

---

**Is Thinking the Big Picture a Leader's Favorite in Psychologically Safe Conditions During Covid-19?**

Hung-Chun Lin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Management, Dayeh University 168 University Road, Dacun, Changhua, Taiwan, R.O.C.

doi: 10.51505/ijebmr.2022.6606

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.51505/ijebmr.2022.6606>

**Abstract**

Voice is an important way for small and medium-sized enterprises to respond to changes in the management of the epidemic. This study suggests that employees' perceptions of psychological safety change their voice patterns. All three leadership styles were negatively correlated with employees' acquiescence voice. Psychological safety was negatively correlated with employees' acquiescence voice. The three leadership styles were fully mediated by psychological safety for their employees' acquiescence voice. From this model, we found that the order of indirect influence strength from strong to weak is supportive leadership, moderate leadership, and inclusive leadership. We conducted a random sample survey of 600 employees of 42 manufacturing SMEs in Taiwan. The analysis results were applied with hierarchical regression and bootstrap method in statistical analysis. The results obtained support our hypothesis and provide current understanding of employee voices in turbulent workplaces. Thus, this study makes important contribution to voice and human resource management research .

**Keywords:** Supportive leadership, Moderation leadership, Inclusive leadership, Psychological safety and Employees' acquiescence voice.

**1. Introduction**

The COVID-19 event threatened companies' existing resources, disrupted work routines, and caused employees to complain about digital technology challenges related to team and collaboration, as well as mood, distractions, which meant working at home Jobs may not be for everyone (Smite et al., 2022). Dramatic changes in work patterns may ultimately reduce their propensity to express voice and increase silence (Wee & Fehr, 2021). A promising way forward in this unprecedented situation is to encourage employees to speak out, thereby helping organizations make more effective decisions in the midst of chaos (Smite et al., 2022 ; Wee & Fehr, 2021).

Employees often publicly state their intention to change the status quo and show managers that the employee constructively envisions an ideal work environment, identifies problems that may hinder the achievement of that ideal state, and develops possible solutions to potentially address those problems and help build a better working environment (Burriss et al., 2017; Park et al.,

2022). Thus, the voice may be characteristic of proactive behavior, but managers' perceived initiative in behavior may vary according to their level of vocal solicitation, suggesting that there may be greater awareness of other active behaviors among different types of managers differences (Martin & Harrison, 2022), and more importantly, supervisors' perceptions directly affect the degree to which employees are rewarded (Park et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022).

Voice is a notable behavior because it represents dissent about the current state of work and often exposes issues to leaders (Park et al., 2022). The social cost of voice is prominent because it is arguably the most dangerous type of civic behavior, as others may dislike it or view it as destructive (Ng et al., 2022). Employees believe they can express themselves to their leaders under psychological safety without fear of negative consequences (Liang et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2017; Qin & Men, 2022). When psychological safety is high, members are likely to communicate more openly with each other and share this enthusiasm with others in the team (Khan et al., 2022), which may lead to better communication, express behavior and contribute to organizational success (Lv et al., 2022; Qin & Men, 2022). Psychological safety thus plays a key role in employee voice and leadership communication in the work environment (Khan et al., 2022; Qin & Men, 2022).

### *1.1 Explore Importance of the Problem*

Therefore, this study focuses on the context of workplace transitions during the COVID-19 crisis and asks the following questions:

Are different leadership styles associated with employees' acquiescent voice behavior in innovative workplaces?

Is psychological safety a mediator of different leadership styles? Specifically, this study examines the influence of three leadership types on employees' acquiescence in building research and the mediating role of psychological safety.

### *1.2 contributions*

Leaders often need employees to find and understand problems and seek improvement ideas so that supervisors can make corrections and make more effective decisions (Burris et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2022). When managers create an inclusive and open environment, members feel safe, worthy of a voice, and willing to express their ideas and voices. The type of employee's voice is good for improvement under the severe epidemic situation, and different types of leaders may have different opinions. How to encourage employees' voice and engage them in intellectual tasks is particularly important for human resource management (HRM) in SMEs. Therefore, this study shows that leaders are particularly important in driving employee voices. However, in the new remote working model, the perceived psychological safety of employees may trigger a self-change in their voice.

We believe this study can make three contributions to the human resource management literature.

First, our findings provide a better understanding of how employees respond to new work patterns by adjusting voice types. Therefore, our work fills a research gap in the HRM field on

employee voice behavior in a crisis. Second, from our findings, managers at the organizational or group level can learn how to motivate employees' voice in the context of shifts in work patterns, and psychological safety mediates leadership-employee voice relationships. Therefore, our findings enrich the research direction of employee voice behavior in the HRM field. Third, our study focuses on people in manufacturing SMEs, thus providing a different perspective from the current HRM literature, which mainly focuses on large firms.

### 1.3 Background

In a global economy characterized by increasing competition, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) make up a high proportion of global enterprises and make a huge contribution to the economic development of countless countries (Wu et al., 2022). However, in a competitive business environment, most SMEs lack the required resources, which puts them at a disadvantage (Wu et al., 2022). Currently, the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the shift in manufacturing to Industry 4.0 and remote work. The trend of digitization of supply chains has intensified the adoption of artificial intelligence-based technologies by SMEs in the manufacturing industry, which has prompted the manufacturing industry to move towards intelligent manufacturing, thereby affecting the productivity of enterprises (Yang, 2022). Such employees are forced to change the form of their work. Since employee voice behavior is critical to sustainable organizational innovation in manufacturing (Khan et al., 2022), the next section will focus on the impact of three leadership styles on employee voice, and discuss how psychological safety mediates between leadership and employee voice.

#### 1.3.1 Leadership styles

Leaders play a key role in encouraging employees' voice, and as leaders adopt strategies of openness, fairness, respect, and appreciation, the less likely they are to keep employees silent, therefore more likely to be a voice for their organization or to contribute to their team (Guenter et al., 2017; Weiss et al., 2018). When leaders remove barriers to hierarchical communication (Lapointe and Vandenberghe, 2018), they create an organizational climate of trust and psychological safety where employees feel safe not only to share advice with colleagues, but more importantly to ask work-related questions (Weiss et al., 2018). Leader personality traits may have indirect effects, positive or negative, on members' voice and work engagement with workplace status (Carnevale et al., 2022; Park et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022). Research has found that leaders' threats to judge employees' voices can lead to lower performance appraisals of employees (Weiss & Morrison, 2019; Xu et al., 2019), so employees may change their voice-over styles in line with their supervisors' perceptions of workplace behavior (Ng et al., 2022 ; Park et al., 2022) . In addition, it seems that managers are unlikely to provide employees with equal opportunities for voice, but seek voice from employees with more elite backgrounds, influencing employees' willingness to proactive voice and adopting different types of voice behaviors to respond (Martin & Harrison, 2022). From a complementary fit perspective, human resource management and leadership behaviors must be aligned to be effective (Hauff et al., 2022). Thus leadership styles affect employee behavior, such as supportive leadership meeting employee needs and providing training and development opportunities (Hauff et al., 2022; Zaman et al., 2022), inclusive leadership promotes employees to feel a sense of belonging (Korkmaz et

al., 2022; Song et al., 2022), while moderation leadership refers to humility and balance among employees (Eisenbeiss, 2012). This study explores three leadership styles, including: supportive leadership, moderation leadership, and inclusive leadership.

### 1.3.2 Employee voice

Employees are widely encouraged to speak out to advance the interests of the organization (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). Employees are often the first to spot problems in the work environment, and leaders can communicate unique information that is critical to improving work processes (Ng et al., 2022). Therefore, employee voice helps the team to reduce errors, increase employee safety, and improve innovation resilience and overall performance (Ng et al., 2022 ; Park et al., 2022). The form of sound is reflexive and there are four types(Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014) : (a) maintain /promote supportive behavior in speech; (b) challenge/enhance constructive sound; (c) preserve/disable defensive sound; (d) challenge/disable destructive sound. The scope of this study is in the first category, using the employee acquiescence voice scale. Employees' acquiescence voice definition emphasizes expressing support for work-related practices and out of a sense of inability to make a difference (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). However, when employees make many suggestions, inevitably, some suggestions will not be regarded as useful, value-added, or practical by others (Chen & Trevino, 2022; Ng et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2019). Colleagues may perceive employees who give a bad voice as incompetent, leading to employee exclusion (Khan et al., 2022; Ng et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2019). Because employees fear being viewed negatively or labeled negatively, individuals do not see any benefit in speaking up and keeping silent (Ng et al., 2022; Weiss et al., 2018).

## 1.4. Hypotheses

### 1.4.1 Leadership styles and employee advice

Leaders play a major role in setting the direction and strategy of an organization by influencing and encouraging beneficial voices and deterring harmful voice actions through formal and informal means (Howard & Holmes, 2020; Park et al., 2022). Disruption by leaders and peers also hurts employee voice and has a positive effect on employee silence (Jung & Yoon, 2019; Knoll et al., 2021; Ng et al., 2022). Prosocial voice is fundamentally a positive form of voice, whereas acquiescent voice behavior reflects a negative form of voice (King et al., 2020). Studies have shown that employees' acquiescence voice behaviors correspond to leadership styles (eg. benevolent leadership and morality leadership) (Chen, 2017) and leadership attitudes are negatively correlated (Howard & Holmes, 2020; Huang et al., 2018; McClean et al., 2018). Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** leadership styles (supportive leadership, moderation leadership, inclusive leadership) will be negatively related to employees' acquiescence voice.

### 1.4.2 The mediating role of psychological safety

When employees express opinions when there is no fear and worry, the perceived cost of expressing opinions is minimized, and the benefits of expressing outweigh the costs, resulting in

more positive evaluations of expressing (Liang et al., 2012). Conversely, when there is a lack of psychological safety, employees feel unable to express themselves freely, and these fears and concerns lead them to avoid speaking out publicly (Liang et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2017). Psychological safety is defined as the degree to which individuals trust that their peers (eg, leaders, members) will not punish or misunderstand them for taking risks, such as expressing voices or concerns (Detert & Burris, 2007). Consistent with this reasoning, psychological safety is thought to facilitate expression, as this perception increases the ease and reduces the risk of presenting new ideas (Liang et al., 2012). Previous empirical studies have also shown that psychological safety plays a mediating role between managerial openness and employee voice (Detert & Burris, 2007; Liu et al., 2017; Lv et al., 2022). It is further confirmed that psychological safety partially mediates the influence of leadership on voice to a certain extent (Liang et al., 2012; Tenney et al., 2021). Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 2:** psychological safety will mediate the relationship between leadership styles (supportive leadership, moderation leadership, inclusive leadership) and employees' acquiescence voice.

## **2. Method**

We conducted a survey of employees to test our hypotheses during the pandemic.

Our sample is made up of manufacturing SMEs in Taiwan. Taiwan's industry is an economic entity dominated by SMEs, accounting for 97.65% of the total number of enterprises in the country (Wu et al., 2022). Because most manufacturing SMEs in Taiwan are suppliers to large companies, they are responsible for much of the productivity in the business community (Yang, 2022). We select sample firms by adopting the governmental definition of SMEs in Taiwan, which are enterprises with no more than 200 employees and have a paid-in capital of less than NT\$100 million. Our sample is then selected from the manufacturing SMEs list accessed by the Taiwan Ministry of Economic Affairs. First, we send invitations to participate in the production sectors of these selected manufacturing industries. Secondly, the obtained leaders are willing to provide front-line employees to assist us in writing the questionnaires, and then we send the questionnaires to the leaders and return the completed questionnaires.

### *2.1 Sampling Procedures*

To reduce the impact of CMV, we collected questionnaires in two time intervals (Zhao et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2022). The first section of the questionnaire was collected to ask employees about their voice behavior and psychological safety. Then, a second questionnaire on independent variables, supportive leadership, inclusive leadership, and moderate leadership was sent a month later. Our data is collected during the COVID-19 pandemic, from January to May 2021. Finally, we obtain a dataset of 600 observations from employees in 42 manufacturing SMEs.

### *2.2 Measures*

This study uses the five-point Likert scale to measure supportive leadership, moderation leadership, and inclusive leadership; in the scale, one represents strongly disagree and five represents strongly agree. Others use the seven-point Likert scale to measure psychological safety

and employees' acquiescence voice; in the scale, one represents strongly disagree and seven represents strongly agree. We translated the English scale into Chinese meanings. To verify that the translation is correct, bilingual experts translate from English to Chinese and back to English to ensure the quality of the conversation.

### *2.3 Research Design*

This study uses the five-point Likert scale to measure supportive leadership, moderation leadership, and inclusive leadership; in the scale, one represents strongly disagree and five represents strongly agree. Others use the seven-point Likert scale to measure psychological safety and employees' acquiescence voice; in the scale, one represents strongly disagree and seven represents strongly agree. We translated the English scale into Chinese meanings. To verify that the translation is correct, bilingual experts translate from English to Chinese and back to English to ensure the quality of the conversation.

#### *2.3.1 Employee voice behavior*

This dependent variable measuring employees' acquiescent voice behavior is individual opinions along with the opinion of the majority of photos to maintain conformity. This behavior takes time nor necessitates a burden to express their voice (Maynes & Podsakoff, 2014). We use a five-item scale adopted from Van Dyne et al. (2003). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.91.

#### *2.3.2 Supportive leadership*

Leaders can provide additional motivation for cohesive teams to take concrete actions that improve their ability to share and combine learning activities (Jansen et al. 2016). We measure this independent variable using a five-item scale developed by Choi et al. (2003). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.74.

#### *2.3.3 Inclusive leadership*

Leaders are willing to listen to their employees, accept their mistakes rationally, and tolerate employees' opinions and failures by giving encouragement and guidance when they make mistakes (Qi et al. 2019). We measure this independent variable using a four-item scale developed by Ye et al. 2019). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.82.

#### *2.3.4 Moderation leadership*

Embrace diversity and differences in gender, nationality, religion, etc., and respect the characteristics of leaders of diverse thinking with humility (Eisenbeiss, 2012). We measure this independent variable using a four-item scale developed by Eisenbeiss (2012). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.70.

#### *2.3.5 Psychological safety*

Psychological safety is particularly important in an employee's work environment, as it is critical to reduce employee errors and improve safety, and has been shown to enable team and individual learning across multiple organizations (Newman et al. 2017). This variable is measured by using a four-item scale developed by Burriss et al. (2017). The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.81.

#### 2.4 Control Variable

We included several control variables. Due to the variables in this study being measured as personal perception, we control for individual factors such as employees' education, gender, job tenure, organizational tenure, and age (Ng et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2022).

### 3. Results

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of all variables. We conduct collinearity diagnostic tests on all variables. The result in Table 1 revealed that all variance inflation factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.09 to 5.42, well below the norm 10. Thus, multicollinearity is not a concern in our study.

#### 3.1 Hierarchical regression analysis

The results of hierarchical regression analysis for all variables are shown in Table 2. We then test the direct effect of supportive leadership, moderation leadership and inclusive leadership, by adding the three variables into Model 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Model 2 presents a negative relationship between supportive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice ( $\beta = -.684, p < .05$ ). Model 3 presents a negative relationship between moderation leadership and employees' acquiescent voice ( $\beta = -.597, p < .05$ ). Model 4 presents a negative relationship between inclusive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice ( $\beta = -.315, p < .01$ ). This result confirms our prediction in **Hypothesis 1**.

Next, regarding the mediating effect, we examine **Hypothesis 2** by adding the interaction term of mediator and independent variables. In Model 5, the interaction term of psychological safety supportive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice shows a negative sign and significant ( $\beta = -1.158, p < .001$ ). In Model 6, the interaction term of psychological safety moderation leadership and employees' acquiescent voice shows a negative sign and significant ( $\beta = -1.108, p < .001$ ). Similarly, in Model 7, the interaction term of psychological safety inclusive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice shows a negative sign and significant ( $\beta = -1.061, p < .001$ ). The results in Models 5 - 7 confirm the existence of negative full mediator effects of psychological safety on the relationship between supportive leadership, moderation leadership, inclusive leadership, and employees' acquiescent voice.

#### 3.2 Robustness check

We used a bootstrap approach with a 95% confidence interval (CI) of 10,000 repetitions to test the mediator effects of psychological safety. We use the **PROCESS SPSS** macro (model 4) for analysis (Hayes & Preacher, 2010; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). We find that the mediator effect of psychological safety on the relationship between supportive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice is significant at total effect (effect =  $-.6367$ ,  $LLCI = -1.1835$ ,  $ULCI = -.0899$ ,  $p < .05$ ), at indirect effect (effect =  $-.6828$ ,  $BootSE = .1710$ ,  $BootLLCI = -1.0464$ ,  $BootULCI = -.3835$ ). The mediator effect of psychological safety on the relationship between moderation leadership and employees' acquiescent voice is significant at total effect (effect =

.3795, LLCI=-.9978, ULCI=-.2388,  $p < .05$ ), an indirect effect (effect=-.2935, BootSE=.1565, BootLLCI=-.6176, BootULCI=-.0047). Similarly, the mediator effect of psychological safety on the relationship between inclusive leadership and employees' acquiescent voice is significant at total effect (effect = -.3107, LLCI=-.0930, ULCI=-.0839,  $p < .01$ ), an indirect effect (effect = -.1211, BootSE=.0513, BootLLCI=-.2291, BootULCI=-.0268). The result confirms the prediction in **Hypothesis 2**.

#### **4. Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to understand the voice behaviors of employees in response to changes in their work environment during the pandemic. We discuss three leadership types of influence on employee voice, supportive leadership, moderation leadership, and inclusive leadership. The results show that in workplaces where employees' voice is spoken, three leadership styles have a negative relationship with employees' acquiescent voice. There was also a negative correlation between psychological safety and employees' acquiescent voice. The results are the same as those proposed by previous research scholars Chen (2017).

However, the study further sheds light on a shift in employees' voice patterns as they experience turmoil. Our findings further suggest that, when psychologically safe, the three leadership styles have a negative relationship to employees' acquiescent voice, resulting in full mediation. In this model, our new finding is that the order of indirect influence strength from strongest to weak is supportive leadership, moderate leadership, and inclusive leadership.

##### *4.1 Contributions*

Our finding is novel and insightful to the HRM literature.

First, previous research has shown that leadership has an encouraging role in employee voices (Howard & Holmes, 2020; Park et al., 2022), but our research advances existing employee voice types by showing different leadership styles. Supported Hypothesis 1 states that leadership style plays a more critical role in determining the employee's voice on the job. Therefore, the results show that even if the spread of the epidemic accelerates the digitization of work, the voice of employees still needs to be communicated and coordinated through the team face-to-face. Our result is consistent with observations by Chen (2017) and highlights the HRM challenges of managing employee voice in the workplace. In addition, the mechanisms and implementation strategies for managing the workplace must depend on integrating the voices of the majority of the team.

Second, confirmation of **Hypothesis 2** helps to understand leadership style affects employee voice response under psychological safety conditions. The result indicates that the three leadership styles have a full mediation relationship with employees' acquiescent voice under psychological safety. This hence enriches the research line of employees' acquiescent voice in the field of HRM. Our finding fills the gap in the HRM literature regarding the lack of empirical evidence linking employees' acquiescent voice and leadership styles.

Third, this study focuses on manufacturing SMEs in Taiwan that play an important role in the supply chain (Hsu et al., 2022). Manufacturing through the voice of employees is a key factor



in supporting organizational change as supply chains change. Our research provides a different perspective than that of large corporations, enriching the understanding of SME employee voice field management.

#### *4.2 Practical implications*

During the global pandemic, manufacturing workers and their leaders had to react quickly to supply shortages upstream and downstream of the economy. This study utilizes three leadership styles to address changes in employee voice behavior in relation to new work patterns, and how adding psychological safety mediators drives changes in the leader-employee relationship. Through the contemporary role of three leadership styles, the study identified different employee voice behaviors. When faced with a turbulent environment, managers need to focus their attention and inspire their employees' voices. In short, managers are advised to coordinate employee face-to-face communication activities during peacetime and encourage employee voice during the crisis. As a result, the practical implication of this study is to guide the HRM practices of SMEs, especially about the transformation of work patterns towards the digitalization of technology.

#### *4.3 Limitations*

Our study has several limitations that may provide some recommendations for future research. The first is that our research collection is limited to manufacturing in Taiwan's SMEs. The findings cannot be overly extrapolated to other countries. Therefore, we suggest that future research examines employee vocalization behaviors in different contexts, such as SMEs in developing countries. Second, this study only discusses the mediator role of psychological safety on the relationship between three leadership styles and employees' acquiescence voice. Third, since our data are cross-sectional, we recommend collecting longitudinal data to observe changes in employee voice types. As the pandemic continues, longitudinal data can provide better insight into what drives employees to exhibit voice behaviors and how managers can operate to motivate employees to make changes.

#### *4.4 future directions*

Different levels of individual work environments have different values to investigate the potential influencing factors of employee voice types. It is suggested that future research should consider the work attitudes of employees in different countries and the different atmospheres of organizations.

### **References**

- Burris, E. R., Rockmann, K. W., & Kimmons, Y. S. (2017). The value of voice to managers: Employee identification and the content of voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(6), 2099-2125.
- Carnevale, J. B., Huang, L., Yam, K. C., & Wang, L. (2022). Laughing with me or laughing at me? The differential effects of leader humor expressions on follower status and influence at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Chen, A., & Trevino, L. K. (2022). Promotive and prohibitive ethical voice: Coworker emotions and support for the voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.

- Chen, S. C. (2017). Paternalistic leadership and cabin crews' upward safety communication: The motivation of voice behavior. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 62, 44-53.
- Choi, J. N., Price, R. H., & Vinokur, A. D. (2003). Self-efficacy changes in groups: effects of diversity, leadership, and group climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(4), 357-372.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open?. *Academy of management journal*, 50(4), 869-884.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A. (2012). Re-thinking ethical leadership: An interdisciplinary integrative approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 791-808.
- Guenter, H., Schreurs, B., van Emmerik, I. H., & Sun, S. (2017). What does it take to break the silence in teams: authentic leadership and/or proactive followership?. *Applied Psychology*, 66(1), 49-77.
- Hauff, S., Felfe, J., & Klug, K. (2022). High-performance work practices, employee well-being, and supportive leadership: spillover mechanisms and boundary conditions between HRM and leadership behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(10), 2109-2137.
- Hayes, A. F., & Preacher, K. J. (2010). Quantifying and testing indirect effects in simple mediation models when the constituent paths are nonlinear. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 45(4), 627-660.
- Howard, M. C., & Holmes, P. E. (2020). Social courage fosters both voice and silence in the workplace: A study on multidimensional voice and silence with boundary conditions. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*.
- Hsu, B. X., Chen, Y. M., & Chen, L. A. L. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and value added in the supply chain: Model and mechanism. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 174, 121302.
- Huang, X., Xu, E., Huang, L., & Liu, W. (2018). Nonlinear consequences of promotive and prohibitive voice for managers' responses: The roles of voice frequency and LMX. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(10), 1101.
- Jansen, J. J., Kostopoulos, K. C., Mihalache, O. R., & Papalexandris, A. (2016). A socio-psychological perspective on team ambidexterity: The contingency role of supportive leadership behaviours. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(6), 939-965.
- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2019). The effects of social undermining on employee voice and silence and on organizational deviant behaviors in the hotel industry. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*.
- Khan, N., Dyaram, L., & Dayaram, K. (2022). Team faultlines and upward voice in India: The effects of communication and psychological safety. *Journal of Business Research*, 142, 540-550.
- Kim, Y., Lee, E., Kang, M., & Yang, S. U. (2022). Understanding the Influence of Authentic Leadership Employee-Organization Relationships on Employee Voice Behaviors in Response to Dissatisfying Events at Work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 08933189221085562.

- King, C., So, K. K. F., DiPietro, R. B., & Grace, D. (2020). Enhancing employee voice to advance the hospitality organization's marketing capabilities: A multilevel perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 91, 102657.
- Knoll, M., Neves, P., Schyns, B., & Meyer, B. (2021). A multi-level approach to direct and indirect relationships between organizational voice climate, team manager openness, implicit voice theories, and silence. *Applied Psychology*, 70(2), 606-642.
- Korkmaz, A. V., van Engen, M. L., Knappert, L., & Schalk, R. (2022). About and beyond leading uniqueness and belongingness: A systematic review of inclusive leadership research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 100894.
- Lapointe, E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2018). Examination of the relationships between servant leadership, organizational commitment, and voice and antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 148(1), 99-115.
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71-92.
- Liu, W., Song, Z., Li, X., & Liao, Z. (2017). Why and when leaders' affective states influence employee upward voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 238-263.
- Lv, W. Q., Shen, L. C., Tsai, C. H. K., Su, C. H. J., Kim, H. J., & Chen, M. H. (2022). Servant leadership elevates supervisor-subordinate guanxi: An investigation of psychological safety and organizational identification. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 101, 103114.
- Martin, S. R., & Harrison, S. (2022). Upward Mobility, the Cleft Habitus, and Speaking Up: How Class Transitions Relate to Individual and Organizational Antecedents of Voice. *Academy of Management Journal*, (ja).
- Maynes, T. D., & Podsakoff, P. M. (2014). Speaking more broadly: an examination of the nature, antecedents, and consequences of an expanded set of employee voice behaviors. *Journal of applied psychology*, 99(1), 87.
- McClean, E. J., Martin, S. R., Emich, K. J., & Woodruff, C. T. (2018). The social consequences of voice: An examination of voice type and gender on status and subsequent leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(5), 1869-1891.
- Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human resource management review*, 27(3), 521-535.
- Ng, T. W., Wang, M., Hsu, D. Y., & Su, C. (2022). Voice quality and ostracism. *Journal of Management*, 48(2), 281-318.
- Park, H., Tangirala, S., Hussain, I., & Ekkirala, S. (2022). How and when managers reward employees' voice: The role of proactivity attributions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(4), 717-731.
- Qi, L., Liu, B., Wei, X., & Hu, Y. (2019). Impact of inclusive leadership on employee innovative behavior: Perceived organizational support as a mediator. *PloS one*, 14(2), e0212091.
- Qin, Y. S., & Men, L. R. (2022). Exploring the Impact of Internal Communication on Employee Psychological Well-Being during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Mediating Role of

- Employee Organizational Trust. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 23294884221081838.
- Smite, D., Tkalich, A., Moe, N. B., Papatheocharous, E., Klotins, E., & Buvik, M. P. (2022). Changes in perceived productivity of software engineers during COVID-19 pandemic: The voice of evidence. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 186, 111197.
- Song, J., Wang, D., & He, C. (2022). Why and when does inclusive leadership evoke employee negative feedback-seeking behavior?. *European Management Journal*.
- Tenney, E. R., Coll, K. A., Bain, K., & Kreps, T. A. (2021). Silenced by Incivility: People, Especially Women, Voice Less in Uncivil Groups. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2021, No. 1, p. 11452). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1359 –1392.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Wang, D., Ou, A. Y., & Song, L. J. (2022). Stay Humble and Fly High: The Roles of Subordinate Voice and Competitive Work Context in the Linkage Between Leader Humility and Career Success. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 29 (1), 147-166.
- Wee, E. X., & Fehr, R. (2021). Compassion during difficult times: Team compassion behavior, suffering, supervisory dependence, and employee voice during COVID-19. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(12), 1805.
- Weiss, M., Kolbe, M., Grote, G., Spahn, D. R., & Grande, B. (2018). We can do it! Inclusive leader language promotes voice behavior in multi-professional teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(3), 389-402.
- Weiss, M., & Morrison, E. W. (2019). Speaking up and moving up: How voice can enhance employees' social status. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(1), 5-19.
- Wu, S. H., Lin, F. J., & Perng, C. (2022). The affecting factors of small and medium enterprise performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 143, 94-104.
- Xu, M., Qin, X., Dust, S. B., & DiRenzo, M. S. (2019). Supervisor-subordinate proactive personality congruence and psychological safety: A signaling theory approach to employee voice behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
- Yang, C. H. (2022). How Artificial Intelligence Technology Affects Productivity and Employment: Firm-level Evidence from Taiwan. *Research Policy*, 51(6), 104536.
- Ye, Q., Wang, D., & Guo, W. (2019). Inclusive leadership and team innovation: The role of team voice and performance pressure. *European Management Journal*.
- Zaman, S., Wang, Z., Rasool, S. F., uz Zaman, Q., & Raza, H. (2022). Impact of critical success factors and supportive leadership on sustainable success of renewable energy projects: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Energy Policy*, 162, 112793.
- Zhao, H., Chen, Y., & Liu, W. (2022). Socially Responsible Human Resource Management and Employee Moral Voice: Based on the Self-determination Theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-18.

Zheng, Y., Epitropaki, O., Graham, L., & Caveney, N. (2022). Ethical Leadership and Ethical Voice: The Mediating Mechanisms of Value Internalization and Integrity Identity. *Journal of Management*, 48(4), 973-1002.

TABLE 1  
Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations <sup>a</sup>

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	VIF
1 av	6.02	.74	<b>(.91)</b>								
2 ml	4.63	.24	-.17 *	<b>(.70)</b>							1.20
3 sp	4.81	.23	-.20 *	.20 *	<b>(.74)</b>						1.41
4 il	4.54	.32	-.24 **	.28 **	.24 **	<b>(.82)</b>					1.20
5 ps	6.73	.40	-.46 ***	.17 *	.46 ***	.221 ***	<b>(.81)</b>				1.37
6 gd	1.47	.50	-.06 *	.15 *	-.17 *	-.15 *	-.11				1.26
7 age	38.79	2.95	.180	-.16	.04	-.04	-.01				5.23
8 edu	2.34	.83	.03	.084	-.11	.01	.15				1.09
9 exp	15.25	6.24	.16*	-.11	.07	-.04	.05				5.42

Note. N = 600; \*p < .05 and \*\*p < .01. Correlation is significant at 0.01 levels (two-tailed); correlation is significant at 0.05 levels (two-tailed);  
α reliabilities are given in parentheses.

Table 2 Results of O.L.S. regression model of employee innovative behavior <sup>a</sup>

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6		Model 7	
	Coef. b	S.E <sup>b</sup>	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
(Constant)	28.15	1.89	45.25	7.30	39.01	6.69	41.79	5.17	57.65	6.28	63.00	7.17	64.95	6.16
Gender	-.065	.705	-.329	.700	.080	.705	-.414	.697	-.433	.622	-.373	.628	-.638	.623
Age	.662	.703	.549	.691	.516	.703	.684	.684	.320	.363	.256	.623	.352	.613
Education	.140	.399	.021	.395	.192	.398	.150	.389	.463	.435	.463	.355	.432	.350
Experience	-.033	.492	.046	.484	.031	.490	-.114	.480	.183	.287	.210	.434	.122	.430
Supportive leadership			.684 *	.282					.063	.628				
Moderation leadership					-.597 *	.353					-.280	.317		
Inclusive leadership							-.315 **	.112					-.192	.102
Psychological climate									-1.158 ***	.210	1.108 ***	.187	1.061 ***	.187
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.033		.077		.055		.092		.262		.267		.248	
F-value	1.050 **		7.974 **		2.862 *		7.974 **		30.350 ***		34.933 ***		32.203 ***	

<sup>a</sup> \*\*\* significant at p < 0.001 level, \*\* significant at p < 0.01 level, \* significant at p < 0.05 level.

<sup>b</sup> Coef: regression coefficient; SE: standard error.

All two-tailed tests.n=600 observations.