement, thereby highlighting discretionary and extra-role behavior (Mowbray et al., 2015), while excluding voice with the intent to express and resolve personal dissatisfaction, also more commonly addressed by HRM and IR scholars. OB scholars have traditionally largely focused on direct, informal voice, arguing that “formal mechanisms for individual and collective employee input are not considered as discretionary voice behavior, nor the cause or consequences of this behavior” (Morrison, 2011, p. 381).

HRM/IR scholars have criticized this narrow OB-centric definition by arguing that motives, content, and channels of voice are limited (Barry & Wilkinson, 2016; Kaufman, 2015; Mowbray et al., 2015; Wilkinson & Barry, 2016; Wilkinson et al., 2014). However, employee voice studies in the OB discipline have focused on individual level antecedents, perceptions, and outcomes of employee voice, which are lacking in HRM/IR-oriented employee voice studies that focus on collective and organizational level mechanisms. By considering and incorporating OB-oriented employee voice research, HRM/IR scholars can further enrich employee voice literature.

At the same time, recent studies in the OB field have tried to extend the definition of employee voice from promotive voice to voices with various motivations and types (Chamberlin, Newton, & Lepine, 2016; Liang, Farh, & Farh, 2012; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Wei, Zhang, & Chen, 2015). Liang et al. (2012) first proposed two types of voice: promotive and prohibitive. They define promotive voice as “employee’s expression of new ideas or suggestions for improving the overall functioning of their work unit or organization” (Liang et al., 2012, p. 74) and assert that its focus is on the future ideal state. On the other hand, prohibitive voice describes “employee’s expressions of concern
about work practices, incidents, or employee behavior that are harmful to their organization” (Liang et al., 2012, p. 75); therefore, it aims to repair a past or present state. Both types of voices fall into the extant voice definition of OB scholars, since both voices are constructive and aimed at benefiting organizations. However, recognition of prohibitive voice can be considered as an answer to HRM/IR scholars’ critique that the OB-centric definition of employee voice covers too limited an area.

Maynes and Podsakoff (2014) agree with the division of voice into promotive and prohibitive, but suggest that voice can be either constructively or destructively focused. Accordingly, they introduced four kinds of voice – supportive, constructive, defensive, and destructive voice – and developed/validated survey measures for the four voice types. Supportive voice is defined as “the voluntary expression of support for worthwhile work-related policies, programs, objectives, procedures, etc., or speaking out in defense of these same things when they are being unfairly criticized” (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014, p. 91). They define constructive voice as “the voluntary expression of ideas, information, or opinions focused on effecting organizationally functional change to the work context” (p. 92). Defensive voice is defined as “the voluntary expression of opposition to changing an organization’s policies, procedures, programs, and practices, even when the proposed changes have merit or making change is necessary” (p. 92). Lastly, destructive voice is defined as “the voluntary expression of hurtful, critical, or debasing opinions regarding work policies, practices, procedures, and so on” (p. 92). Only constructive voice falls into extant definitions of employee voice from both OB and HRM/IR scholars, while the other three voice types include completely different voice characteristics that might not be encouraged by organizations.
These efforts to define employee voice in a more inclusive and broader concept indicate that OB scholars started to recognize the need to include various voice discussions within their research scheme. However, OB scholars still define voice as the voluntary expression of employees rather than a systemic expression of employees through an established formal voice channel, although few scholars have recently begun to recognize that there are various forms, mechanisms, and channels for voice (Morrison, 2014; Klaas et al., 2012). In addition, their focus remains on whether employee voice benefits the organization rather than on whether employee voice might benefit individual employees.

There have been attempts to generate integrative constructs for employee voice, but these attempts have mainly been within the OB discipline with OB-centric definitions and have given little consideration to constructs developed in the HRM and IR disciplines. Most recently, a few studies in HRM/IR discipline have recognized the need to create an integrative employee voice definition on the basis of the OB, HRM, and IR disciplines (Barry & Wilkinson, 2015; Kaufman, 2015; Mowbray et al., 2015). For example, Wilkinson and colleagues (2014, p. 5) define employee voice as: “the ways and means through which employees attempt to have a say and potentially influence organizational affairs relating to issues that affect their work and the interests of managers and owners.” They assert that this definition shows multiple motives such as involvement and participation in decision-making and raising complaints, as well as combines a variety of institutional channels such as collective bargaining through labor unions and employer-implemented non-union employee representation, which have often
been omitted from the OB definition of employee voice. Moreover, Kaufman (2015) conceptualizes that employee voice to managers:

Has both integrative/pie-growing and distributive/pie-sharing dimensions, and takes place in highly variegated forms and settings ranging from an informal 5 minute problem-solving to collective bargaining, and includes not only face-to-face talk but also other forms of communication, such as emails, grievance filing, and striking. (p. 23)

In line with these developments, I adopt in this paper an inclusive definition of employee voice incorporating OB, HRM and IR definitions, conceptualizing voice as agentic behavior of employees who are driven by a prosocial desire for organizational advancement, complaints or dissatisfaction about work-related issues, and/or a willingness to participate in organizational decision-making processes to speak out through formal or informal voice structures.

**Organizational Practices for Employee Voice**

Leaders of organizations have realized that employee voice can be beneficial to the organization. As a method of encouraging employee voice, many organizations have adopted a number of formal employee voice practices. Employee voice practices refer to any formal opportunity given to employees to have their opinions heard in the organization (Kwon et al., 2016), although the actual voice practices preferred by organizations have changed in line with developments in organizations’ employee representation mechanisms over time. This transformation may have significant implications for studies in the management field, as it raises the question of whether voice practices currently used in organizations are effective in actually eliciting employees’ real voice.
Historically, the majority of employee voice practices occurred through indirect mechanisms such as collective bargaining through trade unions (Dundon et al., 2004). Indirect voice, often called collective or representative voice, has a focus on safeguarding employees, including “all mechanisms based on employee collectives and, therefore, encompasses but is more than a synonym for trade unions and joint consultative committees or work councils” (Brewster, Croucher, Wood, & Brookes, 2007, p. 1248). Examples of indirect voice include “elected employee councils, multi-step arbitration-mediation systems, collective bargaining, union-supported grievance procedures, and co-determination systems” (Kaufman, 2015, p. 34). These practices allowed for a loosely coupled connection between the individual employee and the organization’s management through the mediating mechanism of the trade union. Although indirect, these mechanisms were formal processes in which both parties were obliged to participate.

Voice through a collective channel is believed to be more effective and safer than direct voice because of its independence of management: “employee voice is able to exert more influence and power as it is collectively organized, and thus provides employees with more effective say, protection, and leverage over work terms and conditions” (Kaufman, 2015, p. 34). Indirect voice is thus expected to allow employees greater freedom to express concerns without fear of reprisal (Black & Lynch, 2004; Harcourt, Wood, & Harcourt, 2004). However, there is also a counter-argument: some employers attempt to control indirect voice by weakening this collective channel because they fear that collective voice eventually will raise costs and reduce profit. Collective voice is thus seen as transferring power from the employer to the employee (Kaufman, 2015). Moreover, union membership has declined sharply in many advanced economies, and a
sharp decrease in indirect voice channels has been witnessed over recent decades (Bryson, 2004).

Recent practices show that more organizations have adopted direct voice mechanisms such as formally designated teams, problem-solving groups, attitude surveys, suggestion schemes, appraisal systems, and meetings between managers and individual employees (Lavelle et al., 2010). This recent trend towards directness means that voicing opinions has become more frequently an expression of employee’s individual choice rather than being part of a collective process; therefore, the identity of the speaker can be apparent to management. Moreover, arguably it may be more difficult to make the voice of an individual heard, or for it to have a significant impact on workplace decisions, compared to the collective voice. It may also seem riskier for an individual to raise a complaint about work or the organization because of the potential threat to his or her job security. If the use of such mechanisms is left to the discretion of individual employees, the significant investment by organizations in costly direct voice mechanisms may become redundant. Evidence of this redundancy has been found, suggesting that many employee participation practices fail when the use of such practices is not encouraged by an appropriate organizational climate and context (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, & Jennings, 1988; Shadur, Kienzle, & Rodwell, 1999).

**Employee Perception of Employee Voice**

Implementing direct voice practices to facilitate employee voice behavior does not automatically guarantee that employees will speak out, due to the inherent risk embedded in direct voice practices as discussed above. In order to encourage employees to use these practices, organization and management should consider various factors that
encourage or complicate the effect of the intended employee voice practices on actual employee voice behavior. These factors are often described as a “black box,” because it is not clear that what is happening between input – employee voice practices and output – expected behavioral or attitudinal changes. It is therefore important to unlock this black box by understanding employee perceptions of voice (Nishii & Wright, 2008), because these perceptions may be major antecedents of actual employee attitudes and behaviors.

Morrison (2014) suggested safety and efficacy of voice as key perceptions that employees calculate before making a decision to speak out. Employees are said to go through three steps in order to decide whether to speak out or to remain silent (Morrison, 2014). The first step involves employees having something to say related to a prosocial desire for organizational improvement. Once employees are motivated to speak, they calculate whether their voice will be received well and whether it will change the status quo (i.e., be effective). Employees also consider whether their behavior (speaking out) could lead to any negative consequences that could jeopardize their status or job security (i.e., be safe). Even if employees pass this ‘expected utility calculus’ stage, they are again influenced by a ‘non-calculative automatic process’ that can include negative emotions – fear, anger, taken-for-granted beliefs about voice risk created through socialization and culture – that can either facilitate or hinder employees from speaking out (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Morrison, 2014). Wei, Zhang, and Chen’s (2015) empirical study in China supports the importance placed on employee perceptions of safety and efficacy. They contend that employees are more likely to speak out and consider doing so an opportunity to fulfill socially desirable motivations if voice can change the status quo (be effective) without threatening the speaker’s job and interpersonal security (be safe).
Although Morrison (2014) separated expected utility calculus of safety and efficacy from the non-calculative automatic process, I argue that individual’s non-calculative automatic process regarding voice strongly influences their utility calculus process of whether speaking out in an organization is perceived as safe and effective or not; therefore, it is one inclusive mechanism from intention (organizational) to perception (individual) to decision (individual). If employees perceive that speaking out in the organization is safe and effective, they are likely to use the voice practices more frequently and sincerely. Although there might be employees who still speak out while acknowledging that voice behavior may bring risky consequences (based on IR perspective: Kaufman, 2015), perception of efficacy and safety is still critical for employees to make a decision about whether they will speak out or not. Since creating these perceptions is critical for the success of voice, understanding what shapes employees’ perceptions is important.

**Conceptualization of Employee Perception**

Perception is defined as a filter that individuals use to interpret their environment through a complex cognitive process, such as organizing and interpreting their sensory impressions, that results in different attitudes and behaviors (Luthans, 2011). Understanding perception and its role is important because what we perceive can be different from objective reality (Robins & Judge, 2011). The concept of perception is extremely important in the field of human resource management, since research in this field examines how employees – human beings – behave in response to internal and external stimulation. Furthermore, employees’ behaviors are based on their perception of what is the reality of this stimulation, not on the reality itself (Robins & Judge, 2011).
Applying this concept to the employee voice practices, employees would use the voice practices based on their perception whether speaking out in their organization is considered as safe and effective (Morrison, 2014), rather than on the accessibility of the employee voice practices.

The question that arises is how do people develop specific perceptions of a specific object, process, or event? A number of factors operate to shape and distort perception. These factors can be organized into three main categories: factors in the perceiver (individual who perceives), characteristics of the object or event being perceived, and context.

**Factors Influencing Employee Perception**

When people look at an object and try to interpret what they see, their interpretation is strongly influenced by their personal characteristics. Characteristics that influence perceptions include attitudes, personality, motives, interests, and expectations (Robins & Judge, 2011). Education, family situation, and past experiences combine to create these individually unique characteristics, so that people may have different reaction to the same situation and stimuli, i.e., the same employee voice practices (Luthans, 2011). Numerous studies have already investigated individual dispositions as critical antecedents of employee voice (e.g., LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014; Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrision, 2014). According to arguments from these studies, some individuals are more or less likely to speak out because of their inherent characteristics. For example, individuals are more likely to speak out if they perceive themselves as perseverant, eager to achieve, assertive, and open to new opportunities and change (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014), as
having conscientiousness, extraversion, proactive personality (Morrison, 2014), as amiable and courteous (Crant, Kim, & Wang, 2011), as being likely to take initiative to work (Ohly, Sonnentag, & Pluntke, 2006), and as organizational contributors (Liang & Gong, 2013). Individuals with these dispositions are more likely to perceive that speaking out in their organization might be more safe and effective than individuals without these dispositions, and consequently to engage in voice behavior.

However, Schneider (1987) explains that the variations of individual characteristics in an organization are narrowed down, so that those remaining are a relatively homogenous group of employees who share similar individual characteristics. He demonstrates this process through the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) model, described as “attraction to an organization, selection by it, and attrition from it yields particular kinds of persons in an organization” (p. 442). He argues that people who are sharing some extent of individual characteristics are attracted to the same organization, and those people are again selected by the organization through the specific selection process, and then these selected people leave when they do not fit. Therefore, the range of variance in individual differences in the same organization is much less than in individuals outside the organization (Schneider, 1987). Consequently, employees in the same organizations are likely to share similar perceptions and experiences in the work environment such as organizational policies and practices (Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006). Therefore, I can minimize individual factors, as they are largely managed through the attraction, selection, and attrition process.

A second factor affecting perception is the characteristics of the object. Robins and Judge (2011) include novelty, motion, sounds, size, background, proximity, and
similarity in this category. Specific to HRM practices, such as employee voice practices, Bowen and Ostroff (2004) argue that the process of implementing HR practices should serve as a communication mechanism which signals employees to behave in a certain way. When HRM practices are effectively communicated to employees, employees can perceive the HRM system as high in distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus. To be communicated effectively, an HRM practice should be visible, be understandable, obtain legitimacy of authority, have relevance to employees’ goal, establish an effect consistently and broadly, have agreement among decision makers, and be delivered fairly (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004). Therefore, under the assumption that employee voice practices are implemented accordingly, employee voice practices themselves should satisfy these required conditions to be perceived by employees as safe and effective.

The third factor that affects perception is context. Robins and Judge (2011) define context as the environmental characteristics around the object and the perceivers. The context category includes time, work setting, and social setting (Robins & Judge, 2011). Of the three factors, I argue that characteristics of organizational context have the greatest impact on employee perception of the object – employee voice practices – in the current business world, since every organization has created and developed an organizational context through interactions among organizational members that is distinct from those of other organizations (Wright & Nishii, 2007), and this organizational context also interacts with different national cultures, which more frequently happens due to globalization, to shape employee perceptions of voice efficacy and safety.
Organizational Climate

To understand and measure organizational context, most research employs the concept of organizational climate, because the reality of the context of organization can be perceived differently by its members, and measuring this different perception collectively can show the overall level of perception of the organization. Organizational climate has been broadly defined as “employees’ shared perception of organizational events, practices, and procedures” (Patterson et al., 2005, p. 380). It is considered as a mediating variable between organizational context and employee behaviors (Patterson et al., 2005). Although climate is a collective belief or perception about organizational events, practices, and procedures, organizational and group climate have been shown to be distinct from individual perceptions and attitudes about those events, practices, and procedures (Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006).

The concept of organizational culture is similar to the concept of organizational climate since both concepts describe employees’ experiences of the organization. However, most scholars agree with the distinction that organizational culture conveys broader concepts defined as shared value(s), common assumptions, and belief(s) possessed by organizational members, whereas organizational climate is more behaviorally-oriented in that it accounts for specific values that might be found in the organization such as creativity, service, and innovation (Schneider, 2000). Therefore, organizational climate can be understood as a surface manifestation of organizational culture (Patterson et al., 2005). For the purpose of the study, organizational climate is more apt than organizational culture, because this study aims to look at the process of how employees perceive specific practices (i.e., employee voice practices) and specific
climates related to employees’ behavior in using those practices. Likewise, as most climate research uses quantitative research methods to compare multiple organizations, while most culture research uses qualitative research methods to reach an in-depth understanding of a single organization (Patterson et al, 2005), focus on organizational climate matches well with this study’s methodology.

**Participative Climate**

The question organizations are asking is what kind of organizational climate can be fostered to persuade employees to perceive that speaking out in an organization is safe and effective. Since employee voice practices aim for employees to be involved and participate in the organizational decision-making process or the organizational improvement process, a climate encouraging employees’ involvement and participation can be widened to a climate encouraging employees to participate in the organization through the use of employee voice practices.

Shadur, Kienzle, and Rodwell (1999) argue that participation in the decision-making process, teamwork, and communication are factors of employee involvement, and seek to demonstrate the relationship between organizational climate and perceptions of participation in decision making, teamwork, and communication. Shadur et al. (1999) use three dimensions of organizational climate -- support, innovation, and bureaucracy -- and propose that a supportive and innovative climate would have a positive relationship with perceptions of employee involvement, while a bureaucratic climate would have a negative relationship. The results of this study demonstrate that only a supportive climate has a positive relationship with perceptions of the three dimensions of employee involvement. Supportive climate in their study is defined as “incorporating values such as..."
harmony, openness, friendship, collaboration, encouragement, sociability, personal freedom, and trust” (Shadur et al., 1999, p. 485). Some elements of supportive climate can also contribute to the creation of a climate that encourages employee participation. Boudrias, Brunet, Morin, Savoie, Plunier, and Cacciatore (2010) also provide a similar argument that an organizational climate that supports participation can be defined as a supportive climate which exists when “employees perceive that their organization considers them as important assets, recognizes their contribution, values job autonomy, and provides opportunities for development” (p. 202).

Wang and Hsieh (2013) focus on five types of ethical climates and investigate their relationship with employee silence, defined as “employee’s withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual’s behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his or her organizational circumstance to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress” (Pinder & Harlos, 2001, p. 334). There are five ethical climates: instrumental climate that emphasizes “the maximization of self-interest, an egoistic concern at the individual or local level;” caring climate that focuses on “the well-being of others – a benevolent concern at the individual or local level;” independence climate that emphasizes “adherence to one’s personal ethical beliefs – a principled concern at the individual level;” rules climates that focuses on “sticking to the company’s policies and procedures – a principled concern at the local level;” and law and order climate that emphasize “complying with the law and professional standards – a principled concern at the cosmopolitan level” (Wang & Hsieh, 2014, p. 787). These researchers find that caring climate has a negative effect on employee silence and instrumental climate has a positive effect on employee silence.
While Shadur et al. (1999) and Boudrias et al. (2010) generally use dimensions of organizational climate to demonstrate its relationship with factors of employee involvement, some researchers define a participative climate more specifically. Spreitzer (1996) explains that the acknowledgement, creation, and liberation of employees are valued in the participative climate, while control, order, and predictability are valued in the non-participative climate. He also states that the participative climate emphasizes individual contribution and initiative by helping employees believe that they are important assets in the organization and that their involvement can change the organization (Spreitzer, 1996).

Tesluk, Vance, and Mathieu (1999) find that a participative climate has a significant influence on effective high-involvement system. They define the participative climate as a “climate that supports employee participation in work-planning, decision-making, and on-the-job problem solving” (p. 275). Further, Tesluk and colleagues develop a 15-item measurement of participative climate based on Taylor and Bower’s (1972) decision-making climate scale, assessing “the extent to which employees’ opinions and ideas are solicited, employees are actively involved in making decisions, and employees are kept informed regarding practices and policies” (Tesluk et al., 1999, p. 282).

Some scholars have tried to more narrowly define organizational climate related to employee voice: a voice climate (Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar 2011). Morrison and colleagues (2011) conceptualize a group voice climate that has two dimensions: group voice safety beliefs defined as “a shared belief about whether speaking up is safe versus dangerous,” and group voice efficacy beliefs
defined as “a shared belief about whether group members are able to voice effectively” (p. 184). They argue that group voice climate develops as “a result of social interaction and collective sensemaking” (p. 185) and that leadership style, leader behavior, vicarious learning and salient events in the organization are key factors influencing group voice climate. They create a 12-item measure for group voice climate, as well as test and support its construct validity. Morrison et al. (2011) demonstrate that group voice climate has a positive relation with an individual’s voice behavior. In addition, they demonstrate the moderating effect of group voice climate on the relationship between individual-level identification/satisfaction and voice behavior.

I argue that a participative climate, among other related organizational climates that facilitate employee voice, is a relevant mechanism to this paper’s discussion investigating the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perceptions of voice efficacy and safety, because it has a conceptual connection with both variables. Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, (2005) define participative climate as “the employee’s collective perception of the extent to which new ideas, suggestions, and even dissenting views are encouraged by management” (p. 463). Several studies have argued and shown that organizational climate can be generated by implementing relevant organizational policies and practices that are implemented to involve and support employees (e.g., Kopelman, Brief, Guzzo, 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006).

However, those studies also emphasize the critical role of social support provided by management in the organization to generate an organizational climate (Kopelman et al., 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Participative climate is an organization-specific
characteristic that has been formed by social interactions among formal voice mechanisms, employees, and management who shows a specific reaction – whether support or decline – to employee voice. In other words, different organizations might have different levels of participative climate, even though they establish identical voice practices.

Participative climate also has a direct connection to employee perception of voice safety and efficacy. Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin (2003) introduce the concept of “favorable context” and explain that employees are more likely to voice (issue selling) by judging whether a favorable context exist in the organization. Favorable context is a concept similar to participative climate and is described as where “top management is perceived to be willing to listen, the culture is seen as generally supportive, and there is relatively little uncertainty or fear of negative consequences” (p. 1455). Based on this explanation, Milliken et al. (2003) suggest that if there is an unfavorable context, which is defined as one “where employees believe that raising an issue may lead to negative consequences” (p. 1456), employees are more likely to remain silent. Milliken and colleagues also introduce five fears. Four are related to voice safety: being labelled or viewed negatively; damaged relationships; retaliation or punishment; and negative impact on others. One is related to voice efficacy – the belief that their voice behavior will not make a difference – that contributes to employee silence. In addition, they argue that an unsupportive culture may generate these five fears and thus influence employee silence (2003). Huang et al., (2005) also emphasize safety and low risk in terms of speaking out as major characteristics of participative climate. Lee, Diefendorff, Kim, and Bian (2014) agree that a participative culture is one where speaking up is valued and safe.
Cultural Values Influencing Employee Voice

As discussed above, employee perception on voice safety and efficacy can be initiated by existing accessible practices, and this relationship will be mediated by a level of participative climate that is uniquely created and developed within an organization. If a participative climate has been created, employees are able to perceive that speaking out might be safe and effective. However, as organizations do not exist in a vacuum, broader external factors interact with organizational climate to influence employee perception of voice safety and efficacy. Among these factors, cultural values play a critical role in determining the appropriate attitudes and behaviors of individuals, since organizations and individuals are sub-units of a nation.

Many scholars argue that culture has greater influence on some aspects of organizational practices than other contextual factors (Child, 1981; Tayeb, 1987). For example, Child (1981) argues that cultural factors influence people’s choice among alternative choices and therefore, culture has a moderating effect on organizations. Tayeb (1987) argues that culture influences the interpersonal aspects of an organization such as communication patterns, while other contextual variables such as size, structure, and technology influence formal aspects – centralization, formalization, and specialization of an organization.

Before globalization, there may have been little need to consider cultural values, since organizations operated within national borders and the major contextual influence on employee perception was organizational context, as employees possessed relatively similar cultural values. People still have individual beliefs, but those with similar characteristics are more likely to be located together. However, due to accelerating
globalization, organizational practices implemented by multinational companies (MNCs) are becoming isomorphic regardless of country. Increasing numbers of MNCs have emerged, many of which have adopted practices that were created and successful in developed countries as best practices to increase organizational performance regardless of national characteristics (Pudelko & Harzing, 2008). However, there is no guarantee that these best practices will achieve the same level of success in other cultural contexts, due to the different business norms and values in different national cultures (Marchington & Grugulis, 2000; Rowley & Benson, 2002). Unique national cultures may be critical factors in forming the values and beliefs of individual employees (Kwon et al., 2016), as culture represents “the collective mental programming” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 43) of a nation.

As noted, from self-protective implicit voice theories (Detert & Edmondson, 2011), Morrison (2014) separated ‘conscious expected utility calculus’ for safety and effectiveness of voice from the ‘unconscious/non-calculative automatic process’ that influences employee decisions to speak out or remain silent. I build on this thinking here, positing that employee perception resulting from conscious calculation about safety and effectiveness is heavily influenced by the degree of an individual’s non-conscious fear, anger, and taken-for-granted beliefs about voice, in part at least generated by his or her socialization and cultural values. For example, an employee raised in a culture that values high power distance that allows unequal power distribution (Hofstede, 1980) may have a strong belief that speaking out to his or her supervisor is inappropriate behavior and could be considered insubordination, anticipating negative consequences of voice. This employee is being affected (at least partially) by the non-calculative automatic process
emanating from societal cultural values that lead him or her to consciously calculate voice as unsafe and ineffective.

To date, employee voice frameworks have largely failed to consider the influence of cultural values on the perceived consequences of voice. In the cases where this has been included, the focus has been on a single dimension: power distance (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Brockner et al., 2001; Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005; Kwon et al., 2016; Landau, 2009; Wei et al., 2015), since the level of power distance has been known as the most relevant to employee voice (Landau, 2009). Culture differences in voice are, however, likely to extend beyond this single dimension (Morrison, 2014), shaping the automatic processes of individual employees in the workplace, as some components of these different values might have direct or indirect relationship with the characteristics of employee voice.

National-level cultural values can be represented in the individual members, since these individuals are embedded in their own national context (Koch, Koch, Menon, & Shenkar, 2016). Recent studies have demonstrated a strong connection between national-level cultural values and their expression at organizational and individual levels (House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, & Sully de Luque, 2014). Therefore, in this study, I project national level cultural values to the individual level, and argue that individual cultural orientations are equally expected to influence voice perceptions. In this paper, I focus on three more dimensions – uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – in addition to power distance that I argue can be directly relevant to the perception of voice consequences (Hofstede, 1980).
**Power Distance**

According to Hofstede, power distance is defined as “the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally” (1980, p. 45). High power distance has received attention as a factor affecting voice, as it determines the level of decision-making power among members of the organization in accordance with member’s hierarchical position, and the willingness of employees to share opinions, ideas and thoughts (Landau, 2009). Since employee voice is a means to input the opinions of members who are in the low level of hierarchical order in the decision-making process, the level of power distance can determine the amount of power that employees in different positions hold in terms of decision making.

In low power distance cultures, society members tend to decrease unequal power distribution in the various levels of decision-making processes (Brockner et al., 2001). Therefore, employees in low power distance cultures believe that they have the right to voice out in organizations. At the same time, management is more likely to share its decision-making power with employees. In contrast, employees in high power distance cultures are unlikely to believe that they have a right to say in the organizational decision-making process or to complain about their work-related environment. In addition, they are more likely to believe that voice behavior elicits unnecessary conflict with their supervisors and the organization (Huang et al., 2005) Management in high power distance cultures is also less likely to share its decision making power, since this power is considered as their own right. Employees in high power distance cultures are more likely to perceive voice as unsafe and ineffective since it may harm their
relationship with their manager, as well as to feel it is not the employee’s place to speak out (Wei et al., 2015).

Therefore, even if a participative climate has been created and developed in an organization as a result of both establishing employee voice practices and the support from management to speak out, the level of power distance of an individual employee will influence how the employee perceives voice efficacy and voice safety. An individual employee’s tendency to avoid voice that has been created from his/her belief in high power distance will attenuate the influence of participative climate on employee perception of voice efficacy and safety.

**Collectivism**

Collectivism “is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-group (relatives, clan, organizations) to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). Collectivist cultures value group identities, consciousness, and group benefits more than individualistic cultures do (Sullivan et al., 2003). Values such as membership, order, duty, and security in the organization provide stability, and keeping those values is the primary goal (Sullivan et al., 2003). In such societies, collective interest is considered as a shared value that should have priority over pursuing self-interest. As a result, individuals naturally develop a strong obligation and duty to a group to which they belong (Triandis, 1995). In contrast, highly individualistic cultures emphasize the values of self-interest and initiative, and their ultimate goal is to increase the interests of individuals. Individuals’ attachment to organizations “is mainly
calculative which means autonomy, variety, pleasure, financial security, and friendships all envelop this goal” (Sullivan et al., 2003, p. 195).

Voice that is seen as challenging organizational interest or pursues only self-interest, which might benefit the organization in the long term, is therefore more likely to be considered as behavior that is disruptive to the status quo, harmful to interpersonal relationships, and threatening to group cohesiveness (Ng & Feldman, 2015; Thomas & Au, 2002). I therefore expect collectivism to have a negative relationship with employee voice. Furthermore, acceptable behavior in a society high on collectivism is strongly influenced by socially ingrained norms, duties, and obligations, so group members are less likely to exhibit behaviors that do not conform to social values. Empirical research supports such reasoning: Thomas and Au’s (2002) cross-cultural study of employees in Hong Kong and New Zealand demonstrates that horizontal individualism (which has the opposite characteristics of in-group collectivism) has a positive relationship with voice. Therefore, I expect that the relationship between participative climate and employee perception on voice efficacy and voice safety will be weaker in individuals with collectivistic value.

**Uncertainty Avoidance**

The third dimension, uncertainty avoidance is defined as:

The extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise. (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45)

Time, work ethic, acceptable behavior, emotional display, rules and regulations, and derivation of knowledge are the value orientations that characterize uncertainty
avoidance (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, societies with a high level of uncertainty avoidance tend to “have a higher level of anxiety and aggressiveness that creates a strong inner urge in people to work hard” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). In contrast, societies with a low level of uncertainty avoidance are not bound by rules, are free with time, and do not hold a strong work ethic (Sullivan, Mitchell, & Uhl-Bien, 2003). In this type of society, people do not value aggressive and emotional displays, and knowledge is created based on common sense principles (Sullivan et al., 2003).

Due to their emphasis on stability, formal rules, and intolerance for deviant ideas and behaviors, members in a high uncertainty avoidance culture consider change to be undesirable since it can bring ambiguity (Griffin & Pustay, 2012). These members also prefer to maintain the status quo (Aycan, 2005). Considering the nature of employee voice that would bring instability from changes and uncertainty from breaking status quo, I expect uncertainty avoidance to have a negative relationship with voice, as employees with high uncertainty avoidance value might perceive that speaking out is unsafe and ineffective (Dutton, Ashford, O’Neill, Hayes, & Wierba, 1997). Therefore, the relationship between participative climate and employee perception on voice safety and efficacy will be weaker in employees with high uncertainty avoidance value.

Masculinity

Masculinity expresses “the extent to which the dominant values in society are masculine – that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things, and not caring for others, the quality of life, or people” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 46). Hofstede explains that the reason his value is labeled as masculine is that within almost all societies, men scored higher in terms of the positive sense of those values, and the gap between men’s value
and women’s value is wider where the society is more masculine. Masculine cultures value constant drive for excelling, so only those who are assertive for success and achieve high performance are recognized (Sullivan et al., 2003). By contrast, feminine cultures value relationships, modesty, caring for the weak, and quality of life (Hofstede, 1985). They take care of those whom cannot achieve high performance and sometimes fail.

An individual with high assertiveness tends to “speak up, defend, and act in the interest of themselves and their own value, preference, and goals” (Ames & Flynn, 2007, p. 308). A society that values assertiveness is more likely to encourage its members to “vocalize their needs, defend against imposition, articulate clear demand, and display annoyance” (Ames & Flynn, 2007, p. 308). Therefore, masculinity is expected to have a positive relationship with employee voice because highly assertive individuals are more likely to express themselves and to be direct in communication (Morrison, Chen, & Salgado, 2004; Naus, Van Iterson, & Roe, 2007). Individuals in societies with high assertiveness may engage more actively in organizational decision-making processes, feedback-seeking behaviors, and dissatisfaction-resolving behaviors (in other words, voice activities) because they are socialized to communicate their needs and goals directly and openly in order to achieve them (Morrison, 2014; Morrison et al., 2004).

In addition, societies and organizations that drive for high performance often value individuals who go beyond the call of duty and contribute extra effort to achieve performance improvement (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). Therefore, voice might be considered as being both safe and effective by employees if they are able to suggest ideas for organizational improvement, address any concerns that might be
undermining performance, or be involved in decisions to potentially help the organization perform better as a kind of citizenship behavior (Lepine & Van Dyne, 2001). Therefore, employees in masculine cultures are expected to perceive that speaking out might be safe and effective and even be rewarded in some organizations through performance-based pay systems (Harley, 2014). Thus, the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and safety will be stronger in individuals with masculine value.

**Research Model and Hypotheses**

In this section, I propose a research model and hypotheses based on theoretical and empirical rationale from the literature review. The multilevel model developed here explains how organizational (participative) climate mediates the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety (see Figure 2-1). The model also explains how individual cultural values, represented by power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity, moderates the relationship between organizational participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety.

The ultimate goal of implementing employee voice practices is to encourage employees to participate in organizational decision-making processes and to express their concerns in order to achieve organization improvement. However, employees might not feel safe complaining about work processes and the organization to a higher authority, since it might be seen as insubordination that jeopardizes job security or future career. In addition, employees might think speaking out is useless, because their voice will not be
heard well and processed properly. Therefore, employees need to perceive that using these voice practices will be safe and effective as well as encouraged by the organization.

Figure 2-1. The multilevel model of employee voice mechanism

Mere accessibility of the formal practices may be insufficient to create employee perceptions of voice safety and efficacy. What really matters to employees is a participative climate that signals to employees that speaking out does not violate the organizational norm, thus your voice will be heard well and processed appropriately and you will be safe. A participative climate can be generated by implementing a formal organizational mechanism that encourages employees’ participation as well as by being supported by a management that is ready to listen to employees (Kopelman, Brief, Guzzo, 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000, Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006). I argue that
the implementation of employee voice practices can create this participative climate in
the organization. Accessibility to the employee voice practice can give employees a sense
that their organization values employee voice and is ready to listen to employee
complaints and suggestions for further improvement. Therefore, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 1. Actual employee voice practices will influence participative
climate.*

Participative climate is a social-type voice mechanism based on not only the
structural mechanism – employee voice practices, but also social interactions between
supportive management (Huang et al., 2005). Therefore, employees can sense that
employee participation is welcome in the organization through the collective perception -
- participative climate, and consider this climate as a signal that their voice will be heard
and processed properly (efficacy) and will not bring negative consequences (safety).
Therefore, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 2. Participative climate will have a positive effect on employee
perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety.*

As suggested in hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2, employee voice practices will
have positive effect on participative climate, and this particular organizational climate
will have a positive effect on employee perceptions of voice efficacy and voice safety.
Therefore, I hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 3. Participative climate will mediate the relationship between
employee voice practice and employee perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b)
voice safety.*
Power distance determines appropriate attitudes and behaviors in consonance with a person’s hierarchical position (Landau, 2009) and hence the level of decision-making power among the organizational members and the willingness of employees to share opinions, ideas and thoughts. Therefore, employees with high power distance value are more likely to perceive voice as unsafe and ineffective since it may harm their relationship with their manager and to feel it is not the employee’s place to speak out (Wei et al., 2015). Moreover, the positive effect of participative climate on employee voice perceptions will be weaker for employees who are acculturated as high power distance. Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 4.** The level of power distance moderates the association between participative climate and employee perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety; the effect of organizational participative climate on (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety is stronger when the level of power distance is low.

In collectivist societies, collective interest is considered as a shared value that should have priority over pursuing self-interest, and individuals easily develop a strong obligation and duty to a group to which they belong (Triandis, 1995). Voice that challenges organizational interest or pursues only self-interest is more likely, therefore, to be considered as behavior that is disruptive to the status quo and harmful to interpersonal relationships, threatening group cohesiveness (Ng & Feldman, 2015). Therefore, I hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 5.** The level of collectivism moderates the association between organizational participative climate and employee perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety; the effect of organizational participative climate on
(a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety is stronger when the level of collectivism is low.

Members in a high uncertainty avoidance culture consider change as undesirable because it might result in ambiguity (Griffin & Pustay, 2012). I expect, therefore, uncertainty avoidance to have a negative relationship with voice, since employees with high uncertainty avoidance value might perceive that speaking out is unsafe and ineffective, in that it challenges the status quo (Dutton et al., 1997). This negative relationship also influences uncertainty avoidance’s role as moderator on the relationship between participative culture and employee perception on voice efficacy and safety. Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 6. The level of uncertainty avoidance moderates the association between organizational participative climate and employee perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety; the effect of organizational participative climate on (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety is stronger when the level of uncertainty avoidance is low.

Masculinity is manifested as having high assertiveness and drive for high performance (Hofstede, 1980). Masculinity is expected to have a positive relationship with employee voice. Further, individuals might consider voice as safe and effective, because highly assertive individuals are more likely to express themselves and to be direct in communication (Naus, Van Iterson, & Roe, 2007), and individuals who drive for high performance are more likely to involve voice activity for organizational improvement as a kind of citizenship behavior. Therefore, I hypothesize:
Hypothesis 7. The level of masculinity moderates the association between organizational participative climate and employee perceptions of (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety; the effect of organizational participative climate on (a) voice efficacy and (b) voice safety is stronger when the level of masculinity is high.
Chapter 3

METHOD

This chapter delineates the methodological design and procedures of this study. First, the research questions are restated. Then, the research procedure is explained, followed by a data collection procedure and analysis approach. The target population, sample, and data analysis plan of each phase are explained.

Restatement of Research Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to analyze how employee voice practices implemented by the organization influence employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in corporations in South Korea. This study especially emphasizes the role of participative climate as a mediator on the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. In addition, this study will demonstrate the moderating role of four cultural dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – on the association between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. This research pursues the following research questions:

1. How do employee voice practices that are implemented by an organization influence employee voice perceptions?
2. How does a participative organizational climate mediate the relationship between employee voice practices and employee voice perceptions?
3. How do an individual’s cultural values – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – moderate the relations of participative climate to employee voice perceptions?
Research Procedure

Data and Sample

I collected self-report survey data from employees in 22 organizations located throughout South Korea. These organizations are active in the industries of mining and quarrying (1), manufacturing (9), construction (1), accommodation and food service activities (3), information and communication (1), financial and insurance activities (1), professional, scientific, and technical activities (4), public administration (1), and human health and social work activities (1). The diverse industries included in the sample increase the potential generalizability of findings in this study. To meet the requirement that organizations participating in the research must implement some type of employee voice practice, I selected organizations with 50 or more employees, because these organizations are subject to government regulations regarding the implementation of HR practices that encourage employees to speak out. The South Korean Act concerning the Promotion of Worker Participation and Cooperation (APWPC) was enacted in 1997 (Korean Ministry of Employment and Labor, 2016). This Act stipulates that all firms with more than 30 employees must form a Labor Management Council (LMC) and hold meetings every quarter. According to the APWPC, workplace issues to be dealt with by the LMC are classified into three categories: (a) issues requiring prior consent by employee representatives, (b) issues of consultation with employee representatives, and (c) issues to be reported to employee representatives (Lee, 2011).

To recruit participants, I used convenience sampling to select 30 organizations with more than 50 employees and contacted human resource (HR) professionals in each organization by email or phone. By working with HR professionals, I was able to verify
whether the organizations implemented employee voice practices and what kinds of employee voice practices they had adopted. The initial contact included an explanation of the study purpose and research questions and a request for permission to conduct the online survey. Twenty-five organizations agreed to participate in the research. Two kinds of survey were utilized. One kind was for employees answering questions about experienced employee voice practices, participative climate, cultural value dimensions, their perception of voice efficacy and voice safety, and demographic information. The other survey was for HR professionals answering questions about how they implement employee voice practices (coverage of the practices) and organizational information such as industry, organizational type (private or public), organization size, whether they experienced organizational change (acquisition, takeover, merger, relocation, and demerger), whether they have trade union, in which country is the corporate headquarters located, year established, CEO’s nationality, and current CEO’s years of service. I sent these HR professionals of the 25 organizations a recruitment letter and a URL for the online survey for HR professionals, along with the request to randomly select 30 employees to participate in the survey and send the e-mail address of those employees to the researcher (See Appendix A and B). Most of them did not agree to send their employee’s email address to me due to confidentiality concerns, so I asked the HR professionals to randomly select 30 employees and send an informational recruitment letter and URL for the online survey with an implied informed consent form (See Appendix C). Prior to the data collection, this study was approved by IRB at the Pennsylvania State University (See Appendix F).
The final sample consisted of 478 employees distributed across 22 organizations, with an average number of participating employees per organization of 22. Three organizations are excluded from the final sample because the number of final participants from those companies is less than 10, which is too small for multilevel analysis (Maas & Hox, 2005). Among employee respondents, 65.1% were male and 34.9% were female (See Table 3-1). Employees in their 30s were 52.3% and 26.2% were in their 20s. Employees with bachelor degrees were 66.7%, and employees under manager level were 43.3%. Employees with administrative jobs represented 43.3%. The average organizational tenure was 7.07 years with 0.1 years as minimum and 29 years as maximum. Organizations participated in the survey implemented employee voice practices such as attitude surveys, online and offline suggestion schemes, appraisal systems, meetings between managers and individual employees, and townhall meetings.

**Measures**

All the variables except employee voice practices in my proposed model were measured with established items in the existing organization. The Korean version of the survey instruments was created following the backward translation procedure of Brislin (1986). English version items for survey questionnaires are provided in Appendix D, with Korean version items in Appendix E.
### Table 3-1
*Demographics of survey participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under manager</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior manager</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/Sales</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/Internet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employee voice practices.** Boselie, Dietz, & Boon (2005) suggest that an HRM practice can be measured by “its presence, by its coverage, or by its intensity” (p. 74).

Presence can be determined using a dichotomous scale for whether the practice is actually in effect, indicated by a “yes” or “no” response (Boselie et al., 2005). Because I selected organizations with employee voice practices, a question asking whether the organization implemented the practice was skipped. Instead I asked HR professionals what kind of employee voice practices their organization implemented. Coverage can be measured using a continuous scale for the portion of the employees covered by the practice, while intensity can be measured with a continuous scale for the extent to which an individual employee is exposed to the practice (Boselie et al., 2005). Studies using
measures reflecting intensity are relatively fewer and were used to test whether employees received *sufficient* training to do their job, for example (Truss, 2001), thus measuring intensity is not appropriate for this study. Therefore, only an instrument for measuring coverage of employee voice practices was developed for this study.

I argue that employee voice practices can include practices for encouraging communication, challenge, and innovation (Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005). Accordingly, three questions asking employees’ perceptions of coverage of employee voice practices for communication, challenge, and innovation were developed (see Table 3–2) and operationalized. I asked employee’s perception of coverage of employee voice practices, while I also asked HR professionals about their organization’s actual coverage of employee voice practices, which was not used in the analysis. Although the actual HR practices exist in the organization objectively, those practices should be perceived and experienced subjectively by individual employees in the organization (Wright & Nishii, 2007). Wright and Nishii (2007) argue that a significant variance can occur in perceived HR practices, because there might be valid variation in the schemas of individuals that are influenced by other organizational contextual factors. Perceived employee voice practices should be measured at the individual level, but with referent-shifted questions aimed at the organizational level, and data collected at the individual level should be aggregated to organizational level for multilevel analysis (Chan, 1998).

Because employee voice practices were measured as a score that explains how broadly the voice practices are covered in terms of levels of employees, I informed survey participants that they should select the level of employees. A rating of 1 for each of the three items indicates only executive and above level of employees are covered by
the voice practice, and a rating of 6 means all employees including part-time workers are covered by the practice (rate 2 = team leader level and above, rate 3 = part leader level and above, rate 4 = professional employees and above, and rate 5 = clerical workers and above). Therefore, if an organization implements employee voice practices that aim to encourage communication, challenge, and innovation for all employees including part-time workers, the score for employee voice practices becomes 18 (6 * 3). I divided this number by three when conducting statistical analysis to give the average across the three areas of voice practices. This measure was developed to reach a score that demonstrates how much employees in their position are covered by voice practices. Hence, Cronbach’s alpha, which measures reliability for scale, does not apply.

Table 3-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee voice practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe that my organization provides employees with practices such as attitude surveys, suggestion schemes and similar activities that encourage employees to communicate ideas openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I believe that my organization provides employee with practices such as employee-manager meetings, town hall meetings and similar activities that encourage employees to challenge the traditional way of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe that my organization provides employees with practices such as problem solving groups, quality circles, autonomous teams and similar activities that encourage employees to be creative in coming up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participative climates.** Three items out of the four items used by Huang, Vliert, & Vegt (2005) were adopted for assessing employee perceptions of participative climates (see Table 3-3), albeit changing the term “Our location” to “My organization” based on referent-shift model (Chan, 1998). One item - “my immediate boss is usually receptive to suggestions for change from employees” - was purposely omitted since its referent is the immediate boss rather than the organization, thereby making it impossible to change the
referent. These questions are also answered by individual employees in order to understand their shared perception of organizational climate. Each item was rated on a 5-point scale (1 = disagree; 5 = agree). Cronbach’s alpha for the three items is .91.

Table 3-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participative climate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My organization has established a climate where employees can challenge our traditional way of doing things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My organization has established a climate where employees can communicate openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My organization has established a climate where employees are encouraged to come up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural values.** Culture has been conceptualized and measured with various cultural value dimensions by several researchers (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 1999; Trompenaars, 1993). This approach to measuring culture is common and convenient, although criticized, because “cultural dimensions show validity; they are at the right level between generality and detail; they establish a link among individual, organizational, and societal level phenomena; and they are easy to communicate” (Aycan, 2005, p. 1985). Among those measures, Hofstede’s measure for cultural dimension has been most broadly adopted. Using Hofstede’s measure for country-level analysis is very acceptable, but this measure is not appropriate when individual’s cultural values are tested in the study. As a result, some scholars call for developing a new measure for Hofstede’s cultural dimension at the individual level, especially in order to test individual’s cultural values in countries with heterogenous population or individual-level cultural market segmentation. (Yoo, Donthu, & Lenartowicz, 2011).

Yoo and his colleagues (2011) answered the call for the new measure and developed a 26-item CVSCALE: the five-dimensional measure of personal cultural
values, which tests Hofstede’s cultural dimensions at the individual level. I opt to use the individual level measure to determine cultural values in this study, since my sample is from one nation, South Korea, and therefore national level comparison is not applicable. With this sample, measuring the effect of an individual’s cultural value on the employee voice mechanism is more appropriate. Twenty items measuring power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity from CVSCALE were used for this survey; Cronbach’s alpha for each dimension was .71, .85, .92, and .78, respectively (see Table 3-4). Each item was rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). Six items that measure long-term orientation, which is beyond the scope of this research, were excluded.

**Employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety.** Employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety is measured with ten items that are modified from Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar’s (2011) 12-item measure for group voice climate. They created a measure for group voice climate by collecting individual’s perception of the group’s beliefs about voice efficacy and safety. Morrison and colleagues (2011) had survey participants report both the extent to which group members believed that they were capable of effectively speaking out (voice efficacy) and the extent to which group members believed that they could speak out safely (voice safety). They listed the six-item measure for voice behavior developed by LePine and Van Dyne (1998) after two title questions: “members of your team feel they are capable of effectively doing each of the following,” and “members of your team feel it is safe to do each of the following” (Morrison et al., 2011, p. 186).
Table 3-4
*Cultural value dimensions*

1. People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions.
2. People in higher positions should not ask the opinions of people in lower positions too frequently.
3. People in higher positions should avoid social interaction with people in lower positions.
4. People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions by people in higher positions.
5. People in higher positions should not delegate important tasks to people in lower positions.
6. It is important to have instructions spelled out in detail so that I always know what I’m expected to do.
7. It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures.
8. Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected of me.
9. Standardized work procedures are helpful.
10. Instructions for operations are important.
11. Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group (either at school or the workplace).
12. Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties.
13. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.
14. Group success is more important than individual success.
15. Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.
16. Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer.
17. It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women.
18. Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.
19. Solving difficult problems usually requires an active, forcible approach, which is typical of men.
20. There are some jobs that a man can always do better than a woman.

Based on Morrison and colleague’s measure, I generated ten questions for employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety by shifting the referent from ‘members of your team’ to ‘I’ since this study aims to measure individual’s perception (see Table 3-5 and Table 3-6). I did not include a question “keep well informed about issues at work where my opinion can be useful” from the original measure, because direct translation into Korean looked awkward and other Korean graduate students who studied in the US
and Korean practitioners who were involved in translation process did not understand the meaning of the question when translated. When translating into the Korean version, I included two title questions in each item in order for survey participants to understand questions easily. Cronbach’s alphas for voice efficacy and voice safety are .93 and .94, respectively. Each item for both scales was rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

Table 3-5
Employee perception of voice efficacy

1. I feel I am capable of effectively developing and making recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work.
2. I feel I am capable of effectively speaking up and encouraging others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work.
3. I feel I am capable of effectively communicating my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me.
4. I feel I am capable of effectively keeping well informed about issues at work where my opinion can be useful.
5. I feel I am capable of effectively getting involved in issues that affect the quality of life in my work unit.

Table 3-6
Employee perception of voice safety

1. I feel it is safe to develop and make recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work.
2. I feel it is safe to speak up and encourage others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work.
3. I feel it is safe to communicate my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me.
4. I feel it is safe to keep well informed about issues at work where my opinion can be useful.
5. I feel it is safe to get involved in issues that affect the quality of life in my work unit.

Control variables. In line with previous employee voice studies, I controlled for employee’s individual demographics that might influence employee voice, including participant gender, age, educational level, position, and tenure. Gender was coded as 0 =
female and $1 = \text{male}$. Age was coded into four categories ($1 = 20s$, $2 = 30s$, $3 = 40s$, $4 = 50s$, and $5 = 60s$). Education level was coded into five categories ($1 = \text{High school degree}$, $2 = \text{Associate degree}$, $3 = \text{Bachelor degree}$, $4 = \text{Master degree}$, and $5 = \text{Doctoral degree}$). Position level was coded into four categories ($1 = \text{Employees under manager level}$, $2 = \text{Manager (e.g., part leader)}$, $3 = \text{Senior manager (e.g., team leader)}$, and $4 = \text{Executive}$).

Age, educational level, and position were controlled using a dummy code. For age, four dummy codes ($1 = 20s$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = 30s$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = 40s$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = 50s$, $0 = \text{others}$) were used. For education level, five dummy codes ($1 = \text{high school}$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = \text{associate}$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = \text{bachelor}$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = \text{master}$, $0 = \text{others}$; $1 = \text{doctor}$, $0 = \text{others}$) were used. Position was coded as $0 = \text{under manager}$ and $1 = \text{manager and above}$.

Tenure was measured by the number of years an employee worked at the organization. At the organizational level, I controlled for industry, whether a union exists, the year the organization was established, and organization size. I had nine different industries and categorized these industries as $0 = \text{mining, manufacturing, and construction}$, and $1 = \text{others}$ based on the extent of which industries share broad characteristics. Union was coded as $0 = \text{there is no union in the organization}$ and $1 = \text{there is a union in the organization}$. The organization’s HR professional entered the year the organization was established, and I calculated by subtracting it from the current year (2017).

Organizational size was entered by HR professionals.
Data Analysis Approach

Level of Analysis

For multi-level analysis, it is important to clarify the level of measurement and analysis. Kozlowski and Klein (2000) explain that the level of measurement is the level at which data are collected to test a given construct. Individual-level constructs should be assessed with individual-level data, while unit-level constructs can be measured with unit-level measures or individual-level measures.

There are three kinds of properties in unit-level constructs (Kozlowski & Klein 2000). The first, global properties, are defined as “observable, descriptive characteristics of a unit. They do not emerge from individual level experiences, attitudes, values, or characteristics, therefore there is no need to ask all the individuals within a unit to describe its global properties” (p. 33). Therefore, a single informant who has access to relevant information provides an observable single rating of each unit. Examples of global properties are a company’s sales volume reported by a sales manager, a company’s strategy provided by a CEO, and a unit’s function reported by a unit manager. Second, shared properties of a unit are “member’s shared perceptions, affect, and responses” (p. 33); they provide “an opportunity to evaluate the composition model of emergence underlying the shared property” (p. 33). Therefore, the data for shared properties should be tested at the individual level, and the aggregated value of the measure should be assigned to the unit. Examples of shared properties are individual ratings of unit climate, or individual’s ratings of their own demographic characteristics. The third properties are configural properties, defined as “characteristics, cognitions, or behaviors of individual members” (p. 34), where “individual-level data are summarized to describe the pattern or
configuration of these individual data” (p. 34). Since configural properties emerge from individuals but are not aggregated like shared properties, the mean of individual member’s ratings is not an appropriate summary statistic. Rather the theoretical definition of the construct should be used in order to determine proper summary statistics (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

According to this schema, my data consists of two different levels of measurement: individual-level measurement and organizational-level measurement. Within organizational-level measurement, organization size, organization age, industry, and union belong to global properties, and employee voice practices and participative climate belong to shared properties. Employee perceptions of voice efficacy and voice safety and cultural values are individual level data as shown in Figure 3-1.

I assessed employee voice practices and participative climate at the individual level, which reflects employee evaluation of “organizational” coverage of voice practices and participative climate. Next, I aggregated individual level data for employee voice practice and participative climate to the organizational level.

To justify data aggregation of these two variables to organizational level, I employed intra-class correlation coefficients ICC (1), defined as “the degree of reliability associated with a single assessment of the group mean” (Bliese, 2000, p. 355) and ICC(2), defined as “an estimate of the reliability of the group means” (Bliese, 2000, p. 356). LeBreton and Senter (2008) answer 20 questions about inter-rater reliability and inter-rater agreement and explained how to interpret values for ICC(1) and ICC(2). They suggest that for ICC(1), “a value of .01 might be considered a ‘small’ effect, a value of .10 might be considered a ‘medium’ effect, and a value of .25 might be considered as a
‘large’ effect” (p. 838). For ICC(2), LeBreton and Senter (2008) suggest that values between .70 and .85 would be appropriate to justify aggregation.

![The multilevel model of employee voice mechanism](image)

Figure 3-1. The multilevel model of employee voice mechanism

I conducted two ICC(1) and ICC(2), since the model has two separate outcome variables: employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety. ICC(1) and ICC(2) for voice efficacy were .13, which is considered a medium effect, and .76, which is in the acceptable range to justify aggregation. However, ICC(1) and ICC(2) for voice safety were .03 and .36, indicating small effect and low reliability. Bliese (2000) argued that even though group members share only one percent of the variance in a individual level response (ICC(1)), one can still detect strong aggregate relationships. In addition, low ICC(2) for voice safety might be due to relatively small organizational size (average organizational size = 22 employees). Or, it might be
evidence that there are no significant differences among organizations in terms of voice safety. However, I believe I found adequate support for using multilevel analysis for this study.

**Meso-Mediation**

Mediation represents “in its simplest form, the addition of a third variable to the antecedent variable X to the outcome variable Y, whereby X causes the mediator, M, and M causes Y, so X \( \rightarrow \) M \( \rightarrow \) Y” (MacKinnon, Fairchild, & Fritz, 2007). Figure 3-2 uses the notation that is most common in organization studies, with \( a \) representing the effect of X to M, \( b \) representing the effect of M to Y accounting for X, and \( c' \) representing the effect of X to Y accounting for M. \( c \) represents the effect of X to Y without adding M.

*Figure 3-2. Mediation model*
In addition, most mediation analysis uses information from the following three regression equations:

\[ Y = i_1 + cX + e_1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ Y = i_2 + c'X + bM + e_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

\[ M = i_3 + aX + e_3 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where \( i_1, i_2, \) and \( i_3 \) are intercepts for each equation, \( Y \) from equation 1 is a dependent variable of independent variable \( X \), and \( Y \) from equation 2 is a dependent variable of independent variable \( X \) when accounting for mediator \( M \). Equation 3 denotes \( M \) as a dependent variable of independent variable \( X \). Residuals from each equation are presented as \( e_1, e_2, \) and \( e_3 \), respectively (MacKinnon et al., 2007).

Causal steps approaches based on the classic work of Baron and Kenny (1986) is the most widely used method to assess mediation effect. This approach establishes Equation 1, 2, and 3 separately and considers significance of each equation as a necessary condition to proceed to the next step. Four steps in this approach are involved to establishing mediation. The first step is to require a significant relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The second step is to confirm a significant relationship between the independent variable and the mediating variable. The third step is to require a significant relationship between the mediating variable and the dependent variable when both the independent variables are accounted for. Last, the coefficient value between the independent variable and the dependent variable after adding a mediating variable must be larger than the coefficient value between the independent variable to the dependent variable in the original regression model (Baron & Kenny, 1986).
Although this approach has been widely used, several researchers have recently pointed out its limitations (e.g., Hayes, 2009; MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000; MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffman, West, & Sheets, 2002; Shrout & Bolger, 2002; Zhao, Lynch, & Chen, 2010). They criticized the precondition of the significant relation of independent variable to dependent variable and have argued that significant indirect effect can be detected without a significant relationship between X and Y based on simulation studies (Rucker, Preacher, Tormala, & Petty, 2011). Furthermore, the absence of a direct effect after accounting for a mediator should not indicate that the relationship is fully mediated (Rucker et al., 2011). They rather argue that a researcher’s exploration on mediation analysis should be based on theory, not these preconditions.

This new argument related to mediation studies has been recognized broadly, and consensus on this has been growing among quantitative researchers (Hayes, 2013). Specifically, causal steps approach is a mere series of separate significance tests without the product of the two paths between the independent variable and the mediating variable, as well as between the mediating variable and the dependent variable. Consequently, the power to detect mediated effects was very low in this approach, as were Type 1 error rates (MacKinnon et al., 2007). Requiring a significant relation of the independent variable to the dependent variable reduces the ability to detect real mediation effects, because the resulting ratio from a test of mediation – Sobel’s z tests which is calculated based on dividing an estimator, either \( ab \) or \( c-c' \) of the mediated effect by its corresponding standard error, does not always follow a normal distribution, and thus the test is prone to be biased (MacKinnon et al., 2007; Preacher & Hayes, 2004; Zhao et al., 2010).
An alternative procedure that estimates an indirect effect in a mediation model is computer-intensive analysis, also called resampling method or bootstrapping method. This method uses the observed data to generate a reference distribution, and then this distribution is used for confidence interval estimation and significance testing (MacKinnon et al., 2007). This computer-intensive method is more advanced than the widely used causal steps approach because, according to MacKinnon and colleagues:

… it provides a general way to test significance and construct confidence intervals in a wide variety of situations where analytical formulas for quantities may not be available, and it does not require as many assumptions as other tests, which is likely to make this method more accurate than traditional mediation analysis. (2007, p. 602)

Given that a statistically significant indirect effect is an essential part of a mediator model, this procedure has no assumption of the initial existence of the total effect and recommends bootstrapping analysis to ascertain the statistical significance of the indirect effect (Zhao et al., 2010). This bootstrapping procedure for estimating an indirect effect is gaining increasing acceptance (MacKinnon et al., 2002). For example, programs such as the AMOS (Arbuckle, 1997), EQS (Bentler, 1997), LISREL (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993), and Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012) conduct bootstrap resampling for the mediated effect.

Mathieu and Taylor (2007) define meso-mediation as a mediational relationship “that operates downward across levels of analysis” (p. 141), and discuss preconditions and evidential basis for the meso-mediational type relationships. The first precondition for meso-mediation is that “justifying the X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y causal order is absolutely fundamental for tests of mediation” (p. 144). Mathieu and Taylor argue that the cross-level meso-mediation model provides multiple bases that are more likely to apply causal
relationship of upper-level variables as antecedents to lower-level variables. Therefore, causal conditions from the mediator – participative climate to the dependent variables – employee perception of voice efficacy and safety are satisfied. Moreover, theoretically, organizational climate has been created as a result of establishing relative organizational policies, practices, and programs, in addition to the characteristics and quality of interactions among organizational members, which is related to that particular climate (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006). Therefore, I argue that the independent variable of this study, employee voice practices, is a precursor of the mediating variable, participative climate.

A second precondition for meso-mediation is the construct validity of measures in terms of the convergent and discriminant validity of measures. Multilevel constructs require various types of aggregate level constructs, so researchers should take particular care when they evaluate both convergent and discriminant validity (Mathieu & Taylor, 2007). This is particularly true when a construct is operationalized, as referent shift types require additional evidence for meso-mediational tests, since data are collected from lower-level units but used for higher levels of analysis. To make this possible, the discriminant validity of upper-level measures should be established. Researchers should use averages within upper-level responses per item for calculating the appropriate scale reliability, such as Cronbach’s alpha and the multi-level confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) at the aggregate level of analysis. In this study, I conducted Cronbach’s alpha test and CFA test with average within organizational level response for participative climate. The result showed that Cronbach’s alpha was .96, and standardized estimations for CFA test for three questions for participative climate are significant.
A measurement precondition regarding aggregate measures is that they should possess “sufficient between group variability to afford reasonable power for testing mediational relationships between them at the higher level of analysis in a multilevel-mediation design, as well as to drive cross-level effect in meso-mediational tests” (Mathieu & Taylor, 2007, p. 147). ICC(2) indicating whether unit averages are reliably different from each other is the most applicable for satisfying this precondition (Mathieu & Taylor, 2007). I conducted ICC(2) for participative climates, and the result was .74, which ranged above the commonly accepted criterion (.70: LeBreton and Senter, 2008).

The last precondition for meso-mediation model is possessing sufficient power, since small sample sizes are more likely to lead to inferences of full mediation. Meso-mediation works better with a large number of higher-level groups with a small number of unit members nested in each higher-level group, rather than a small number of higher-level groups with large number unit members (Mathieu & Taylor, 2007). Since the number of organizations and members nested in each organization is relatively small in the sample of this study, the resulting small power of the model of this study is a limitation. In sum, as discussed above, preconditions for meso-mediation are satisfied by applying multiple tests, although minor considerations such as small power are detected.

If meso-mediation analysis is conducted at the individual level while ignoring the nested characteristics of data, Type I error rates can be too high. This is because observations within a unit-level variable tend to be dependent, thereby violating the assumption of independent observations (MacKinnon et al., 2007). In addition, a mediated effect present in the unit level variables may not exist at the individual level. Further, mechanisms of mediating effects at the unit level variables may be different from
the mechanism of mediating effect at the individual level variable (MacKinnon et al., 2007). Path coefficient from the independent variable to mediating variable (a), from the mediating variable to the dependent variable (b), and the independent variable to the dependent variable (c′) may vary significantly across the unit level rather than having a single fixed effect. “If a and b are random effects, they may covary, and an appropriate standard error and point estimate for the mediated effect must allow for this covariance between random effects” (MacKinnon et al., 2007, p. 603). Assessing the meso-mediation effect of participative climate on the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and safety by assessing this covariance entails combining equations for the dependent variable and equations for the mediating variable into the same analysis and directly estimating the random effect (MacKinnon et al., 2007). In this study, I use the Mplus program (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012), which provides adequate bootstrapping analysis.

**Analytical Technique**

First, I completed a descriptive analysis for both organization and employees and conducted a correlation analysis to determine if there are associations among variables. Then, I conducted a reliability test (Cronbach’s alpha) and Confirmation Factor Analysis (CFA) to test the discriminant validity of measures used in this study and overall measurement quality. Next, in order to assess multilevel data, I applied a hierarchical linear model (HLM) with the software SPSS v.21, using its function of mixed models to assess the hypotheses. Since hypotheses for this study require two separate and different analytical strategies – mediation effect and moderation effect, I divided the analytical model into two models. The first model estimates HLM to examine the extent to which
the employee voice practices are related to employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety after controlling for the other variables, and then examines the mediation effect of participative climate on this relationship, also after controlling for the other variables. For this HLM analysis, I separately estimated the analysis for two different outcome variables: employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety. As a supplementary test for the indirect effect of participative climate on the relations of employee voice practice to employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety, I employed multi-level structural equation modelling (MSEM) in Mplus program, as discussed above about the merit of using Mplus for measuring the indirect effect of a mediating variable in multilevel analysis.

The second model also estimates HLM to test the moderating effects of four cultural dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and safety. Two separate HLM analyses were conducted for the second model in order to test two different dependent variables, just as with the first model. I used grand mean centering for predictor variables – employee voice practices, participative climate, and four cultural dimensions, because the primary interest is in level 2 predictors – employee voice practices and participative climate, and the interaction effects involves Level 2 variables (Enders & Tofighi, 2007).
Chapter 4

RESULTS

This study examines the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate. In addition, the study examines the moderating role of four cultural dimensions – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity – on the association between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. This chapter delineates the result of the investigation in three parts. First, descriptive information and results from inter-item reliabilities are provided. Then, the results from testing the equivalence of a measurement model are presented. Lastly, results from testing the hypothesized multilevel relations among the variables of interest are discussed.

Descriptive Statistics

Presented in Table 4-1 are means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations among variables of interest. Table 4-1 also shows the inter-item reliabilities that were measured by Cronbach’s alpha. Descriptive statistical information on control variables at the individual level and organizational level is discussed in the method section. Cronbach’s alpha of all measures, except power distance, was above .75. Cronbach’s alpha for power distance in this study was .71, which is slightly lower, but generally within the acceptable threshold for reliability.

As shown in Table 4-1, employee voice practices (aggregated to organizational level), participative climate (aggregated to organizational level) and uncertainty avoidance were positively related to employee perception of voice efficacy, and power
distance was negatively related. Moreover, employee voice practices, participative climate, uncertainty avoidance, and collectivism were positively related to employee perception of voice safety, while power distance was negatively related. Correlation between employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety were relatively high ($r = .64, p < .01$), however, below the .7 is generally accepted as indicative of potential multicollinearity. I conducted exploratory factor analysis in order to verify that ten items from two variables are divided accordingly, and the results showed that the two variables are related but distinct.

**Measurement Model**

I conducted a series of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) with M-PLUS 7.3 program in order to examine the discriminant validity of the multi-item variables and to test overall measurement quality. As suggested by Hu and Bentler (1998), the goodness-of-fit indices used in this study included $\chi^2$, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). Acceptable fit to the data is designated as CFI and TLI values greater than .90 (Bentler, 1992), RMSEA values smaller than .08, and SRMR values smaller than .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999), whereas good fit data is designated as TLI and CFI values close to or greater than .95, RMSEA values close to .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and SRMR values smaller than .05 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1982).
Table 4-1
Descriptive statistics and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education Level</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Position</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tenure</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Industry</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Union</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational Size</td>
<td>6910.33</td>
<td>13144.82</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational Age</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>27.87</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Voice practices</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participative climate</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power distance</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Collectivism</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Masculinity</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Voice efficacy</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Voice safety</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 478 at the individual level, n = 22 at the group level

Reliabilities of scales are on the diagonal. Data on variables 1-5 and 10-17 were reported by employees; data on 6-9 were reported by HR professionals.

Gender (0 = female; 1 = male), Age (1 = 20s; 2 = 30s; 3 = 40s; 4 = 50s), Education (1 = high school; 2 = associate; 3 = B; 4 = M; 5 = PHD), Position (1 = under manager; 2 = manager; 3 = senior manager; 4 = executive), Industry (0 = mining, manufacturing, and construction; 1 = others), Union (0 = no; 1 = yes), Organizational Size (number of employees), Organizational Age (years).

* p < .01; *p < .05; two-tailed tests.
I first examined the proposed eight-factor model that included employee voice practices, participative climates, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, masculinity, employee perception of voice efficacy, and employee perception of voice safety. The proposed model exhibited acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 1107.24$, $df = 566$, RMSEA = .05, CFI = .94, TLI = .93, SRMR = .05).

I further tested the discriminant validity of the eight constructs by comparing the fit of the hypothesized eight-factor model with five alternative models. Model 1 combines outcome variables (7 factors), Model 2 further combines four cultural dimensions into one factor (4 factors), Model 3 combines mediator and moderators as one factor (3 factors), Model 4 combines all variables except outcome variable (2 factors), and Model 5 combines all the eight variables into one factor. As seen in the Table 4-2, the result showed none of them showed a better fit, thus confirming the use of the eight-factor hypothesized model.

**Hypothesis Testing**

I followed the stepwise multilevel analysis process to test two models, and testing for each model was performed twice because of the two dependent variables in this study’s conceptual framework (i.e., employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety). First, the null models without predictors were used to test the between-group variance in dependent variables by examining the level 2 residual variance of the intercept ($\tau_{00}$) and ICC(1). Analysis showed significant between-organization variances in employee perception of voice efficacy ($\sigma^2 = .90$; $\tau_{00} = .13$; $p < .001$; ICC(1) = .13), which indicates that 13% of variance residing between organizations.
Table 4-2
Comparison of proposed model and alternative models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed model</td>
<td>1107.24***</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A seven-factor model$^a$</td>
<td>1915.86***</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A four-factor model$^b$</td>
<td>3575.58***</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A three-factor model$^c$</td>
<td>4473.99***</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A two-factor model$^d$</td>
<td>5050.39***</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A one-factor model</td>
<td>6757.75***</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Combining employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety.

$^b$ Combining employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety, and combining power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity.

$^c$ Combining employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety, and combining power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, masculinity, and combining participative climate and intended voice practices.

$^d$ Combining employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety, and combining power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, masculinity, participative climate, and intended voice practices.

*** $p < .000$
However, between-organization variances in employee perception of voice safety showed that only 3% of variance resides in between organizations ($\sigma^2 = 1.29; \tau_{00} = .03; p < .001; \text{ICC}(1) = .03$). It might be difficult to justify multilevel analysis for employee perception of voice safety as the appropriate analytical technique, since the broadly accepted level for ICC(1) is above .05 (Flinchbaugh, Li, Luth, & Chadwick, 2016).

However, I conducted multilevel analysis for both dependent variables based on the reasoning discussed in the method section. I tested study models once with all of the control variables and found that some organizational level control variables (i.e., industry, organization size, and organization age) had no significant effect on either employee perceptions of voice efficacy and voice safety in all cases. Thus, I excluded those three control variables from study models in order to enhance power and model parsimony (Becker, 2005).

**The Indirect Effect of Employee Voice Practices on Employee Perception of Voice Efficacy and Voice Safety**

Hypothesis 1 suggested that employee voice practices would be positively related to participative climate. As shown in Model 2 of Table 4-3, the regression result showed that employee voice practices perceived by employees positively influenced participative climate ($b = .48, p < .000$). Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor variable</th>
<th>Participative Climate (H1)</th>
<th>Employee Perception of Voice Efficacy (H2a)</th>
<th>Employee Perception of Voice Safety (H2b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.12***</td>
<td>1.36***</td>
<td>4.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.02 .04 .03 .04</td>
<td>.20* .09 .19* .09 .23* .09 .18 .09 .16 .09 .17 .10</td>
<td>.25* .11 .26* .11 .29* .11 .19 .11 .21 .11 .20 .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20s</td>
<td>.09 .06 .11* .05</td>
<td>.30 .38 .09 .37 .10 .36 .21 .37 .11 .36 .14 .37</td>
<td>.87* .43 .67 .43 .69 .43 .50 .44 .61 .42 .78 .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30s</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>.22 .33 .11 .33 .13 .32 .23 .33 .13 .32 .20 .33</td>
<td>.63 .38 .48 .38 .50 .38 .33 .39 .42 .37 .58 .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 40s</td>
<td>.05 .06 .01 .05</td>
<td>-.08 -.32 -.19 .32 -.17 .31 -.05 .32 -.17 .31 -.10 .32</td>
<td>.32 .37 .17 .37 .19 .37 .07 .38 .10 .36 .27 .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 50s</td>
<td>-.46** .14 -.32** .12</td>
<td>-- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: High school</td>
<td>-.29* .15 -.20 -.13</td>
<td>-.120** .44 -.13** .43 -.90* -.41 -.34** -.41 -.10* -.42 -.24** -.43</td>
<td>-.79 .53 .45 .65 .45 .24 .44 .52 .76 .54 .61 .50 .76 .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Associate</td>
<td>-.21** .07 -.17*.07</td>
<td>-.95** .33 -.86** .32 -.62 .31 -.78* .33 -.83* .32 -.89** .32</td>
<td>-.101* .39 -.88* .39 -.64 .39 -.92* .39 -.80* .38 -.96* .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Bachelor</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>-.47 .29 .42 .27 .31 .26 -.35 .28 .40 .27 -.46 .27</td>
<td>-.67* .33 -.62 .33 -.52 .33 -.62 .33 -.57 .32 -.66* .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Master</td>
<td>-.05 -.05 -.03 .04</td>
<td>-.39 -.29 -.33 .28 -.18 .27 -.26 .28 .28 .27 -.38 .28</td>
<td>-.56 .34 .50 .34 -.37 .33 -.54 .34 -.40 .33 -.53 .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education: Doctor</td>
<td>.20 .12 .11 .10</td>
<td>-- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00 -- .00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.11* .05 .13** .04</td>
<td>-.46*** .11 .46*** .11 .41*** .10 .46*** .11 .44*** .11 .43*** .11</td>
<td>-.38** .13 .32* .13 .28* .13 .37** .13 .29* .13 .31* .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.01 .01 .01 .00</td>
<td>.04** .01 .03** .01 .03* .01 .03** .01 .03* .01 .03** .01</td>
<td>.02 .01 .02 .01 .02 .01 .02 .01 .02 .01 .02 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>.05 .04 .09*.04 .04</td>
<td>-.08 .14 -.10 .10 -.10 .14 .09 -.12 .11 -.10 .09 -.09 .10</td>
<td>-.13 .12 -.17 .12 -.21 .12 -.16 .12 -.17 .11 -.15 .12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVP</td>
<td>.45*** .04</td>
<td>.28 .14 .03 .11 .02 .11 .02 .13 .04 .11 .03 .12</td>
<td>.28*.12 .07 .13 .08 .13 .03 .13 .09 .13 .07 .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>.55*** .12</td>
<td>.55*** .12 .51*** .14 .57*** .12 .49*** .13</td>
<td>.46*** .15 .45*** .14 .44** .14 .50*** .14 .41** .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>-.29** .05</td>
<td>- .25** .07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Standardized coefficients are reported. EVP = Employee voice practices; PC = Participative climates; PD = Power distance; UN = Uncertainty avoidance; CO = Collectivism; MA = Masculinity. *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001. "-" = This parameter is excluded; "--" = This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant. 

$R^2$ indicates the proportion of variance explained at each level, i.e., level 1 within-unit variance, level 2 between-unit variance and cross-level interactions. Total $R^2 = \sum R^2$ within unit x (1-ICC1) + $R^2$ between unit x ICC1
Hypothesis 2 predicted that participative climate would be positively related to employee perception of voice efficacy (H2a) and voice safety (H2b). As shown in Model 4 and Model 10 of Table 4-3, the multilevel analysis revealed that participative climate positively influenced employee perception of voice efficacy ($b = .55, p < .000$), as well as employee perception of voice safety ($b = .46, p < .000$). Therefore, hypotheses 2a and 2b were supported.

Hypothesis 3 suggested the participative climate mediates the cross-level relationship between employee voice practices (Level 2) and employee perception of voice efficacy (H3a) and voice safety (H3b) (Level 1). In order to assess this multilevel mediation analysis, I applied MSEM using the Mplus program. MSEM has the advantage of traditional mediation techniques such as Sobel test, since an MSEM mediation estimate decreases measurement bias as participative climate of organizational level variables can be tested without organizational level aggregation (Preacher, Zyphur, & Zhang, 2010).

I conducted a 2-2-1 model with employee voice practices and participative climate at the organizational level, and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety tested at the individual level. Analysis (see Table 4-4) reported a significant estimated unstandardized coefficient indirect effect of employee voice practices on employee perception of voice efficacy via participative climate as .41 ($p < .01$), while its direct effect of employee voice practices to employee perception of voice efficacy was not significant ($b = -.02, p = .91$). Thus hypothesis 3a was supported with only indirect effect. In addition, the estimated unstandardized coefficient indirect effect of employee voice practices on employee perception of voice safety via participative effect was also
significant \( (b = .30, p < .01) \), while the direct effect between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice safety was not significant \( (b = .06, p < .38) \). Therefore, hypothesis 3b was supported with only indirect effect.

**Cross-Level Interactions of Four Cultural Dimensions**

Hypotheses 4, 5, 6, and 7 predicted the cross-level interaction that each cultural dimension – power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and masculinity (Level 1) – moderated the relationship between participative climate (Level 2) and employee perception of voice efficacy and safety (Level 1). As shown in Model 5 and Model 7 of Table 4-3 for employee perception of voice efficacy, the interactive effect of power distance and uncertainty avoidance were not significant \( (b = -.09, p = .44; b = .01, p = .95) \), while direct relationships from power distance and uncertainty avoidance to voice efficacy were significant \( (b = -.29, p < .000; b = .21, p < .000) \). Therefore, hypotheses 4a and 6a were not supported. However, as shown in Model 6 and Model 8 of Table 4-3, the interactive effect of collectivism and masculinity were significant \( (b = -.26, p < .01; b = -.22, p < .05) \). Figure 4-1 displays the pattern of the moderating effect of collectivism that in low collectivism, there is a stronger relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy. Thus, hypothesis 5a was supported. However, as shown in Figure 4-2, there is a weaker relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy in high masculinity, which is the opposite result from what was hypothesized in hypothesis 7a. Direct effects from collectivism and masculinity to voice efficacy were not significant \( (b = .06, p = .18; b = .01, p = .84) \).

However, as shown in Model 11, Model 12, Model 13, and Model 14 of Table 4-3 for employee perception of voice safety, all interactive effects were not significant
(power distance: \( b = -.06, p = .69 \); collectivism: \( b = -.02, p = .89 \); uncertainty avoidance: \( b = -.01, p = .86 \); masculinity: \( b = -.10, p = .47 \)), therefore hypotheses 4b, 5b, 6b, and 7b were not supported. However, direct effect on voice safety of power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance were significant (\( b = -.25, p < .000 \); \( b = .18, p < .000 \); \( b = .35, p < .000 \)).

Table 4-4
Multilevel structural equation modelling mediation analysis of participative climate (Hypotheses 3a and 3b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>95% Confidence interval</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice practice → Employee perception of voice efficacy</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice practice → Employee perception of voice safety</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice practice → Participative climate → Employee perception of voice efficacy</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice practice → Participative climate → Employee perception of voice safety</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .05 \). **\( p < .01 \).
Figure 4-1. Moderating effect of collectivism on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy (Hypothesis 5a)
Note. ‘Low’ means -1SD from the mean and ‘High’ means +1SD from the mean.

Figure 4-2. Moderating effect of masculinity on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy (Hypothesis 5a)
Note. ‘Low’ means -1SD from the mean and ‘High’ means +1SD from the mean.
Chapter 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter discusses the results demonstrated in the previous chapter. The results are summarized first. Second, the theoretical contributions and practical implications are presented. Next, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are addressed. Finally, the chapter ends with a conclusion.

Discussions

The result of this study show that employee voice practices have a positive indirect effect on employee perceptions of voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate. The results demonstrated a positive relationship between employee voice practices and participative climate, as well as a positive association of participative climate to both employee perception of voice efficacy and employee perception of voice safety. More specifically, employees who perceived that their organization provides formal voice practices encouraging employees to speak out for a broad range of employees tended to perceive that their organization has a higher level of participative climate. This finding supports the argument in previous studies that implementing HR practices and policies contributes to the generation of relevant organizational climate (Kopelman, Brief, Guzzo, 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Schulte, Ostroff, & Kinicki, 2006). When companies implement employee voice practices, employees see this as a signal that the organization has a participative climate, which in turn encourages and supports employee participation in organizational affairs (Bowen & Ostroff, 2004).

Furthermore, employees who perceive that their organization welcomes and encourages employee participation are more likely to think that they are able to speak out
and that their voice will be heard and processed appropriately (voice efficacy), as well as feeling that they might not be penalized by voice behavior (voice safety). This finding is consistent with previous studies that examined related organizational climates (i.e., participative climate) as substantial antecedents of employee voice behavior (Frazier & Bowler, 2015; Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005; Lee, Diefendorff, Kim, & Bian, 2014; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Shadur, Kienzle, & Rodwell, 1999; Spreitzer, 1996; Tesluk, Vance, & Mathieu, 1999; Wang & Hsieh, 2013).

However, the results revealed that employee voice practices have no direct relation to employee perceptions of either voice efficacy or voice safety. This means that even though employees think that their organization provides employee voice practices implemented in order to encourage employees to speak out for a broad range of employees, this perception does not directly influence employee perception of overall voice efficacy and safety. This result confirms previous studies demonstrating that for certain HR policies and practices, the implementation of the practice itself is not enough to generate the desired attitudinal and behavioral changes of employees, but it should be combined with a fundamental cultural change (Ryan & Kossek, 2008).

The results regarding the direct effect of four cultural values on employee perception of voice were varied. First, power distance had a negative correlation with both voice efficacy and voice safety, supporting the theoretical arguments and results of existing studies (e.g., Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Brockner et al., 2001; Huang et al., 2005; Kwon et al., 2016; Landau, 2009; Wei et al., 2015). On the other hand, the results demonstrated that collectivism was positively associated with voice safety, which was
counter to what this study hypothesized (based on Ng & Feldman, 2015; Thomas & Au, 2002). In addition, uncertainty avoidance showed a positive correlation to both voice efficacy and voice safety; this result again was counter to what I had hypothesized (based on Dutton, Ashford, O'Neill, Hayes, & Wierba, 1997). Finally, any significant effect of masculinity was presented on either voice efficacy or voice safety.

From the moderation analysis, only collectivism and masculinity demonstrated a moderating effect on the relation of employee voice practices to employee perception of voice efficacy, although neither variable had a direct effect on voice efficacy. Interestingly, power distance and uncertainty avoidance showed a positive significant relationship with voice efficacy, while a moderating effect of both variables was not detected. Previous studies demonstrated that formalized employee involvement and a participative climate positively influence employee voice behavior in countries with a small power distance culture (e.g., Huang et al., 2005). Although the results of this study are in line with these studies in terms of directly relating power distance to voice efficacy, this study failed to find evidence of the moderating role of power distance that was demonstrated by Huang and colleagues’ (2005) study. One explanation could be that power distance is more ingrained in organizational contexts, i.e., within the participative climate, so that a moderating effect might be undetectable. If an organization has more members who have low power distance values, that organization is more likely to have a high participative climate, because an organizational climate is a product of social interaction among organizational members, and power distance value is very closely related to participative climate.
There was no existing study investigating a moderation effect of uncertainty avoidance on the relationship between participative climate (or other relevant organizational climates) and employee voice, so it is not possible to compare the results from this study to other studies. However, the results can be attributed to the characteristics of sample of this study that the level of uncertainty avoidance \((M = 5.52)\) is much higher than the mean value of uncertainty avoidance \((M = 3.96)\) from development and validation study of CVSCALE, and the variance of uncertainty avoidance of this study’s sample \((SD = .48)\) is much narrower than that of the validation study \((SD = .89)\) of CVSCALE (Yoo et al., 2011). According to this figure, a dominant number of individuals in this study’s sample have high uncertainty avoidance value and its variance is relatively small. Therefore, a distinctively different effect of a group of high uncertainty avoidance from a group of low uncertainty avoidance might be undetectable due to relatively homogenous characteristics in terms of the level of uncertainty avoidance from this study.

Results regarding the moderation effect of collectivism supported the hypothesis that collectivism weakened the positive correlation of participative climate to employee perception of voice efficacy. In other words, individuals with a high collectivistic value did not show large differences in terms of voice efficacy of whether they perceived their organization had high participative climate or not. However, individuals with low collectivism showed large differences vis-à-vis their perception of participative climate.

Unexpectedly, masculinity also weakened the positive relationship of participative climate to employee perception of voice efficacy, which was hypothesized to have the opposite relationship. Individuals with high masculinity did not show large
differences according to whether or not they perceived a participative climate, while voice efficacy of individuals with low masculinity displayed an increase when they perceived a highly participative climate. There might be many reasons for this unexpected result. One might be how I presented masculinity in the survey. The questionnaire used for this study only measures whether an individual has traditional gender values, rather than whether an individual has assertiveness and performance-oriented traits. In masculinity value, individuals ascribing to traditional gender roles usually tend to be more assertive and more performance-oriented (Hofstede, 1980). Yoo and colleagues (2011) may have created questionnaires for masculinity based on this reasoning. However, individuals who ascribe to strong traditional gender roles are also more likely to hold general traditional values such as hierarchical ordering and collectivistic harmony, which might have a negative relationship with voice. For this reason, high masculinity might weaken the relationship between participative climate and voice efficacy.

Lastly, no moderating effect of any cultural dimensions was detected on the relation of participative climate on employee perception of voice safety, although the direct effects of power distance, collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance to voice safety were significant. This result indicates that employee perception of voice safety is clearly distinct from voice efficacy. It also demonstrates that participative climate more strongly influences employee perception of voice safety than voice efficacy, regardless of an individual’s cultural values. One reason for this could be that the extent of the influence of context and individual values on an individual’s perception will be different for efficacy and safety. According to Morrison and colleagues (2011), perception of voice
safety relates to psychological safety, or beliefs about whether an individual can take an interpersonal risk within a particular context. On the other hand, perception of voice efficacy might be shaped by more individual and interpersonal factors such as self-confidence and sense of personal agency, whether the intended voice target has been receptive, and the level of influence of status of both speaker and voice target (Morrison, 2014). Therefore, voice efficacy might be decided based on more individual and interpersonal factors and relatively less influenced by contextual factors, while perception of safety is strongly influenced by contextual factors such as relevant organizational climate and culture.

**Theoretical Implications**

This study makes several important contributions to the employee voice literature. First, the theoretical model and findings contextualized to Korea complement existing theory and evidence based on results in Western settings. While several employee voice studies have been recently conducted based on Chinese samples (Huang et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2015), no study had been conducted in South Korea, while employee voice research has produced mostly Western-based evidence. Korean companies had developed distinctive HR systems such as seniority-based payment and lifetime employment through trade union in the past (Lee, 2011), which might have different influences on employee voice perceptions. However, current trends of decreasing union density and placing employee voice as an individual choice is a global issue and employee voice practices are expanding around the globe. This study found that employees in non-Western culture perceived the importance of participative climate in generating their perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. In addition, this study is
among the first to demonstrate cultural values other than power distance – collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity – as factors to influence employee voice in non-Western context, while other studies based on non-Western contexts only focused on power distance as a critical antecedent of employee voice (e.g., Huang et al., 2005). Future research in other non-Western contexts will enrich employee voice literature.

One of the novel insights from this study is to link two concepts – employee voice practices and employee voice perception – that have been studied separately in the HRM/IR disciplines and the OB discipline. Employee voice studies in the OB discipline have focused on individual attitudes and behaviors of voice that are based on the individual’s discretionary decision (Morrison, 2011, 2014). In order to investigate factors influencing this discretionary voice behavior, OB scholars have focused on individual dispositions (i.e., conscientiousness, extraversion, and proactive personality), individual perceptions and attitudes toward job and organizations (i.e., felt responsibilities, commitment, engagement, and psychological safety), relational based factors within an organization (i.e., leader-member exchange (LMX) and leadership styles), and contextual factors such as workplace climates (Chamberlin, Newton, & Lepine, 2016). However, OB scholars have not accounted for employee voice via formal organizational mechanisms such as unions, collective bargaining, and non-union employee representation as their study scope, and therefore have not considered formal employee voice practices as factors influencing employee voice attitude and behavior (Morrison, 2011).

In contrast, IR scholars have focused on formal voice mechanisms as a method to reduce employee dissatisfaction and increase employees’ power share in the organization.
Therefore, their interest has not been on the individual’s attitude and behavior of voice, but rather on whether collective voice mechanisms such as collective bargaining and unions have increased employees’ power share in the organization (Black & Lynch, 2004; Brewster et al., 2007; Dundon et al., 2004; Harcourt, Wood, & Harcourt, 2004; Kaufman, 2015). In another vein, HRM scholars have considered formal voice practice as a way for employees to participate in the decision-making process for both individual advancement and organizational development, thus their interest has been on whether employee voice practices positively increase organizational performance, not on individual attitudes and perceptions of employee voice (Boxall & Purcell, 2011; Harley, 2014; Wilkinson et al., 2014).

This study attempts to break this academic silo around employee voice research by linking the antecedent – formal employee voice practices – that has been studied in the HMR/IR disciplines to the individual’s voice perception that has been perceived as the critical variable in the OB discipline. The results of this study show that there are significant indirect relations of employee voice practices to employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety via participative climate. Hence, it is clear that establishing formal employee voice practices influences employees to think they can speak out with a belief that their voice behavior would lead to a desired change, while at the same time not jeopardizing their work security. This finding encourages more research on the link between formal employee voice practices and perceptions of employee voice.

Third, this study found a mediating role of participative climate on the positive link between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. According to the results of mediation analysis, only an indirect effect of
employee voice practices to employee perception of voice efficacy and safety via participative climate was detected, while no significant direct effect between the two variables was detected. This result demonstrates the significant role of organizational climate as an antecedent in creating employee perception of voice behavior, as well as being an outcome of experienced/perceived employee voice practices. This evidence supports the findings of other studies that investigated the positive relationship between relevant organizational climates and employee voice (Frazier & Bowler, 2015; Frazier & Fainshmidt, 2012; Huang et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2014; Morrison et al., 2011; Shadur et al, 1999; Spreitzer, 1996; Tesluk et al., 1999; Wang & Hsieh, 2013). However, no empirical study addressing the relationship between employee voice practices and participative climate exists, although several studies argued that organizational policies and practices create relevant organizational climate (Kopelman el al., 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000, Schulte et al., 2006). By linking the newly explored relationship between employee voice practices and participative climate to existing relations of participative climate to employee perception of voice into one complete model, this study supports and expands the role of participative climate in relation to employee voice. Future research on other potential mediators of these relationships is needed to enhance the understanding of the newly defined relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice.

Another important contribution of this study is that it expands our knowledge of the influence of cultural values on employee voice. Detert and Edmondson (2011) demonstrate that employees are influenced by taken for granted beliefs about when and why voice behavior at work is risky and inappropriate, and these beliefs are based on
culturally endorsed values about challenging hierarchical relationships, in addition to individual experiences about authority through interactions with other individuals and institutions. Therefore, cultural values should be considered as a critical contextual factor influencing employee perception of voice behaviors.

The influence of the power distance dimension on employee voice has been extensively discussed in extant research (e.g., Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Brockner et al., 2001; Huang et al., 2005; Kwon et al., 2016; Landau, 2009; Wei et al., 2015), since employee voice has been regarded as a behavior which challenges hierarchical order. In response to the recent call for extended research on cultural differences in voice beyond power distance (Morrison, 2014), this study has empirically explored the influence of four national culture values – power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity – as moderators of the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety.

In this study, I have established the relevance of other cultural values. I have argued that voice might be seen as harmful to group cohesiveness and group harmony in high collectivism societies, similar to in high power distance societies, and therefore be an unsafe and ineffective behavior. In high uncertainty avoidance cultures, voice might lead to organizational uncertainty that is considered negative. I suggested that societies likely to embrace voice, creating perceptions of high safety and high effectiveness, are those that are high in masculinity, since they place a high value on performance orientation (using voice to increase overall organizational performance) and on assertiveness (voice as a form of constructive feedback and active self-expression).
Statistical analysis testing the direct effect between cultural dimensions to employee perception of voice demonstrated very interesting results such that only power distance had the expected negative relationship to both voice efficacy and voice safety. Unexpectedly, uncertainty avoidance and collectivism showed significant relations to employee perception of voice efficacy (uncertainty avoidance only) and voice safety (both), but its direction was positive, which is opposite of what was expected. The reason for these unexpected results can be various, including characteristics of data, or other explanations based on different theories.

One of the explanations can be attributed to the characteristics of the sample of this study. Almost 80% of participants are in their 40s and under, and almost 90% of participants hold more than bachelor degrees. This relatively young and highly educated participant pool may possess different ideas about employee voice and cultural values. For example, they might perceive that voice behavior may not be against their cultural values such as group cohesiveness, group harmony, and status quo. Even though they hold these values, they can still think their voice behavior within an organization will be processed properly and valuably without risking their interpersonal and job security. I expect future research on finding direct or moderating relationships between cultural dimensions and employee voice may help to answer these questions.

In addition to expanding the scope of employee voice research by including new cultural dimensions as critical contextual factors, this study hypothesized moderating roles of those cultural dimensions on the link of participative climate to employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. The results unexpectedly did not show any evidence to support existing studies stating that power distance will moderate the
relationship between relative organizational climate and employee voice behavior (i.e., Huang et al., 2005). However, this study contributes to the field by expanding the scope of employee voice study by incorporating unexplored cultural values in the theory model and demonstrating evidence that collectivism and masculinity can play moderating roles in the perception of employee voice. Future empirical research investigating the role of each cultural dimension as a moderator of organizational level contextual factors to employee voice perceptions is needed to better understand these findings.

In addition, the results demonstrate that the moderating effects of cultural values were significant on voice efficacy, but not on voice safety. These results may mean that voice efficacy is more influenced by individual level characteristics because efficacy is based on strong individual confidence of their capacity (Morrison, 2014). In contrast, perception of safety might be more strongly influenced by contextual factors than by individual beliefs about their safety (Morrison et al., 2011). Future research on the differences between voice efficacy and voice safety should be conducted to articulate the distinction further.

**Practical Implications**

This study has several practical implications. First, the findings show that organizational climate plays an important role when implementing HR practices. As the results show, implementing employee voice practices does not automatically generate employee perception that they can speak out with a belief that their voice will be heard and processed properly or that this voice behavior will not jeopardize their interpersonal and job security. Employee voice practices only influence employee perception of voice when there is a relevant organizational climate – participative climate (Huang et al.,
Organizational climate can be generated by implementing organizational policies and practices aimed at encouraging desired attitudinal and behavioral changes as well as providing continuous and consistent social support from management in the organization to encourage employees to change their attitudes and behavior (Frazier & Bowler, 2015; Kopelman et al., 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Rogg, Schmidt, Shull, & Schmitt, 2001; Shadur et al., 1999).

Usually, organizations implement employee voice practices to encourage employees to speak out and expect that these bottom-up ideas will eventually contribute to increased organizational performance. However, if organizations implement a practice without providing proper social support that can be experienced by employees through day-to-day interactions with their supervisor, manager, and executives (i.e., as part of a participative climate), the desired attitudinal and behavioral change of employees might not take place. Management should incorporate formal practices and informal social support into their employee voice system. This idea can be applied to other HR practices as well.

This study also demonstrates that a best practice strategy arguing that one best practice will advance organizational performance regardless of national characteristics might not work universally (Kwon et al., 2016). As studies of convergence in HRM practices have concluded, results tend to indicate that HRM is largely a localized practice, and question the notion of convergence generally (Mayrhofer, Brewster, Morley, & Ledolter, 2011; Von Glinow, Drost, & Teagarden, 2002). More specifically, organizational practices with soft interpersonal aspects are more likely to be influenced by culture, while more formal aspects of practices such as centralization, formalization,
and specialization of an organization are strongly influenced by hard aspects of organizational context such as size, structure, and technology (Tayeb, 1987).

Employee voice practices are implemented in order to listen to employees and provide opportunities for employees to participate in the organizational decision-making process. These practices influence the communication pattern of the organization, which is an interpersonal aspect that is strongly influenced by culture. Therefore, implementing the same employee voice practices that have been successful in advanced economies into other countries with different cultural and institutional characteristics might not generate the same desired outcome.

As the theoretical modeling and findings of this study demonstrate, employee perception of voice efficacy and voice safety are significantly influenced by an individual’s beliefs about cultural values. Individuals’ cultural values, which have been formed through interactions within their own culture, are deeply ingrained in individuals’ traits and organizational context, so that individuals might not accept newly implemented HR practices if those values do not align with their individual and collective value systems. Therefore, organizations should recognize and assess their dominant cultural values first, then modify the practices to fit these dominant values, and finally, provide social support for employees to accept new practices without strong resistance. Here again, the role of appropriate organizational climate is significant. With a proper organizational climate that helps mitigate employee’s resistance to new organizational practices such as employee voice practices, employees are more likely to use those practices and, eventually yielding attitudinal and behavioral changes of employees.
Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This study suggests theoretical and practical implications for employee voice research literature by empirically studying the mechanism of participative climate in the relationship between employee voice practices and employee perception of voice efficacy and safety, as well as investigating the moderating role of four cultural dimensions on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice. However, this work has some limitations that necessitate subsequent research to expand the scientific empirical evidence.

First, I presented a multilevel mediation process of participative climate, but cross-sectional research design is not an ideal approach to test such a process model based on causal thinking. However, as a cross-level meso-mediation model can apply causal ordering of upper-level variables as antecedent to lower-level variables, one causal relation from mediator (participative climate) to dependent variables (employee perception of voice efficacy and safety) was satisfied (Mathieu & Taylor, 2007). In addition, the mediator of this study is a result of an independent variable based on theoretical reasoning (Kopelman et al., 1990; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Schulte et al., 2006), which can alleviate this limitation of causal linking. However, future research will be needed to test for a clearer causal relationship in a similar mediation model.

Second, all variables except some control variables were assessed through employee responses, so this may cause concern about the common method bias. Nevertheless, this practice of data collection is commonly used in research on employee voice, given that the theoretical model of this study aims to measure individual’s perception of their organization and themselves, and other people might not be able to
detect these individual perceptions. The CFA results in Table 4-2 indicate that common method variance might not be problematic (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), and therefore it does not contaminate the findings. Also, creating the interaction terms between moderator (power distance, collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity) and mediator (participative climate) makes the common method variance a less serious concern (Evans, 1985).

In addition, sample size – total 478 participants in 22 organizations with an average organization size of 22 – is smaller than the normally accepted number of unit level and unit level size for multilevel analysis. As Kozlowski and Klein (2000) suggest, “in order to have sufficient power to detect cross-level interactions, it is necessary to have a sample of 30 groups containing 30 individuals each” (p. 496). In addition, Bickle (2007) suggested that a minimum of 20 groups and 30 individuals per group is considered as acceptable for multilevel analysis. According to their suggestion, the sample used for this study was slightly smaller, and thus might generate small power, thereby generating too small ICCs of one dependent variable (employee perception of voice safety) to conduct multilevel analysis. However, I believe I can counter this limitation, because ICCs for employee perception of voice efficacy (another dependent variable) were within the acceptable range. In addition, one can detect a strong aggregate relationship with a small percentage of shared variance in lower-level responses (Bliese, 2000). However, subsequent research should replicate my proposed model with multi-source database and sufficient sample size.

Fourth, the focus of this study in terms of the moderating effect of cultural dimensions is limited to a part of the proposed model – participative climate to employee
perception of voice efficacy and voice safety. The study might contribute more to employee voice literature in terms of linking two distinct silos – formal employee voice practices and employee perception of voice – if the moderating effect of cultural values can be measured on the mediated relationship. However, a literature search did not yield an appropriate advanced statistical analysis technique to address adequately multilevel moderated mediation. Future research needs to test this multilevel moderated mediation in order to clearly demonstrate the role of cultural dimension as a moderator to strengthen or weaken the mediated relationships linking voice practice to employee voice through participative climate.

**Conclusion**

This study makes a meaningful addition to employee voice research by linking two separately developed concepts – experienced employee voice practices and employee perception of voice – and demonstrating their indirect relationship via participative climate. Further, this study complements employee voice research by substantiating moderating effects of collectivism and masculinity on the relationship between participative climate and employee perception of voice efficacy.

I was able to provide a more complete explanation of how employee perception of or experience with organizational practices and policies is transferred to employee’s holistic perception about voice itself, and identify organizational and national level contextual factors that influence this process. This study will encourage further examination concerning the fundamental impact and the conditions under which employee perception of voice is influenced by organizational practices, by organizational context, and by national cultural values.
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Appendix A

Recruitment Email (English Version)
Recruitment email messages

Recruitment email to HR Professionals of each Organization in South Korea

Title: Need Your Assistance in Employee Voice Research in South Korea

Greetings,

Bora Kwon, a doctoral student at Penn State University needs your assistance to complete employee voice research project.

I am conducting research about the influence of employee voice practices on employee’s perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in South Korea.

I want to figure out what factors influence the relationship between experienced employee voice practices and employees’ perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in South Korea. I assume that organizational climates (e.g. participative climate) and level of cultural value dimensions of individuals might influence in this mechanism.

If you (or your organization) accept, a different e-mail with a link to the survey specially designed for HR professionals will be sent. In the survey, I will ask characteristics of your employees and your organization in order to identify contextual differences of the organization. The survey will not take more than 10 minutes. All of responses collected through survey will be kept fully confidential and be used only for the research purpose.

In addition to complete this survey, please randomly select 30 employees who can participate in this research and ask their intent to participate. If they agree, please send them a recruitment e-mail and survey link to them.

Again, identification will remain completely confidential except to the researchers. If you have any concern or question about this research, you can email or call the principal investigator, Bora Kwon. Her email address is bxk268@psu.edu and phone number is 1-(814)-321-3768.

Thank you in advance for your support in answering the survey for this study.

Best regards,

Bora Kwon
Recruitment email messages

*Recruitment email to employees through HR Managers of Organizations in South Korea*

**Title: Need Your Assistance in Employee Voice Research in South Korea**

Greetings,

Bora Kwon, a doctoral student at Penn State University needs your assistance to complete employee voice research project.

I am conducting research about the influence of employee voice practices on employee’s perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in South Korea.

I want to figure out what factors influence the relationship between experienced employee voice practices and employees’ perception of voice efficacy and voice safety in South Korea. I assume that organizational climates (e.g. participative climate) and level of cultural value dimensions of individuals might influence this mechanism.

In the survey, I will ask your organization’s employee voice practices, the level of your perception of those practices, your perception of organizational climate and your level of power distance orientation. The survey will not take more than 5 minutes. All of the responses collected through survey will be kept fully confidential and be used only for the research purpose.

Again, identification will remain completely confidential except to the researchers. If you have any concern or question about this research, you can email or call the principal investigator, Bora Kwon. Her email address is bxk268@psu.edu and phone number is 1-(814)-321-3768.

*Thank you in advance for your support in answering the survey for this study.*

Best regards,

Bora Kwon
Appendix B

Recruitment Email (Korean Version)
안녕하세요, ㅇㅇㅇ님

저는 펜실베니아 주립대학 박사과정의 권보라라고 합니다. 설문에 참여해 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.

현재 저는 "직원 참여 제도"가 회사 내 잘 정착되기 위한 "참여적 조직 문화"와 "국가 문화"의 역할에 대해 연구중이고, 이를 위해 30여개 한국 기업들로부터 설문을 걷고 있습니다.

연구참여를 위해 ㅇㅇㅇ님께 부탁드리는 사항은 다음과 같습니다.

1. 먼저 ㅇㅇㅇ님께서는 조직 문화 담당자로서 다음의 설문 (링크: https://pennstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_7OQyNdUlmIwCUpD)에 응답해 주시기를 부탁드리고,

2. 회사 내 직원 총 30분께 다음의 설문 (링크: 사별 링크)을 요청해서 받아주시면 됩니다.

만약 위의 설문 링크가 회사의 방화벽 등으로 인해 열리지 않는 경우에 알려주시면 감사하겠습니다. 다른 링크를 보내드리겠습니다.

귀하께서 제공하는 정보는 연구목적으로 취합된 형태로만 활용되며, 또한 익명으로 관리되고 비밀이 유지될 것입니다. 귀하의 모든 답변은 철저한 비밀보장과 무기명으로 관리될 것입니다.

다시 한 번 설문 참여에 감사드리고, 궁금한 사항이 있으시면 kwon.bora.psu@gmail.com으로 연락주시기 바랍니다.

감사합니다.

권보라 드림
Appendix C

Informed Consent Forms
Title of Project: *Analysis of the mechanisms linking employee voice practices to employees' perceptions in South Korea*

Principal Investigator: *Bora Kwon*

Address: *1400 Martin Street, #3015, State College, PA 16803*

Telephone Number: *1-(814) 321-3768*

Advisor: *David L. Passmore*

Advisor Telephone Number: *1 814 863 2583*

---

**We are asking you to be in a research study. This form gives you information about the research.**

**Whether or not you take part is up to you. You can choose not to take part. You can agree to take part and later change your mind. Your decision will not be held against you.**

**Please ask questions about anything that is unclear to you and take your time to make your choice.**

---

1. **Why is this research study being done?**

This research is being done to find out the mechanism linking employee voice practices to employees’ perception on those policies. This research specifically investigates the role of participative organizational climate that might encourage employees to have a positive perception of employee voice practices in South Korea, where high power distance culture dominates. Which factors influence the creation of participative organizational culture will be explored. Moreover, the influence of individuals’ cultural orientation on this mechanism will be investigated.
Approximately 500 Korean employees who had been employed in companies with more than 30 employees in South Korea will take part in this research study, because these companies have to implement at least one employee voice practice due to the Korean government regulation (by The Act concerning the Promotion of Worker Participation and Cooperation which is enacted in 1997).

I will not limit employees’ job functions and industries to see if the model works well regardless of those factors, but rather will limit the employees’ characteristic to white-collar workers in the headquarters of the organization.

2. **What will happen in this research study?**

1) Investigators will ask the HR managers of 20 companies who wanted to participate in the research to send email a study participation request to employees in South Korea. This first e-mail message will include a link to the implied informed consent form of this study. Once a participant agrees to participate in our research, he or she will be led to the survey web page.

2) Researchers’ contact information will be provided in the initial e-mail. The survey will be administrated by the principal investigator by using Qualtrics-based survey via Penn State Qualtrics website (https://pennstate.qualtrics.com), and data will be stored at a secure server (PSU id/password protected).

3) One week after the first emailing, the researchers will send the e-mail that contains a link to the survey questionnaires and the same informed consent form link as well.

4) Depending on data collection progress for the survey, investigators might send a reminder email again one week later.

3. **What are the risks and possible discomforts from being in this research study?**

There are no risks and possible discomforts from participating in this research study.

4. **What are the possible benefits from being in this research study?**

4a. **What are the possible benefits to you?**

Upon request, the principal investigator can provide organizational level of diagnoses and recommendations based on the result from data analysis and findings from this study.
4b. What are the possible benefits to others?

By providing a clear mechanism between employee voice practices and employees’ perception on those practices, organizations can prepare and provide entire package for their employees to actively use employee voice practices that eventually benefit organizational effectiveness and overall performance.

5. What other options are available instead of being in this research study?

You may decide not to participate in this research.

6. How long will you take part in this research study?

Survey has a total 42 questions and it will take around 20 minutes.

7. How will your privacy and confidentiality be protected if you decide to take part in this research study?

All data will be collected and maintained by the principal investigator on a password protected computer and will not be made available to other investigators. No personal identifiable information will be reported when writing the result.

8. What are the costs of taking part in this research study?

8a. What will you have to pay for if you take part in this research study?

N/A

8b. What happens if you are injured as a result of taking part in this research study?

N/A

9. Will you be paid or receive credit to take part in this research study?

N/A

10. Who is paying for this research study?

N/A

11. What are your rights if you take part in this research study?
Taking part in this research study is voluntary.

- You do not have to be in this research.
- If you choose to be in this research, you have the right to stop at any time.
- If you decide not to be in this research or if you decide to stop at a later date, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled.

12. If you have questions or concerns about this research study, whom should you call?

Please call the head of the research study (principal investigator), Bora Kwon at 814-321-3768 or bxk268@psu.edu if you:

- Have questions, complaints or concerns about the research.
- Believe you may have been harmed by being in the research study.

You may also contact the Office for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775, ORProtections@psu.edu if you:

- Have questions regarding your rights as a person in a research study.
- Have concerns or general questions about the research.
- You may also call this number if you cannot reach the research team or wish to talk to someone else about any concerns related to the research.

INFORMED CONSENT TO TAKE PART IN RESEARCH

*Your participation implies your voluntary consent to participate in the research.*
*Please keep or print a copy of this form for your records.*
Appendix D

Questionnaires for Survey (English Version)
Thank you for participating in the study. This study seeks to investigate how organizational climate and power distance orientation influence employees’ perception of formal voice practices.

In this survey, basic information about your organization and the formal employee voice practices provided by your organization will be solicited.

It will take 5 to 10 minutes to respond to the survey. Please respond to all questions, so that your complete answers can be used in the final analysis of the study.

I would like to clarify that your answers to this survey will be used only for the purpose of scientific research and no one else except for the researchers will be able to see the responses. All of your responses in the survey will be kept fully confidential and anonymous.

If you have any concerns or questions about this research, you can email the investigator, Bora Kwon. Her email address is bxk268@psu.edu.

Thank you.

Principal Investigator: Bora Kwon, Ph.D. Candidate, Workforce Education & Development Program, The Pennsylvania State University, 409B Keller Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA
Email: bxk268@psu.edu
Phone: (814) 321-3768
I. Employee Voice Practices

Please indicate the level of employees that are covered by the following employee voice practices implemented in your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Executive and above</th>
<th>Team Leaders</th>
<th>Part Leaders</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Clerical workers</th>
<th>Entire employees (including part timer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My organization provides employees with practices such as attitude surveys, suggestion schemes, and similar activities that encourage employees to communicate ideas openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify the formal voice practices that are applied to #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My organization provides employees with practices such as employee-manager meetings, town hall meetings, and similar activities that encourage employees to challenge the traditional way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify the formal voice practices that are applied to #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My organization provides employees with practices such as problem solving groups, quality circles, autonomous teams, and similar activities that encourage employees to be creative in coming up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please specify the formal voice practices that are applied to #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the formal voice practices provided above, please indicate any other formal practices that encourage employees to speak out in order for them to participate in the organizational decision-making process.
II. Employee Information

Please provide the following demographic information of your employees. It will only be used to make statistical comparisons between different groups of respondents.

1. Please indicate approximate proportions of your employees applied in the following groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full timers</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part timers</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please indicate approximate proportions of your employees applied in the following age groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20’s</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30’s</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40’s</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50’s</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60’s</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate approximate proportions of your employees applied in each gender group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate approximate proportions of your employees applied in each education level group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or equivalent</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Organizational Information

Please provide the following information about your organization.

1. Please indicate your company’s name

   

2. Please indicate the main sector of industry or services in which you operate (Please select one that most closely resembles your organization’s activity)

   - A. Agriculture, forestry and fishing
   - B. Mining and quarrying
   - C. Manufacturing
   - D. Electricity, gas, steam and water supply
   - E. Sewerage, waste management, materials recovery and remediation activities
   - F. Construction
   - G. Wholesale and retail trade
   - H. Transportation
   - I. Accommodation and food service activities
   - J. Information and communications
   - K. Financial and insurance activities
   - L. Real estate activities and renting and leasing
   - M. Professional, scientific and technical activities
   - N. Business facilities management and business support services
   - O. Public administration and defense; compulsory social security
   - P. Education
   - Q. Human health and social work activities
   - R. Arts, sports and recreation related services
   - S. Membership organizations, repair and other personal services
   - T. Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use
   - U. Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies

3. Is your organization:

   - Private sector
     - Yes
     - No
   - If private sector, are you a Public Limited Company (on the stock market)
     - Yes
     - No
   - Public sector
     - Yes
     - No
   - If public sector, are you
     - National
     - Regional
   - Not for profit
     - Yes
     - No
4.
| Mixed (Public and Private sector) | Yes | No |

4.
| Is the business owned and/or controlled by primarily one family? | Yes | No |
| If yes, is the family also actively involved in its management? | Yes | No |

5. How would you describe the main market(s) for your organization’s products or services?

| 1. Local |
| 2. Regional |
| 3. National |
| 4. Continent-wide |
| 5. World-wide |

6. Has your organization been involved in any of the following changes in the last 3 years? (Select all that apply)

| A. Acquisition of another organization | Yes | No |
| B. Takeover by another organization |
| C. Merger |
| D. Relocation |
| E. Demerger |

If you choose A, B, or C, which organization did your organization acquire, be taken over by, or merge with?

How long has it been since that change?

7. Does your organization have a trade union?
   1) Yes
   2) No

If yes, please indicate an approximate proportion of your employees holding a membership in the union

8. In which country is the corporate headquarters of your organization based?
   (Please refer to ultimate parent company of your organization is part of a larger group)
9. In what year was your organization established?

10. Is your organization (or part that you are answering for):

A. Corporate HQ of an international organization
B. Corporate HQ of a national organization
C. Subsidiary of an international organization
D. Subsidiary of a national organization
E. Independent organization with more than one site
F. Independent organization with a single site

11. Is your CEO or president a Korean with a Korean nationality? If not, what nationality is your CEO or president?

12. How many years has your current CEO or president held their current position?

Thank you so much for your participation in this study!
Employee Voice Survey

Thank you for participating in the study. This study seeks to investigate how organizational climate and power distance orientation influences employees’ perception on formal voice practices.

It will take 3 to 5 minutes to respond to the survey. The survey is divided into 4 sections. Please respond to all questions, so that your complete answers can be used in the final analysis of the study.

I would like to clarify that your answers to this survey will be used only for the purpose of scientific research and no one else except for the researchers will be able to see the responses. All of your responses in the survey will be kept fully confidential and anonymous.

If you have any concern or question about this research, you can email the investigator, Bora Kwon. Her email address is bxk268@psu.edu.

Thank you.

Principal Investigator: Bora Kwon, Ph.D. Candidate,
Workforce Education & Development Program
The Pennsylvania State University
409B Keller Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA
Email: bxk268@psu.edu
Phone: (814) 321-3768
I. Employee Voice Practices

Please indicate the level of employees, you believe, that are covered by of the following employee voice practices implemented in your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I believe</th>
<th>Executives and above</th>
<th>Team Leaders</th>
<th>Part Leaders</th>
<th>Professionals</th>
<th>Clerical workers</th>
<th>Entire Employees (including part timer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My organization provides employees with practices such as attitude surveys, suggestion schemes and similar activities that encourage employees to communicate ideas openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My organization provides employee with practices such as employee-manager meetings, town hall meetings and similar activities that encourage employees to challenge the traditional way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My organization provides employees with practices such as problem solving groups, quality circles, autonomous teams and similar activities that encourage employees to be creative in coming up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Participative Organizational Climates

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your organizational climates (1= ‘Disagree’, 2= ‘Somewhat Disagree’, 3= ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4= ‘Somewhat Agree’, 5 = ‘Agree’.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My organization has established a climate where employees can challenge our traditional way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My organization has established a climate where employees can communicate openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My organization has established a climate where employees are encouraged to come up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My department has established a climate where employees can challenge our traditional way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My department has established a climate where employees can communicate openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My department has established a climate where employees are encouraged to come up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My immediate manager has established a climate where employees can challenge our traditional way of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My immediate manager has established a climate where employees can communicate openly with those above them without fear of reprisal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My immediate manager has established a climate where employees are encouraged to come up with innovative solutions to work-related problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Cultural Value

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your power distance orientation (1= ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 = ‘Disagree’, 3 = ‘Somewhat Disagree’, 3= ‘Neither agree nor disagree’, 4= ‘Somewhat Agree’, 5 = ‘Agree’.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People in higher positions should make most decisions without consulting people in lower positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People in higher positions should not ask the opinions of people in lower positions too frequently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People in higher positions should avoid social interaction with people in lower positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People in lower positions should not disagree with decisions by people in higher positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People in higher positions should not delegate important tasks to people in lower positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is important to have instructions spelled out in detail so that I always know what I’m expected to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is important to closely follow instructions and procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rules and regulations are important because they inform me of what is expected of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Standardized work procedures are helpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Instructions for operations are important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individuals should sacrifice self-interest for the group (either at school or the work place).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individuals should stick with the group even through difficulties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Group welfare is more important than individual rewards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Group success is more important than individual success.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Individuals should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Group loyalty should be encouraged even if individual goals suffer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Solving difficult problems usually requires an active, forcible approach, which is typical of men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. There are some jobs that a man can always do better than a woman.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Perceived Employee Voice

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your views on voice efficacy in your organization (1= ‘Definitely not capable’, 2= ‘Not capable’, 3= ‘Somewhat not capable’, 4= ‘Neither capable nor not capable’, 5= ‘Somewhat capable’, 6 = ‘Capable’, 7 = ‘Definitely capable’.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel I am capable of effectively doing each of the following</th>
<th>Definitely not capable</th>
<th>Not capable</th>
<th>Somewhat not capable</th>
<th>Neither capable Nor not capable</th>
<th>Somewhat Capable</th>
<th>Capable</th>
<th>Definitely capable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop and make recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work. (Communication)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Speak up and encourage others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work. (Communication)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicate my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me. (Challenge)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Get involved in issues that affect the quality of life in my work unit. (Communication)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Speak up to my supervisor with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures at work. (Innovative)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Give my supervisor suggestions about how to make this work unit better, even if others disagree. (Challenge)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Challenge my supervisor to deal with problems around here. (Challenge)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Speak up to my supervisor with ideas to address employees’ needs and concerns. (Innovative)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your views on voice safety in your organization (1= ‘Definitely not safe, 2= ‘Not safe’, 3= ‘Somewhat not c safe’, 4= ‘Neither safe nor not safe’, 5= ‘Somewhat safe’, 6 = ‘safe’, 7 = ‘Definitely safe’.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel It is safe to do each of the following</th>
<th>Definitely not safe</th>
<th>Not safe</th>
<th>Somewhat not safe</th>
<th>Neither safe Nor not safe</th>
<th>Somewhat safe</th>
<th>Safe</th>
<th>Definitely safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Develop and make recommendations to my supervisor concerning issues that affect my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Speak up and encourage others in my work unit to get involved in issues that affect our work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communicate my opinions about work issues to others in my work unit, even if their opinions are different and they disagree with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Get involved in issues that affect the quality of life in my work unit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Speak up to my supervisor with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Give my supervisor suggestions about how to make this work unit better, even if others disagree.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Challenge my supervisor to deal with problems around here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Speak up to my supervisor with ideas to address employees’ needs and concerns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Demographic Information

Please provide the following demographic information. It will only be used to make statistical comparisons between different groups of respondents; it will not be used to profile individual respondents.

1. Your Age (years): __________

2. Your Gender
   a) Female
   b) Male

3. Your Highest Completed Level of Education
   a) High school degree
   b) Associate degree
   c) College degree
   d) Masters degree
   e) Ph.D. or equivalent
   f) Other (please specify): ________________

4. What is your managerial level?
   1) Employees under manager level
   2) Manager (e.g., Part Leader)
   3) Senior Manager (e.g., Team Leader)
   4) Executives

5. Number of years you have spent in your current organization

   __________  Years

6. Number of years you have spent in your current department

   __________  Years

7. Number of years you have spent with your current immediate manager

   __________  Years

8. What type of job do you work for?

   1) Marketing/Sales
   2) Production
   3) Research & Development
4) Engineering
5) IT/Internet
6) Administration
7) Other (Please specify) ______

Thank you so much for your participation in this study!
Appendix E

Questionnaires for Survey (Korean Version)
직원 참여 제도에 관한 직원 의식 설문

(조직 문화 담당자용)

본 연구에 참여해 주셔서 감사합니다. 본 연구는 조직 풍토(Organizational climate)와 국가 문화(National Culture)가 직원들의 구성원 참여 제도에 대한 인식에 어떤 영향을 미치는지를 조사하고자 합니다.

본 설문에서는 귀하의 회사와 직원에 관한 기본 정보와 귀사에서 운영하고 있는 구성원 참여 제도에 대한 정보를 얻고자 합니다.

설문서 작성에는 약 5~10분 정도 소요될 것입니다. 설문서는 총 3개 섹션으로 구성되어 있습니다. 본 연구에 귀하의 소중한 의견이 반영될 수 있도록 가능하면 모든 질문에 응답해 주시기 바랍니다.

귀하가 제공하는 정보는 연구 목적으로 취합된 형태로만 활용되며, 또한 익명으로 관리되고 비밀이 유지 될 것입니다. 귀하의 모든 답변은 철저한 비밀보장과 무기명으로 관리될 것입니다.

질문이나 의견이 있으시면, 연구자 권보라에게 이메일 (bxk268@psu.edu)로 연락해 주시기 바랍니다. 감사합니다.

연구자 권보라 (박사과정)
미국 펜실베니아 주립대학교, 조직개발 전공
주소: 409B Keller Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA
이메일: bxk268@psu.edu
전화: 1 (814) 321-3768
I. 직원 참여 제도

귀하의 조직에서 운영하고 있는 구성원 참여 및 의견 개진 제도를 이용할 수 있는 직원의 직위( 혹은 직급)에 표시하여 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>직원의 직위( 혹은 직급) 표시</th>
<th>임원급 이상</th>
<th>팀장/팀 리더 급(부장/차장 급) 이상</th>
<th>파트장/파트 리더급(과장/대리 급) 이상</th>
<th>일반 직원(대리 및 사원급) 이상</th>
<th>서무 직원 이상</th>
<th>전 직원 (비정규직 직원 포함)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 우리 회사는 직원들이 보복에 대한 두려움 없이 자신의 아이디어를 상사와 자유롭게 커뮤니케이션 할 수 있도록 직원의식조사(attitude survey), 의견 제안 활동(suggestion scheme), 혹은 유사한 제도 및 활동을 실시하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>문항 1에 해당하는 구성원 참여 및 의견 개진 제도를 모두 기입해 주십시오.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 우리 회사는 직원들이 기존의 업무 방식에 대해 개선 의견을 제기할 수 있도록 직원-상사간 미팅, 간담회, 혹은 유사한 제도를 운영하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>문항 2에 해당하는 구성원 참여 및 의견 개진 제도를 모두 기입해 주십시오.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>임원급 이상</td>
<td>팀장/팀 리더 급 (부장/차장급 이상)</td>
<td>파트장/파트 리더급 (과장/대리급 이상)</td>
<td>일반 직원 (대리 및 사원급 이상)</td>
<td>서무 직원 이상</td>
<td>전 직원 (비정규직 직원 포함)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 우리 회사는 직원들이 업무 관련 문제에 대해 혁신적인 해결방안을 도출할 수 있도록 문제 해결 팀 (Problem solving group), 품질 관리 팀 (Quality circle), 현장 자율경영팀 (autonomous teams), 혹은 유사한 조직을 만들어 운영하고 있다.

문항 3에 해당하는 종업원 발언 및 의견 개진 제도를 모두 기입해 주십시오.

위 문항에 답변한 구성원 참여 및 의견 개진 제도 외에, 조직 구성원들이 조직 내 의사 결정 과정에 참여할 수 있도록 장려하는 여타의 제도 및 활동이 있다면 자유롭게 기입해 주십시오.
II. 직원 정보

귀사의 직원 구성에 대한 질문입니다. 다음의 정보를 기입해 주십시오. 해당 정보는 타 조직의 설문 응답자 간의 통계학적 비교와 분석에만 사용될 것입니다.

1. 다음의 직무 형태에 해당하는 귀사 직원들의 비율을 기입해 주십시오

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>고용 형태</th>
<th>퍼센트</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>정규직</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>비정규직</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 다음의 연령 그룹에 해당하는 귀사 직원들의 비율을 기입해 주십시오

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>연령 그룹</th>
<th>퍼센트</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 대</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 대</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 대</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 대</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 대 이상</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 다음의 성별 그룹에 해당하는 귀사 직원들의 비율을 기입해 주십시오

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>성별</th>
<th>퍼센트</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>남성</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>여성</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 다음의 학력 그룹에 해당하는 귀사 직원들의 비율을 기입해 주십시오

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>학력</th>
<th>퍼센트</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>고등학교 졸업</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 년제 대학 (전문대) 졸업</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 년제 대학교 졸업</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>석사 학위 소지</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>박사 학위 소지</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. 조직 정보

귀사에 대한 다음의 정보를 기입해 주십시오.

1. 귀하가 근무하시는 회사명을 기입해 주십시오

2. 귀사가 해당하는 산업에 표기해 주십시오.

| A. 농업, 임업 및 어업 |
| B. 광업 |
| C. 제조업 |
| D. 전기, 가스, 수도 |
| E. 폐기물, 환경 복원 |
| F. 건설업 |
| G. 도매 및 소매 |
| H. 운수업 |
| I. 숙박 및 음식점업 |
| J. 출판, 영상, 정보 등 |
| K. 금융, 보험 |
| L. 부동산, 임대 |
| M. 전문, 과학, 기술 |
| N. 사업 시설, 사업 지원 |
| O. 행정, 국방, 사회보장 |
| P. 교육 서비스 |
| Q. 보건 및 사회복지 |
| R. 예술, 스포츠, 여가 |
| S. 협회, 수리, 개인 |
| T. 자가소비생산활동 |
| U. 국제 및 외국기관 |
3. 귀사의 대략의 직원수 (상시 근로자 기준)를 기입해 주십시오.

4. 귀사의 기업 형태에 표기해 주십시오

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>귀사는 사기업 입니까?</th>
<th>예</th>
<th>아니오</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(사기업인 경우) 귀사는 주식회사 입니까?</td>
<td>예</td>
<td>아니오</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>귀사는 공기업 입니까?</td>
<td>예</td>
<td>아니오</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(공기업인 경우) 귀사가 해당하는 기업 형태를 표시해 주십시오.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 정부부처 형태의 공기업</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 주식회사 형태의 공기업 (혼합 기업)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 공사</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 해당사항 없음</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. 귀사의 소유 형태에 대해 기입해 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>귀사는 오너 가족에 의해 소유되거나 관리되고 있습니까?</th>
<th>예</th>
<th>아니오</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(“예”라고 대답한 경우) 해당 가족이 경영활동에 참여하고 있습니까?</td>
<td>예</td>
<td>아니오</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 귀사의 제품 혹은 서비스가 타겟으로 하는 주요 시장에 모두 표기해 주십시오.

   1) 국내 마켓
   2) 아시아 퍼시픽
   3) 글로벌
7. 최근 3 년 동안의 귀사의 주요한 변화에 대해 기입해 주십시오 (해당되는 사항을 빠짐없이 모두 표기해 주십시오)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>항목</th>
<th>응답</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>타기업을 인수하였음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대상 기업명을 기입해 주십시오</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>해당하는 변화를 겪은지 몇년이 되셨습니까?</td>
<td>년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>타기업에 의해 인수 되었음 (피인수)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대상 기업명을 기입해 주십시오</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>해당하는 변화를 겪은지 몇년이 되셨습니까?</td>
<td>년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다른 회사와 합병하였음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대상 기업명을 기입해 주십시오</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>해당하는 변화를 겪은지 몇년이 되셨습니까?</td>
<td>년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>회사의 사업장(혹은 공장) 및 사무실을 이전하였음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대상 기업명을 기입해 주십시오</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>해당하는 변화를 겪은지 몇년이 되셨습니까?</td>
<td>년</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>회사를 분할하였음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>대상 기업명을 기입해 주십시오</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>해당하는 변화를 겪은지 몇년이 되셨습니까?</td>
<td>년</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. 귀사는 노동 조합이 있습니까?

  1) 예
  2) 아니오

(“예” 라고 대답한 경우) 노동 조합에 가입한 직원들의 비율을 기입해 주십시오.

------------------------------------------%

9. 귀사의 본사는 어느 나라에 위치하고 있습니까? (만약 귀사가 다국적 기업일 경우, 본사가 위치한 국가명을 기입해 주십시오)

------------------------------------------
10. 귀사의 설립연도를 기입하여 주십시오.

-------------------------------------

11. 귀사가 해당하는 조직 형태에 표시해 주십시오:

1) 다국적 기업의 기업본부 (HQ)
2) 국내 기업의 기업 본부 (HQ)
3) 다국적 기업의 자회사
4) 국내 기업의 자회사
5) 하나 이상의 사이트가 있는 독립 기업
6) 단일 사이트의 독립 기업

12. 귀사의 현 CEO 혹은 회장(사장)은 한국 국적을 가진 한국인입니까? 만약 아니라면 CEO의 국적은 어디입니까?

-------------------------------------

13. 귀사의 현 CEO 혹은 회장(사장)이 취임한지 몇 년 되었습니다가?

-------------------------------------

설문에 참여해 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.
직원 참여 제도에 관한 직원 인식 설문

본 연구에 참여해 주셔서 감사합니다. 본 연구는 조직 풍토 (Organizational climate)와 국가 문화 (Cultural Value) 가 직원들의 직원 참여 제도에 대한 인식에 어떤 영향을 미치는지를 조사하고자 합니다.

설문서 작성에는 약 3~5분 정도 소요될 것입니다. 설문서는 총 4개 섹션으로 구성되어 있습니다. 본 연구에 귀하의 소중한 의견이 반영될 수 있도록 가능하면 모든 질문에 응답해 주시기 바랍니다.

귀하가 제공하는 정보는 연구 목적으로 취합된 형태로만 활용되며, 또한 익명으로 관리되고 비밀이 유지 될 것입니다. 귀하의 모든 답변은 철저한 비밀보장과 무기명으로 관리될 것임을 다시 한번 강조드립니다.

질문이나 의견이 있으시면, 연구자 권보라에게 이메일 (bxk268@psu.edu)로 연락 해 주시기 바랍니다. 감사합니다.

연구자 권보라 (박사과정)
미국 펜실베니아 주립대학교, 조직개발 전공
주소: 409B Keller Building, University Park, PA 16802, USA
이메일 : bxk268@psu.edu
전화: 1 (814) 321-3768
I. 참여적 조직 풍토

귀하의 회사의 조직문화에 대한 질문입니다. 각 문항들에 대해 귀하께서 동의하는 정도를 표기하여 주십시오. (1=‘동의하지 않는다’, 2=‘다소 동의하지 않는다’, 3=‘중립적이다’, 4=‘약간 동의한다’, 5=‘동의한다’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>동의하지 않는다</th>
<th>다소 동의하지 않는다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 동의한다</th>
<th>동의한다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 우리 회사는 직원들이 기존의 업무 방식에 대해 문제 제기할 수 있는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 우리 회사는 직원들이 보복에 대한 두려움 없이 상사와 자유롭게 아이디어를 논의할 수 있는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 우리 회사는 직원들이 업무 관련 문제에 대해 혁신적인 해결방안을 자유롭게 논의할 수 있도록 독려하는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 우리 부서(팀)는 직원들이 기존의 업무 방식에 대해 문제 제기할 수 있는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 우리 부서(팀)는 직원들이 보복에 대한 두려움 없이 상사와 자유롭게 아이디어를 논의할 수 있는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 우리 부서(팀)는 직원들이 업무 관련 문제에 대해 혁신적인 해결방안을 자유롭게 논의할 수 있도록 독려하는 분위기가 조성되어 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 나의 직속상사는 직원들이 기존의 업무 방식에 대해 문제 제기할 수 있는 분위기를 조성하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>동의하지 않는다</td>
<td>다소 동의하지 않는다</td>
<td>중립적이다</td>
<td>악간 동의한다</td>
<td>동의한다</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 나의 직속상사는 직원들이 보복에 대한 두려움 없이 상사와 자유롭게 아이디어를 논의할 수 있는 분위기를 조성하고 있다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 나의 직속상사는 직원들이 업무 관련 문제에 대해 혁신적인 해결방안을 자유롭게 논의할 수 있도록 돕려하는 분위기를 조성하고 있다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. 문화 척도


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>내 생각에</th>
<th>전히 동의하지 않는다</th>
<th>동의하지 않는다</th>
<th>다소 동의하지 않는다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 동의한다</th>
<th>동의한다</th>
<th>매우 동의한다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 윗 사람은 아랫 사람의 자문을 귀하지 않고 의사결정을 내려야 한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 윗 사람은 아랫 사람들에게 너무 자주 의견을 구하지 말아야 한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 윗 사람은 아랫사람과 친목하는 모임을 피해야 한다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 아랫 사람은 윗사람이 내린 결정에 반박해서는 안된다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 윗 사람은 아랫사람에게 중요한 업무를 맡겨서는 안된다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 내가 수행해야 할 일을 잘 알 수 있도록 (학교나 직장에서) 지시사항을 자세하게 내려 주는 것이 중요하다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 지시사항과 정해진 절차를 충실히 따르는 것이 중요하다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 규칙과 통제사항은 내가 해야할 임무가 무엇인지지를 알려 주기 때문에 중요하다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 업무 절차가 표준화되어 있으며 큰 도움이 된다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>내 생각에</td>
<td>전혀 동의하지 않는다</td>
<td>동의하지 않는다</td>
<td>다소 동의하지 않는다</td>
<td>중립적이다</td>
<td>약간 동의한다</td>
<td>동의한다</td>
<td>매우 동의한다</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 업무시 작업 지시사항은 중요하다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 개인은 (학교나 직장에서) 집단을 위하여 개인의 이익을 희생해야 한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 개인은 어떤 어려움이 있더라도 집단과 생사고를 같이 해야 한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 집단의 이익이 개인의 이익보다 더 중요하다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 집단이 잘 되는 것이 개인이 잘 되는 것보다 더 중요하다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 개인은 집단의 이익을 고려한 후에 비로소 개인의 목표를 추구해야 한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 집단에 대한 충성심은 개인의 목표가 침해받더라도 강조되어야 한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 남자가 전문직의 경력을 갖는 것이 여자의 경우보다 더 중요하다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 남자는 보통 논리적 분석을 통해 문제를 해결하지만 여자는 보통 직관을 통해 문제를 해결한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 어려운 문제를 해결할 때는 보통 적극적이고 강력한 접근방법이 요구되는데 이런 것은 흔히 남자들이 잘한다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 남자가 여자보다 항상 더 잘할 수 있는 직업이 몇 가지 있다.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
귀하의 회사의 직원 참여의 효과성에 대한 질문입니다. 각 문항들에 대해 귀하께서 동의하는 정도를 표기하여 주십시오. (1 = ‘전혀 불가능하다’, 2 = ‘불가능하다’, 3 = ‘다소 불가능하다’, 4 = ‘중립적이다’, 5 = ‘약간 가능하다’, 6 = ‘가능하다’ 7 = ‘매우 가능하다’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>순번</th>
<th>문항</th>
<th>1. 전혀 불가능하다</th>
<th>2. 불가능하다</th>
<th>3. 다소 불가능하다</th>
<th>4. 중립적이다</th>
<th>5. 약간 가능하다</th>
<th>6. 가능하다</th>
<th>7. 매우 가능하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>나는 업무에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 이슈들에 대한 해결방안을 개발하여 직속 상사에게 효과적으로 제안할 수 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>나는 우리 부서(팀)의 업무에 영향을 미치는 이슈 해결에 동료(팀원)들이 참여하도록 효과적으로 격려할 수 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>나는 비록 동료(팀원)들의 의견과 다르더라도, 동료(팀원)들에게 업무와 관련한 이슈에 대한 내 의견을 효과적으로 개진할 수 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>나는 우리 부서(팀) 전체의 업무 환경에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 이슈 논의에 효과적으로 참여할 수 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>나는 새로운 프로젝트나 업무 절차의 변화에 관련된 의견을 상사에게 효과적으로 이야기할 수 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 우리 부서(팀)의 업무에 영향을 미치는 이슈 해결에 동료(팀원)들이 참여하도록 격려하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>안전하지 않다</th>
<th>다소 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 안전하다</th>
<th>안전하다</th>
<th>매우 안전하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. 비록 동료(팀원)들의 의견과 다르더라도, 동료(팀원)들에게 업무와 관련한 이슈에 대한 내 의견을 개진하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>안전하지 않다</th>
<th>다소 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 안전하다</th>
<th>안전하다</th>
<th>매우 안전하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. 우리 부서(팀) 전체의 업무 환경에 영향을 미칠 수 있는 이슈 논의에 참여하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>안전하지 않다</th>
<th>다소 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 안전하다</th>
<th>안전하다</th>
<th>매우 안전하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. 새로운 프로젝트나 업무 절차의 변화에 관련된 의견을 상사에게 이야기하는 것이 안전하다고 느낀다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>안전하지 않다</th>
<th>다소 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 안전하다</th>
<th>안전하다</th>
<th>매우 안전하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. 다른 동료(팀원)들이 동의하지 않더라도 우리 부서(팀)를 개선할 수 있는 방법에 대해 상사에게 건의하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>전히 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>안전하지 않다</th>
<th>다소 안전하지 않다</th>
<th>중립적이다</th>
<th>약간 안전하다</th>
<th>안전하다</th>
<th>매우 안전하다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
전혀 안전하지 않다 | 안전하지 않다 | 다소 안전하다 | 중립적이다 | 약간 안전하다 | 안전하다 | 매우 안전하다
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
15. 상사가 우리 부서(팀)의 문제를 해결하는 방식에 대해 이의를 제기하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
16. 직원들의 요구사항 및 불만사항을 해결할 수 있는 의견을 상사에게 이야기하는 것에 대해 안전하다고 느낀다. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
IV. 직원 참여 제도

귀하의 조직에서 운영하고 있는 직원 참여 및 의견 개진 제도를 이용할 수 있다고 생각되는 직원의 직위(혹은 직급)에 표시하여 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>내 생각에</th>
<th>임원급 이상</th>
<th>팀장/팀 리더 급(부서/차장 급) 이상</th>
<th>파트장/파트 리더 급(과장/대리 급) 이상</th>
<th>일반 직원(사원 급) 이상</th>
<th>서무 직원 이상</th>
<th>전 직원(비정규 직원 포함)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 우리 회사는 다음의 직원들이 보복에 대한 두려움 없이 자신의 아이디어를 상사와 자유롭게 커뮤니케이션 할 수 있도록 직원의식조사(attitude survey), 의견제안활동(suggestion scheme), 혹은 유사한 제도 및 활동을 실시하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 우리 회사는 다음의 직원들이 기존의 업무 방식에 대해 개선 의견을 제기할 수 있도록 직원-상사간 미팅, 간담회, 혹은 유사한 제도를 운영하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 우리 회사는 다음의 직원들이 업무 관련 문제에 대해 협신적인 해결방안을 도출할 수 있도록 문제 해결팀(Problem solving group), 품질관리팀(Quality circle), 현장자율경영팀(autonomous teams), 혹은 유사한 조직을 만들어 운영하고 있다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. 인적 사항

다음의 인적사항을 기입하여 주십시오. 귀하의 개인 정보는 타 조직의 설문 응답자 간의 통계학적 비교와 분석에만 사용될 것이며 어느 누구에게라도 노출되지 않을 것입니다.

1. 귀하의 연령 그룹에 표시해 주십시오.
   1) 25-30세
   2) 31-40세
   3) 41-50세
   4) 51-60세

2. 귀하의 성별에 표시해 주십시오.
   1) 남자
   2) 여자

3. 귀하의 최종학력에 표시해 주십시오.
   1) 고등학교 졸업
   2) 2년제 대학 (전문대) 졸업
   3) 4년제 대학교 졸업
   4) 석사학위 소지
   5) 박사학위 소지

4. 회사 내에서 귀하의 현재 직위 (또는 직급)는 무엇입니까?
   1) 매니저 직급 이하 : 또는 일반 직원
   2) 파트장 / 파트 리더 : 또는 대리/과장 (급)
   3) 팀장 / 팀 리더 : 또는 차장/부장 (급)
   4) 임원 (급)

5. 현재 회사에서 지금까지 몇 년이나 일하셨습니까?
   _____________년
6. 현재 팀(부서)에서 지금까지 몇 년이나 일하셨습니까?


6년

7. 현재의 직속 상사와 지금까지 몇 년 동안 함께 일하셨습니까?


8. 회사 내에서 현재 어떠한 직무를 수행하고 계십니까?

8) 마케팅/영업
9) 생산/제조
10) 연구/개발
11) 엔지니어링
12) 정보기술(IT)/인터넷
13) 행정관리 (기획/재무/회계/인사/법무/감사)
14) 기타 (구체적으로 기입해 주십시오): ________________

설문에 참여해 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.
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