

Worker Voice Literature Review

Final Report

Submitted to:

United States Department of Labor
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy
Chief Evaluation Office
200 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20210
202-693-7121
Contact: Lissette Gean

Prepared by:

Gallup, Inc.
Government Group
901 F Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-715-3030
Contact: Alison Simon, Ph.D.

December 2010

Worker Voice Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review examines the existing research on worker voice to facilitate the development of a quantitative survey measurement scale that will be used by Department of Labor (DOL) to measure worker voice and its relationship to compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Wage and Hour Division (WHD) rules and regulations. This voice measurement tool will help DOL achieve one of the key outcome goals of its strategic plan: to ensure worker voice in the workplace.¹ According to the DOL Strategic Plan, when workers have a strong voice in the workplace, they become more involved in their workplace and ensure that working conditions are safe. To help achieve this goal, the voice measure that is developed will contribute to baseline statistics of the level of voice in various industrial sectors in the U.S. economy. This knowledge will ultimately help DOL strategically target workplace inspections with its limited inspection resources.

The current literature on worker voice covers numerous topical areas. In this review, we will focus on the foundational works that provide definitions of worker voice and studies that use survey instruments to measure worker voice. In that regard, this should not be considered a comprehensive review of voice literature but a focused review to aid in the development of a quantitative measurement scale. This literature review has two main purposes: first, to review the definition of voice from its inception in Hirschman's 1970 work *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*² to the present definition of voice in the current research literature. The second purpose is to review the existing quantitative survey research on voice and to examine the survey items used to measure voice as well as the positive and negative outcomes associated with voice in the current research literature.

1 U.S. Department of Labor. *Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2011-2016*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 2010.

2 Albert O. Hirschman. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970).

Definition of Voice

DOL defines voice as a “worker’s ability to access information on their rights in the workplace, their understanding of those rights, and their ability to exercise those rights without fear of discrimination or retaliation.”³ When the definition of voice in the literature is compared with DOL’s working definition of voice in the workplace, few common elements emerge. Voice, as defined in the literature, is primarily speaking-up behavior that is driven by various underlying motivating factors. Nowhere in our research did we encounter any existing studies that defined voice as having access to information or as knowledge and understanding of that information. However, there are some similarities: The need for psychological safety (subordinates’ perception that if they speak up, they will be free from any personal harm) as a precondition for voice does align well with DOL’s definition of voice with respect to “[worker’s] ability to exercise those rights without fear of discrimination or retaliation.”⁴ This is one of the few instances in which the definitions from DOL and the voice literature align.

Voice research has grown and evolved greatly since its inception in Hirschman’s 1970 study of African railway workers.⁵ Hirschman originally defined voice as “any attempt at all to change rather than escape from an objectionable state of affairs,” meaning that when employees are dissatisfied, voice is an attempt to change or improve the situation. However, this definition is by no means consistent with how other studies have defined voice in the workplace. For instance, in their 1984 book, Freeman and Medoff defined voice as “direct communication to bring actual and desired conditions closer together.”⁶ More recently, Detert et al. defined voice as verbal behavior that is improvement oriented and aimed at an individual inside the organization who holds power

3 U.S. Department of Labor. *DOLQ109631003 Blanket Purchase Agreement*. Washington, D.C.: 2010.

4 James R. Detert, Ethan R. Burris, Nathaniel Foote, Kelly Delaney-Klinger, Amy Ed, Dave Harrison, Kathleen O’Connor, Chad Pro, Steve Sauer, and Melissa Thomas-Hunt. “Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open?” *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (2007): 869.

5 Hirschman, 1970.

6 Richard B. Freeman and James L. Medoff. *What do unions do?* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

and who can effect change.⁷ This definition has emerged as a consistent theme in much of the recent research literature.

While these and other definitions include the common thread of speaking-up behavior, the specific motivators of why individuals voice vary greatly in the literature. For Hirschman, individual dissatisfaction is the primary motivator.⁸ The desire to improve working conditions is the main motivation in Rusbult et al. and in Freeman and Medoff.^{9 10} Gorden et al. and Bryson stated that employees suggesting improvements is the primary motivator to voice.^{11 12} Boxall and Purcell maintained that voice is primarily motivated by the desire to contribute to the decision making of the firm.¹³ Graham posited that voice is motivated by the individual desire to express dissent.¹⁴ Finally, Gundlach et al. and Harvey et al. stated that voice is driven by the desire to report wrongdoing in the organization.^{15 16}

Voice Definitions in Detail

Hirschman was the first to suggest worker voice as a response to organizational dissatisfaction. Using the theory of consumer behavior as a framework, Hirschman presented voice and exit as the only two options available to employees

who are dissatisfied with some aspect of their organization.¹⁷ Therefore, employees can either voice (make complaints and attempt to effect positive change in the organization) or exit (leave the organization) in response to dissatisfaction. Hirschman's definition of voice is:

any attempt at all to change rather than 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 change in management, or through various types of actions and protests, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinions.

Conversely, he defined exit as when "some customers stop buying the firm's products or some members leave the organization." In Hirschman's model, an employee's decision to voice or exit is influenced by loyalty. According to Hirschman, loyal employees will use voice to express discontent, while employees who are disloyal will use exit. Hirschman's construct lacks much of the nuance of later definitions of voice. His model captures only the two extremes of behavior, with no real definition of the middle ground between voice and exit.

The concept of voice was expanded by Freeman and Medoff, who argued that employees as well as employers benefit from having voice.¹⁸ The authors saw voice as having a beneficial impact on the organization that could improve productivity and quality. Freeman and Medoff also saw voice as a mechanism to forestall potential "blowups" over contentious issues between employers and the workforce. In addition to refining the meaning of voice, the authors added the concept of the voice mechanism—the means by which voice is transmitted from the employee to the employers—to the literature. Freeman and Medoff considered trade unions to be the most efficient arrangement for providing employees with voice at the workplace, as unions' independence from employers adds a degree of legitimacy to worker voice. In

7 Detert et al., 2007.

8 Hirschman, 1970.

9 Caryl E. Rusbult, Dan Farrell, Glen Rogers, and Arch G. Mainous III. "Impact of Exchange Variables on Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect: An Integrative Model of Responses to Declining Job Satisfaction," *Academy of Management Journal* 31 (1988) 599.

10 Freeman and Medoff, 1984.

11 William I. Gorden, Dominic A. Infante, and Elizabeth E. Graham. "Corporate Conditions Conducive to Employee Voice: A Subordinate Perspective," *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 1 (1988): 101.

12 Alex Bryson. "Managerial Responsiveness to Union and Nonunion Worker Voice in Britain," *Employee Relations* 43 (2004): 213.

13 Peter Boxall and John Purcell. *Strategy and Human Resource Management* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

14 Jill Graham. "Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay," in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Eds. B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1986), 1.

15 Michael J. Gundlach, Scott C. Douglas, and Mark J. Martinko. "The Decision to Blow the Whistle: A Social Information Processing Framework," *Academy of Management Review* 28 (2003):107.

16 Paul Harvey, Mark J. Martinko, and Nancy Borkowski. "A re-examination of the attribution-emotion-behavior framework in the context of unethical behavior," in *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, Eds. Neal M. Ashkanasy, Wilfred J. Zerbe and Charmine E. J. Härtel (West Yorkshire, England: Emerald, 2008).

17 Hirschman, 1970.

18 Freeman and Medoff, 1984.

this light, the authors considered union presence to be an advantage, and found that the cost of unionization to the employer is outweighed by the benefit the union provides by facilitating active voice.

Farrell added another dimension to Hirschman's voice-exit model: neglect.¹⁹ Neglect challenges the assumption that voice and exit are employees' only options when they are dissatisfied. Instead, some employees may elect to put in the minimum amount of effort in doing their jobs to avoid being fired or seriously reprimanded by management. This behavior is what Farrell termed neglect. Farrell characterized neglect as "lax and disregardful behavior among workers."

In 1988, Rusbult et al. further expanded the meaning of voice to include the effort put forth by employees to improve their working conditions.²⁰ Specifically, the authors defined voice as "actively and constructively trying to improve conditions through discussing problems with a supervisor or coworkers, taking action to solve problems, suggesting solutions, seeking help from an outside agency like a union, or whistle-blowing."

Hirschman's model was deficient in its ability to make any predictive suggestions of voice behavior. Withey and Cooper expanded Hirschman's model in 1989 to remedy that problem.²¹ The authors argued that prior to that point, voice had often been an ill-defined concept. As a result, the predictive aspect of voice had been a measurement problem: Voice is most likely more than one concept, and it is possible that the combination of different types of voice had thus far confounded the research. Withey and Cooper also theorized that voice is often difficult to predict because it involves measuring more than one person—the individual who is voicing and the recipient of that voice.

19 Dan Farrell. "Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 596.

20 Rusbult et al., 1988.

21 Michael J. Withey and William H. Cooper. "Predicting Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 34 (1989): 521.

In 1988, Gorden, Infante, and Graham examined the conditions necessary for worker voice in a U.S. corporate setting.²² They examined the voice of the worker through the lens of a minority group (employees) versus the majority (management). Though the workforce is often much larger than the management structure in any organization, workers are subordinate in terms of power distribution, and act similarly to a minority group. Like any minority group, workers' ability to speak or voice is contingent on organizational freedom. In this context, freedom is the fostering of employee communication and the receptiveness of dissent and argument. Specifically, Gorden et al. defined voice as:

the necessary mechanism to make known desired job modifications and/or redesign so that one's work is more congruent with one's self-interests and goals. Voice thus might be conceptualized as role-making while role-taking.

Interestingly, the authors considered voice to be not only behavior but "the necessary mechanism" by which opinions can reach management from below.

Similarly, Boxall and Purcell defined voice as "a whole variety of processes and structures which enable, and at times empower employees, directly and indirectly, to contribute to decision making in the firm."²³ The focus on the presence of structure raises an interesting point regarding the conditions necessary for voice. Thus far, the onus had been mainly on the employee to voice, regardless of conditions. The suggestion that direct and indirect voice channels (including individual voice and group voice mechanisms) can influence voice behavior is powerful and suggests that an effective voice structure may be as important as individual motivations to voice.

Bryson's 2004 examination of management response to union and non-union voice defined voice as two-way communication between workers and management.²⁴ For Bryson, voice

22 Gorden et al., 1988.

23 Boxall and Purcell, 2003.

24 Bryson, 2004.

and the mechanism by which voice is delivered were two separate and completely distinct concepts.

Detert et al. had a lengthy and highly nuanced definition of voice:

Voice, which we define as the discretionary provision of information intended to improve organizational functioning to someone inside an organization with the perceived authority to act, even though such information may challenge and upset the status quo of the organization and its power holders, is critical to organizational well-being yet insufficiently provided by employees, who see the risk of speaking up as outweighing the benefits.²⁵

The authors saw voice as presenting a challenge to management decisions, and that carried a risk to the individual who voices. Inherent to the voice process, each individual weighs the potential costs of voice against the benefits generated by voice.

Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, and Kamdar took a similar approach to Detert et al. (2007) in defining voice.²⁶ Indeed, this definition is consistent with several recent studies (Burriss et al., 2008²⁷; Detert & Trevino, 2010²⁸; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998²⁹; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008³⁰; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998³¹). In the Morrison et al. study, voice was defined as “the discretionary communication of ideas, suggestions, concerns, or opinions intended to improve organizational

25 Detert et al., 2007.

26 Elizabeth W. Morrison, Sara L. Wheeler-Smith, and Dishan Kamdar. “Speaking Up in Groups: A Cross-Level Study of Group Voice Climate and Voice,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2010).

27 Ethan R. Burriss, James R. Detert, and Dan S. Chiaburu. “Quitting before leaving: the mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2008).

28 James R. Detert and Linda K. Trevino. “Speaking Up to Higher-Ups: How Supervisors and Skip-Level Leaders Influence Employee Voice,” *Organization Science* (2010).

29 Linn Van Dyne and Jeffrey A. LePine. “Helping and Voice Extra-Role Behaviors: Evidence of Construct and Predictive Validity,” *Academy of Management Journal* 41 (1998): 108.

30 Subrahmaniam Tangirala and Rangaraj Ramanujam. “Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross-level effects of procedural justice climate,” *Personnel Psychology* (2008).

31 Jeffrey A. LePine and Linn Van Dyne. “Predicting voice behavior in work groups,” *Journal of Applied Psychology* (1998).

or unit functioning.” Their work was a natural extension of Detert et al., given that it expanded the conceptual linkage of voice and psychological safety to the workgroup level.

Voice Survey Research

In the following section, we will examine the existing quantitative survey instruments used to measure worker voice and related constructs. When available, we will also examine the tests of validity and reliability for each instrument. Finally, we will examine the relative importance of the existing voice measurement instruments using a number of citations in the research literature as a proxy for importance.

The existing voice measures generally fall into three categories: voice measures, voice predictors, and measures of management response. The majority of existing instruments are focused on scales measuring voice and likelihood to voice. These scales measure actual or likely voice behavior. Voice predictor scales measure different factors that were found to be associated with voice in the literature. While predictor scales do not measure actual voice behavior, they measure conditions that are likely to foster voice. Finally, there is a single scale to measure perceptions of management response by employees. The scales are classified as follows:

- Voice Measurement/Definitions:
 - Likelihood to Voice Scale³²
 - Generic voice measure^{33 34}
 - Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS)³⁵
 - Organizational Dissent Scale³⁶
 - Organizational Tolerance for Dissent Scale³⁷

32 David M. Saunders, Blair H. Sheppard, Virginia Knight, and Jonelle Roth. “Employee Voice to Supervisors,” *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 5 (1992): 521.

33 Van Dyne & LePine, 1998.

34 Rusbult et al., 1988.

35 UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills. “The 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey,” *UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills*, 2010, <<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/berr.gov.uk/what-wedo/employment/research-evaluation/wers-98/index.html>> (04 April 2010).

36 Jeffrey W. Kassing. “Development and Validation of the Organizational Dissent Scale,” *Management Communication Quarterly* 12 (1998).

37 Bonnie M. Schultz. *Development of a scale to measure an organization's tolerance or dissent*, unpublished master's thesis (San Jose, CA: San Jose

- Voice Predictors:
 - Supervisor as Voice Manager Scale³⁸
 - Argumentativeness Scale³⁹
 - Aggressiveness Scale⁴⁰
 - WERS
- Management Response:
 - WERS

- WERS 500+ citations
- Verbal Aggressiveness Scale 293 citations
- Rusbult's voice measures 290 citations
- Argumentativeness Scale 246 citations
- Van Dyne's voice measure 159 citations
- Supervisor as Voice Manager Scale 49 citations
- Likelihood to Voice Scale 49 citations
- Employee responses to Dissatisfaction Scale 45 citations
- Organizational Dissent Scale 44 citations
- Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale 23 citations
- Employee Rights Scale 10 citations
- Organizational Tolerance for Dissent Scale 2 citations

When one closely examines these voice measures, it is clear that there is little to no existing measurement of voice as defined by DOL: There are no measures to assess the level of knowledge with any DOL laws and regulations, and there are no measures to assess the level and quality of access to DOL laws and regulations. Instead, researchers have measured voice in a much different manner. Most have focused on the actual behavior of speaking up and, to a lesser extent, on the conditions necessary for voice to occur and factors that predict voice. Given this large gap in knowledge, it is clear that new measurement tools will need to be developed to measure voice as defined by DOL.

However, some existing voice measures will be useful in developing a core set of survey items when constructing a new measure of voice using DOL's definition. To aid in ranking the relative importance of the existing measures, we examined the number of citations each measuring tool has had in the literature. The number of citations a research study has in other research is a good general indicator of its importance in the literature. The following data were gathered using a Google Scholar search:⁴¹

The Likelihood to Voice Scale

In 1992, Saunders et al. conducted a two-stage quantitative study related to voice.⁴² The study was a longitudinal survey that examined employees' perceptions of their supervisor as voice manager and the individual likelihood to voice. The authors hypothesized that employee perception of supervisors as voice managers is an important determinant of likelihood to voice. In the first stage of this study, 19 individuals who represented a mix of supervisors and subordinates from a university support services department were surveyed, with a response rate of 73%. In the second stage, 82 employees from the same department were surveyed, with a response rate of 70%. The two-stage participation rate was 78%.

As part of this study, the authors developed a battery of survey items called the "Supervisor as Voice Manager Scale," which we will refer to as the Supervisor Scale (See Appendix for survey items). The Supervisor Scale consists of 11 items that attempt to capture effective behaviors of voice managers that were drawn from the literature. Responses to the

State University, 1992).

38 Saunders et al., 1992.

39 Dominic A. Infante and Andrew S. Rancer. "A Conceptualization and Measure of Argumentativeness," *Journal of Personality Assessment* 46 (1982): 72.

40 Dominic A. Infante and Charles J. Wigley. "Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure," *Communication Monographs* 53 (1986): 61.

41 Google Inc., Google Scholar, <<http://scholar.google.com/>> (20 December 2010).

42 Saunders et al., 1992.

Supervisor Scale are on a 7-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree).

In addition to the Supervisor Scale, the authors developed a battery of items called the “Likelihood to Voice Scale,” which we will refer to as the Likelihood Scale (See Appendix for survey items). The Likelihood Scale consists of eight items measuring the likelihood of employees to voice to their supervisors. Responses to the Likelihood Scale are on a 7-point Likert scale (1=not very likely to 7=very likely).

The Supervisor Scale was found to be a significant predictor of likelihood to voice; employees who perceived their supervisors as effective voice managers were also more likely to report voicing to managers. Interestingly, employee satisfaction with pay was a significant predictor of likelihood to voice; employees who were more satisfied with their pay were less likely to voice to their supervisors. Additionally, when employees changed supervisors, they were less likely to voice, implying that employees take a wait-and-see attitude when evaluating the new manager’s receptiveness to voice. Some important factors were found not to predict voice: general work satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and satisfaction with supervisor.

Gorden, Infante, and Graham’s Voice Measures

Gorden, Infante, and Graham’s 1988 study examined the conditions necessary for employees to voice to management from the subordinate perspective.⁴³ The primary focus of the study was to examine the corporate conditions that are conducive to worker voice. The authors argued that management of U.S. corporations should be rooted in American values. In other words, employees need freedom of speech on the job. The authors hypothesized that subordinate satisfaction will be greater when corporate conditions are receptive to voice. Subordinate satisfaction was defined as satisfaction with work, career, pay, superior, and superior effectiveness. The conditions necessary for voice were: an environment that fosters “argumentativeness” but not verbal aggressiveness; perceptions that superiors encourage argument; and

43 Gorden et al., 1988.

an organizational commitment to employees, quality, and employee rights.

Data were collected from 150 students who were enrolled in an introductory communication course at a large Midwestern university. To be included in the sample, students had to verify that they worked at least 20 hours per week. Students completed paper surveys in person in two different data collection sessions.

The authors used a number of survey instruments they had previously developed to test their hypothesis about the organizational conditions necessary for voice. The first was the Employee Rights Scale (ERS) developed by Gorden et al. (See Appendix for partial survey items).⁴⁴ The ERS is a 20-item survey instrument that assesses individuals’ perceptions of how their organization protects or violates the rights of employees.

Study participants also responded to a series of items called the Argumentativeness Scale developed in a 1982 Infante and Rancer study (See Appendix for survey items).⁴⁵ The Argumentativeness Scale measures an individual’s general tendency to be argumentative. Finally, participants responded to another series of items called the Aggressiveness Scale from a 1986 study by Infante and Wigley (See Appendix for survey items).⁴⁶ The Aggressiveness Scale measures the tendency of an individual to attack the self-concept of other people rather than issues or topics of communication that reflect argumentativeness.

The results supported the hypothesis that when conditions are conducive to worker voice, the net result is that employees have higher career satisfaction and improved perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. The authors also found that what mattered most for subordinate satisfaction was having a supervisor who was not verbally aggressive but who encouraged argument.

44 William I. Gorden, Dominic A. Infante, L. Wilson, and C. Clarke. “Rationale and development of an employee rights scale,” *Free Speech Yearbook 1984* (1985): 66.

45 Infante & Rancer, 1982.

46 Infante & Wigley, 1986.

Workforce Employee Relations Survey

In 2000, Bryson published a work examining voice in British workplaces using data from the 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey (WERS).^{47 48} The 1998 survey is the fourth in a recurring series of surveys of British workplaces. The WERS has the benefit of being a large, well-funded, nationally representative survey: 28,215 employees were surveyed in 2,191 workplaces. Response rates were extremely high: 80% at the establishment level and 64% at the employee level. Additionally, the survey has undergone rigorous piloting and developmental work to ensure the quality of the instrument. The survey is a multi-part multi-mode effort; we will focus on the Employee Questionnaire and the Panel Questionnaire, which have the most relevance to our research.

The Employee Questionnaire is a self-administered paper survey that includes a battery of questions that ask employees to rate managerial effectiveness on a number of topics: keeping people up-to-date about proposed changes, providing everyone with the chance to comment on proposed changes, responding to suggestions from employees, dealing with work problems, and treating employees fairly (See Appendix for survey items). The responses are on a 5-point Likert scale (1=very good to 5=very poor). The items are positively correlated. However, Bryson found that the correlation was not strong enough to suggest that employees would answer all of the questions in the same way.

In Bryson's analyses, voice mechanism was derived from information provided in the WERS Personnel Manager survey, which is an establishment-level survey.^{49 50} Bryson used variables from that survey to identify the presence of two different voice mechanisms: union voice and non-union voice. While such questions are not on the Employee Questionnaire, there is an entire section of the survey dedicated to worker representation. Numerous items from this

questionnaire could be used to determine level of voice to mimic Bryson's construct: questions about trade union membership, staff association membership, and preference for representation when dealing with various workplace issues (increases in pay, complaints, and discipline; See Appendix for survey items). The 2004 iteration of the WERS employee survey has a reduced number of items related to managerial effectiveness but nonetheless could be considered a useful reference for our research efforts (See Appendix for survey items).

Bryson's findings were numerous: Direct voice by itself was associated with better perceptions of managerial effectiveness than representative voice alone. However, the combination of direct voice and representative voice was found to be just as effective. Interestingly, union voice was found to elicit only opinions about management that were more negative. This led to a major finding: Unions tend to highlight the shortcomings of management and increase voice primarily as a result of more complaints. In fact, union voice was found to be relatively ineffective compared with non-union voice. Thus, Bryson found little support for Freeman and Medoff's hypothesis that union voice is more effective than non-union voice for workers.⁵¹

Van Dyne and LePine's Self Voice Measure

In 1998, Van Dyne and LePine developed and empirically validated a six-item voice scale in a longitudinal field study.⁵² While their voice instrument was originally intended to measure voice for workgroups, the authors did apply the scale to individuals, and its application could be of interest for our research. The authors used the instrument to test several hypotheses quantitatively: Individuals who are satisfied with their workgroups will engage in more voice than those who are not satisfied, individuals with higher self-esteem will engage in more voice than those with lower self-esteem, workgroup size will be negatively related to voice such that individuals in smaller workgroups will voice more, and individuals in self-managed groups will engage

47 Alex Bryson. *Have British Workers Lost their Voice, or Have they Gained a New One?* (London, UK: Policy Studies Institute, 2000).

48 UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2010.

49 Bryson, 2000.

50 UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills, 2010.

51 Freeman and Medoff, 1984.

52 Van Dyne & LePine, 1998.

in more voice compared with individuals in traditionally managed groups.

The voice measure was based on Van Dyne and colleagues (1994)⁵³ and Withey and Cooper (1989)⁵⁴. Voice in this instance was categorized as specific behaviors: making recommendations that concern the workgroup, encouraging others to get involved in issues that affect the group, communicating differing opinions, staying well-informed about issues that could affect the group, getting involved in issues that affect the quality of work life, and speaking up with ideas to improve procedures (See Appendix for survey items). Data were collected from 441 employees in 91 workgroups from 25 firms.

The results yielded several variables that are associated with higher levels of voice. High satisfaction was associated with high voice overall. Individuals with higher levels of self-esteem engaged in more voice behavior than did those with low self-esteem. Workgroup variables also explained a great deal of the variation in voice behavior. Individuals in small workgroups voiced more often compared with those in large groups.

Measures of Voice

In 1988, Rusbult, Farrell, Rogers, and Mainous published a paper with the results from three separate studies, each with its own measure of voice.⁵⁵ The authors measured the effect of different variables on the four general responses to dissatisfaction outlined by Hirschman (1970): exit, voice, and loyalty.⁵⁶ They proposed to measure the circumstances under which employees are likely to engage in each category of response. The authors tested three separate hypotheses: first, employees with high levels of overall job satisfaction and high levels of prior job satisfaction should be more likely to engage in voice and loyalty (constructive behavior) and less likely to engage in exit and neglect (destructive behavior)

53 Linn Van Dyne, J.W. Graham, & R.M. Dienesch, "Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation," *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (1994): 765.

54 Withey and Cooper, 1989

55 Rusbult et al., 1988.

56 Hirschman, 1970.

than employees with low overall job satisfaction; second, employees with high investment in a job should be more likely to engage in voice and loyalty and less likely to engage in exit and neglect than employees with low investment; third, employees with high-quality alternatives should be more likely to engage in exit and voice and less likely to engage in loyalty and neglect than employees with poor-quality alternatives.

The authors designed three studies to empirically test the hypotheses. The first was a simulation experiment and provided preliminary information about the impact of hypothesized models on the response to workplace dissatisfaction. A total of 128 respondents, with an equal number of men and women, were drawn from the student population of an introductory psychology course. Students were asked to read an essay describing a workplace with deteriorating conditions and ineffective management. After reading the essay, each student completed a 17-item questionnaire that contained four items to measure voice (See Appendix for voice survey items). Voice items were collected on a 9-point end-labeled Likert scale with endpoints labeled 1="Definitely Would Not React In This Way" to 9="Definitely Would React In This Way."

The second study was a larger survey of respondents randomly selected from the population of local union members in a large utility company. Surveys were mailed to 864 employees, or one-third of the union membership. Of those, 473 responded, for a response rate of 55%; 54% of respondents were men. Each respondent completed a 20-item questionnaire with a 5-item measure of voice (See Appendix for voice survey items). Voice items were collected on a 5-point bipolar scale with endpoints labeled 1="Definitely Would Not React In This Way" to 5="Definitely Would React In This Way."

The third study was a simulation experiment similar to Study One. Students participated in a simulation of a newspaper newsroom work environment. Initially, students were divided into high- and low-investment groups that received more or less job-specific training. Students were then

assigned a number of tasks, and their work was evaluated, which the students then read. The cycle repeated for three iterations. After completion, students were paid by varying amounts according to their evaluations. Student evaluations were rated more negatively after each iteration of the experiment, and work assignments became gradually more difficult. After the experiment, participants completed a number of behavioral measures and selected a voice, exit, loyalty, or neglect path. A total of 80 students, with an equal number of males and females, participated to fulfill the research experience requirement for an introductory psychology course. Each respondent completed a 37-item questionnaire with a 7-item measure of voice (See Appendix for voice survey items). Voice items were collected on a 7-point bipolar scale with endpoints labeled 1="Definitely Would Not React In This Way" to 7="Definitely Would React In This Way."

The results from Study One were consistent with the initial hypothesis: The effect of prior satisfaction was significant, with high satisfaction strongly linked to the tendency to voice, and low satisfaction linked to the tendency to exit or neglect. The second study found similar results: High job satisfaction was associated with higher loyalty and lower exit and neglect; higher investment was linked to greater likelihood to voice and lower likelihood to exit or neglect; and good employment alternatives were associated with more voice and exit behavior. Results from the third study were slightly more nuanced and not easy to interpret, but the following findings can be derived from the analysis: Highly satisfied subjects were more likely to engage in constructive action, and less satisfied subjects were more likely to engage in destructive action; low-investment subjects were more likely to react constructively and less likely to react destructively.

Results from the three studies were combined meta-analytically, and the collective overall analysis provided good support for the authors' hypotheses. For the first hypothesis, the analysis found that high job satisfaction consistently predicted constructive voice. For the second hypothesis, high investment consistently predicted voice. Lastly, consistent

with the third hypothesis, the availability of high-quality job options was a predictor of voice.

Organizational Dissent Scale

In 1998, Kassing developed a measurement tool called the Organizational Dissent Scale (ODS) to capture how employees verbally express contradictory opinions and disagreements about organizational issues.⁵⁷ Kassing viewed dissent as a subset of worker voice behavior that focused on expression of disagreement and contrary opinions to management, with whistle-blowing as a subset of dissent behavior. The purpose of the ODS was to assess how employees express disagreement in the workplace and how they combat the psychological and political constraints in their organizations. Kassing developed the ODS over three separate studies. The first was used to develop the measure; the second and third were used to generate evidence of reliability and validity of the measure.

The first study sampled 347 employees from a broad spectrum of seven different organization types. Paper questionnaires were returned by 191 respondents, for a response rate of 55%; 53% of respondents were male, and 47% were female. Respondents covered a wide variety of work experience, job tenure, and education levels, and ranged from clerical workers to top management. Kassing analyzed the responses using iterated principal components factor analysis with orthogonal (varimax) rotation. Factors had to have at least two principal components with adequate loading and acceptable Cronbach's alpha reliability to be included in the final measurement tool. Using those criteria, Kassing started with a 45-item dissent scale and winnowed it down to a 27-item scale. The 27-item scale was tested in the two subsequent studies.

Study Two was conducted among employees of four different organization types. To ensure strong representation of non-management employees, the second study had a large population of non-management personnel. Overall, 776 paper questionnaires were distributed, and 195 were

⁵⁷ Kassing, 1998.

returned, for a response rate of 25%; 48% of respondents were male, and 52% were female. Similar to Study One, a broad range of demographics was captured. Kassing carried out analysis similar to Study One, and the ODS was further reduced to 20 items (See Appendix for survey items). Some of the factors in the 20-item scale are not completely orthogonal; while they represent distinct sets of behaviors, those behaviors may not occur in isolation.

A third and final study was conducted to test the validity of the 20-item ODS measure, using a convenience sample from a graduate business course; 61 respondents completed the questionnaire. The group was predominantly male (64%) and consisted largely of business professionals from both the management and non-management ranks. Reliability of the instrument was found to be high in Kassing's analysis; all dimensions of the ODS were found to be significant over time.

Throughout the three rounds of data collection, Kassing was able to develop a reliable and robust 20-item measure of organizational dissent. The ODS is a useful tool that could be adapted or used verbatim by other organizational researchers.

Employee Response to Dissatisfaction Scale

Leck and Saunders (1992) examined Hirschman's exit, voice, and loyalty model with a specific focus on loyalty.⁵⁸ Before this, there had been a debate in the literature about whether loyalty was a distinct behavior (like exit and voice are behaviors) that results from dissatisfaction or an attitude that deters exit and encourages voice. While the focus of this study was not voice behavior per se, voice was captured in the authors' measurement tool as a separate scale (See Appendix for survey items). Scale items for each measure were adapted from those used in previous voice studies (Rusbult et al., 1988).⁵⁹ The authors' goal was twofold: to create reliable measures of the behavior response to workplace dissatisfaction and to examine the relationship

58 Joanne D. Leck and David M. Saunders. "Hirschman's Loyalty: Attitude or Behavior?" *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 5 (1992): 219.

59 Rusbult et al., 1988

between loyalty and the behavior responses to workplace dissatisfaction.

The authors sampled 320 part-time students who were also employed. About 55% of the participants were male, and more than half were in management positions. Each respondent was asked to complete an "employee survey" at the beginning of a class session. Respondents answered questions in the context of their current employer. The authors used factor analysis to assess the extent to which each scale was measuring a distinct concept. All items on the voice scale loaded to the same factor, and all loadings for voice were higher than 0.5. These results suggest that Leck and Saunders' voice measure is distinct and captures a unique underlying concept from the rest of their questionnaire.

The resulting analysis produced some interesting findings. The authors found that dissatisfaction resulted in increased exit and neglect but decreased voice. In fact, satisfaction was positively related to voice. In other words, dissatisfied employees respond by leaving the organization, and satisfied employees speak up and attempt to change what's wrong. The authors concluded by stating that their voice, exit, and loyalty measures were a significant improvement over those found in the literature.

Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale

In 1991, Gorden and Infante developed a scale to measure the freedom an individual has to communicate in the workplace.⁶⁰ The scale, called the Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale (See Appendix for survey items), was constructed and used to test various hypotheses. The authors' first hypothesis was: Employees will perceive that there is less freedom of speech in the workplace than they desire. The main focus of the study, however, was to test two additional hypotheses: Employees who perceive that their organizations are more open to freedom of speech will rate their organizations as more financially stable, more encouraging of employee participation in decision making, more committed to product quality, more committed to work-

60 William I. Gorden and Dominic Infante. "Test of a Communication Model of Organizational Commitment," *Communication Quarterly* 39 (1991): 144.

life quality, and more committed to employee rights; and secondly: Employees who perceive that their organizations are more open to freedom of speech will be more satisfied with work, pay promotions, supervisors, and coworkers, and will have more organizational commitment. Finally, a fourth hypothesis contended that employee perceptions of having workplace freedom of speech influence organizational commitment not explained by the organization's actual commitment to quality and financial stability.

Data were collected from 253 respondents in a major industrial metropolitan center in the Midwest; 56% of respondents were male, and 44% were female. The respondents were recruited from a wide variety of sizes and types of organizations. Respondents were asked to complete a paper questionnaire and to mail it to the researchers upon completion. The questionnaire contained the 5-item Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale, the Employee Rights Scale, a generic organizational commitment scale, and a general job satisfaction scale.

The authors found that positive perceptions of freedom of speech were linked to hypothesized outcomes. In support of the first hypothesis, they saw a significant difference between employee preferences and perceptions of freedom of speech in their workplaces. They also found evidence in support of the second hypothesis: Employees who indicated more freedom of speech in their workplace felt their organization was more stable financially, encouraged more participation in decision making, was more attentive to employee rights, and had better perceptions of work-life quality. Third, employees who felt that their organization was committed to freedom of speech also believed that their organization was more stable. Additionally, employees who perceived greater freedom of speech were more satisfied with work, pay, supervision, and coworkers. Finally, more freedom of speech was found to account for variation in organizational commitment that could not be predicted by other variables.

Organizational Tolerance for Dissent Scale

In 1992, Schultz developed a scale to measure an organization's tolerance for dissent, which we will refer to as the Organizational Tolerance for Dissent Scale (OTDS).⁶¹ The purpose of the scale was to measure employees' perceptions of how tolerant their organization is of dissent. This scale could be a useful measure to test hypotheses related to dissent across different types of organizations. The author hypothesized that a positive relationship would exist between an organization's tolerance for dissent and its openness to employee speech, an environment that values employee rights, and general job satisfaction.

Respondents were sampled from employees of the Pacific Stock Exchange and the San Jose, California, office of Coopers & Lybrand. A total of 190 employees completed a questionnaire, and the overall response rate was 54%. The questionnaire contained the author's 25-item OTDS (See Appendix for survey items) and select items from the Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale (Gorden & Infante, 1991), the Employee Rights Scale (Gorden et al., 1984), and a general job satisfaction scale.

Schultz's analysis indicated a strong correlation between the OTDS and the other three scales on the questionnaire. In the author's estimation, the OTDS and the Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale measured the same underlying concepts. Thus the high correlation between scales supports the validity of the OTDS and the author's hypothesis.

Summary

The current research literature defines voice in a drastically different manner than DOL defines voice. Indeed, our review of the literature found no existing research studies that have a definition of voice that is similar to DOL's definition. This indicates that research based on DOL's conceptualization of voice would likely add new domains to the existing research literature. These domains could focus on knowledge of workplace rights, access to information about workplace rights, and workers' ability to exercise those rights.

61 Schultz, 1992.

When the existing voice survey research is examined using DOL's definition of voice as a guide, it suffers from several empirical shortcomings. There are no existing measures to assess the level of knowledge about any DOL laws and regulations. Further, there are no measures to assess the level and quality of access to DOL laws and regulations. Instead, researchers have operationalized voice in a much different manner: Most have focused on the actual voice communication behavior, the conditions necessary for voice to occur, and the factors that are likely to be predictive of voice behavior. When a new measure of voice is constructed using DOL's definition, some of the existing measures will be useful in developing a core set of voice question items. For the most part, however, turning DOL's voice definition into a robust measurement scale will be a unique addition to the existing voice research.

Appendix: Voice Survey Items

Supervisor as Voice Manager Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
My boss takes action to correct the concerns that I speak to him or her about.	End-labeled 7-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree
My boss treats concerns reported from other workers and myself equally.	
If I want to bring a concern to my boss there are clear steps to be followed.	
My boss is fair when I take a concern to him or her.	
Taking a concern to my boss would not cause future problems between my boss and me.	
I find it quite stressful to take a concern to my boss.	
My boss doesn't really listen to me when I bring in a concern.	
My boss doesn't ever do anything about my concerns.	
It is not especially difficult or time consuming to go to my boss with a concern.	
I do not know how to approach my boss with a concern.	
I get to describe my concerns completely before my boss responds to me.	
My boss takes action to correct the concerns that I speak to him or her about.	

Saunders et al., 1992

Likelihood to Voice Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
How likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about a concern over how another worker was doing his or her job?	End-labeled 7-point Likert scale from 1=not very likely to 7=very likely
How likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about a better way to do your job?	
If you knew a co-worker was not honest how likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about it?	
If you had a gripe about something to do with your job, how likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about it?	
When something at work irritates (bothers) you, how likely are you to speak to your immediate supervisor about it?	
If something about the policies and procedures of the university irritated or bothered you, how likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about it?	
If an employee from another department did something to irritate or bother you, how likely would you be to speak to your immediate supervisor about it?	
If your immediate supervisor did something to irritate or bother you, how likely would you be to speak to him or her about it?	

Saunders et al., 1992

Employee Rights Scale

Survey Item (Partial)	Response Scale
In my place of work, differences of opinions are freely voiced.	End-labeled 5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
In my place of work, it is understood one should not argue a point vigorously.	
In my place of work, there are communication channels through which an employee may confidentially submit complaints, comments, or questions.	

Gorden et al., 1985

Argumentativeness Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
While in an argument, I worry that the person I am arguing with will form a negative impression of me.	1=almost never true 2=rarely true 3=occasionally true 4=often true 5=almost always true
Arguing over controversial issues improves my intelligence.	
I enjoy avoiding arguments.	
I am energetic and enthusiastic when I argue.	
Once I finish an argument I promise myself that I will not get into another.	
Arguing with a person creates more problems for me than it solves.	
When I finish arguing with someone I feel nervous and upset.	
I enjoy a good argument over a controversial issue.	
I get an unpleasant feeling when I realize I am about to get into an argument.	
I enjoy defending my point of view on an issue.	
I am happy when I keep an argument from happening.	
I do not like to miss the opportunity to argue a controversial issue.	
I prefer being with people who rarely disagree with me.	
I consider an argument an exciting intellectual challenge.	
I find myself unable to think of effective points during an argument.	
I feel refreshed and satisfied after an argument on a controversial issue.	
I have the ability to do well in an argument.	
I try to avoid getting into arguments.	
I feel excitement when I expect that a conversation I am in is leading to an argument.	

Infante and Rancer, 1982

Aggressiveness Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
I am extremely careful to avoid attacking individuals' intelligence when I attack their ideas.	1=almost never true
When individuals are very stubborn, I use insults to soften their stubbornness.	2=rarely true
I try very hard to avoid having other people feel bad about themselves when I try to influence them.	3=occasionally true
When people refuse to do a task I know is important, without good reason, I tell them they are unreasonable.	4=often true
When others do things I regard as stupid, I try to be extremely gentle with them.	5=almost always true
If individuals I am trying to influence really deserve it, I attack their character.	
When people behave in ways that are in very poor taste, I insult them in order to shock them into proper behavior.	
I try to make people feel good about themselves even when their ideas are stupid.	
When people simply will not budge on a matter of importance I lose my temper and say rather strong things to them.	
When people criticize my shortcomings, I take it in good humor and do not try to get back at them.	
When individuals insult me, I get a lot of pleasure out of really telling them off.	
When I dislike individuals greatly, I try not to show it in what I say or how I say it.	
I like poking fun at people who do things which are very stupid in order to stimulate their intelligence.	
When I attack a person's ideas, I try not to damage their self concepts.	
When I try to influence people, I make a great effort not to offend them.	
When people do things which are mean or cruel, I attack their character in order to help correct their behavior.	
I refuse to participate in arguments when they involve personal attacks.	
When nothing seems to work in trying to influence others, I yell and scream in order to get some movement from them.	
When I am not able to refute others' positions, I try to make them feel defensive in order to weaken their positions.	
When an argument shifts to personal attacks, I try very hard to change the subject.	

Infante and Wigley, 1986

Employee Questionnaire: Measures of Managerial Responsiveness

Question: How good would you say managers here are at the following?	Response Scale
Keeping everyone up to date about proposed changes	Fully labeled 5-point Likert scale from 1=very good to 5=very poor
Providing everyone with the chance to comment on proposed changes	
Responding to suggestions from employees	
Dealing with work problems you or others may have	
Treating employees fairly	

WERS, 1998

WERS Personnel Manager Survey: Representation at Work

Survey Item	Response Scale
Are you a member of a trade union or staff association?	1=yes 2=no, but have been in the past 3=no, have never been a member
Ideally, who do you think would best represent you in dealing with managers here about the following issues? Getting increases in my pay If I wanted to make a complaint about working here If a manager wanted to discipline me	1=myself 2=trade union 3=another employee 4=somebody else
How much contact do you have with trade union or other worker representatives about workplace matters?	1=I am frequently in contact with worker representatives 2=I am occasionally in contact with worker representatives 3=I am never in contact with worker representatives 4=I am a worker representative 5=I do not know any worker representatives
Is there a trade union or staff association at this workplace?	1=yes 2=no

WERS, 1998

Employee Survey: Measures of Managerial Responsiveness

Question: How good would you say managers here are at . . .	Response Scale
Seeking the views of employees or employee representatives?	Fully labeled 5-point Likert scale from 1=very good to 5=very poor
Responding to suggestions from employees or employee representatives?	
Allowing employees or employee representatives to influence final decisions?	

WERS, 2004

Van Dyne and LePine's Self Voice Measure

Survey Item	Response Scale
I develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect this work group.	End-labeled 7-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree
I speak up and encourage others in this group to get involved in issues that affect the group.	
I communicate my opinions about work issues to others in this group even if my opinion is different and others in the group disagree with me.	
I keep well informed about issues where my opinion might be useful to this work group.	
I get involved in issues that affect the quality of work life here in this group.	
I speak up in this group with ideas.	

Van Dyne & LePine, 1998

Measures of Voice, Study One

Survey Item	Response Scale
I would go to my immediate supervisor to discuss the problem.	End-labeled 9-point Likert scale from 1=Definitely Would Not React In This Way to 9=Definitely Would React In This Way
I would ask my co-workers for advice about what to do.	
I would talk to the office manager about how I felt about the situation.	
I would try to solve the problem by suggesting changes in the way work was supervised in the office.	

Rusbult et al., 1988

Measures of Voice, Study Two

Survey Item	Response Scale
When I think of an idea that will benefit my company I make a determined effort to implement it.	End labeled 5-point Likert scale from 1=Definitely Would Not React In This Way to 5=Definitely Would React In This Way
I have contacted at least once an outside agency (e.g., union) to get help in changing working conditions here.	
I sometimes discuss problems at work with my employer.	
When things are seriously wrong and the company won't act, I am willing to "blow the whistle."	
I have made several attempts to change working conditions here.	

Rusbult et al., 1988

Measures of Voice, Study Three

Survey Item	Response Scale
I have an idea that I think will improve the feedback system, and I will make a serious effort to implement it.	End-labeled 7-point Likert scale from 1= Definitely Would Not React In This Way to 7= Definitely Would React In This Way
I want to discuss the evaluation/feedback system with my supervisor.	
I want to talk things over with my co-workers to get their help in changing working conditions.	
I want to suggest changes in the procedures by which work is assigned or evaluated.	
I want to change the way things are done in the newsroom.	
I want to talk to my supervisor about the difficulty of the job and/or the nature of the feedback.	
I will work harder—this job is difficult but “do-able.”	

Rusbult et al., 1988

Organizational Tolerance for Dissent Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and effect changes in this organization.	5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.	
There is very little risk of reprisal to someone in this organization who objects to the prevailing view on an issue.	
If an issue is serious, my co-workers and I feel free to take it to our boss.	
When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.	
My co-workers and I will typically approach several of those in authority, if necessary, in order to effect a change.	
In this organization, it is better to smooth things over with other people, than confront them to improve the situation.	
When I notice something that needs to be fixed in this organization, there are plenty of ways to make this known.	
I have a great deal of confidence in my ability to make a difference in decisions affecting this organization.	
When someone in this organization disagrees with management, they are likely to be isolated or fired.	
To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization is just not worth the effort.	
It is part of my job to report problems with our products/services.	
When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, it is best not to report it to the boss.	
If I see something going on that violates one of my principles, I let other people in this organization know about it.	
There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.	
Employees are aware of issues in this organization.	
Employees are kept informed of business conditions.	
When something goes wrong in this organization, I'm likely to know about it.	
I would object if an activity in my department was clearly illegal.	
I would object if an activity in my department was clearly immoral or unethical.	
I would object if an activity in my department was irrational.	
I would object if an activity in my department was incredibly stupid.	
I would object if an activity in my department was insensitive to human needs and feelings.	
I would object if an activity in my department was inefficient or impractical.	
I would object if an activity in my department was irritating or annoying.	

Schultz, 1992

Workplace Freedom of Speech Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
In my workplace I feel I have freedom of speech.	5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
In my workplace superiors do not encourage subordinates to argue corporate issues.	
In my workplace employees are penalized if they openly disagree with management practices.	
In my workplace employees who speak up about job related matters are considered team players.	
In my workplace there is fear of expressing your true feeling on work issues.	

Gorden & Infante, 1991

Employee Responses to Dissatisfaction Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
Avoid work by talking to co-workers, attending to personal business, daydreaming, etc.	7-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree
Criticize or bad-mouth your job to others.	
Criticize or bad-mouth your organization to others.	
Put in less effort in your work than you know you can.	
Show up late for work even when you could make it in on time.	
Deliberately avoid your boss.	
Take more and longer breaks than you should.	
Deliberately cause problems for your organization.	
Discuss your suggestions and concerns with your boss.	
Discuss your suggestions and concerns with senior management.	
Say good things about the organization even when others criticize it.	
Voluntarily wear clothing (hat, jacket, pin, etc.) that bears your organization's symbol or insignia.	
Say good things about your job even when others criticize it.	
Stick quietly by your job through good and bad times.	
Stick quietly by your organization through good and bad times.	
Wait patiently for things to improve during bad times.	
Accept a job outside your present organization.	
Search for a job outside your present organization.	
Make errors and deliberately do not correct them.	
Call in sick even when you are not sick.	
Request a transfer to another area within your organization.	
Discuss your suggestions and concerns with your co-workers.	
Report wrong-doings or illegal activities performed by your organization to the proper authorities.	
Contact outside agencies (e.g., unions, newspapers) to get help in changing conditions with which you are dissatisfied.	
Make anonymous suggestions and complaints.	
Use formal procedures (e.g., grievances, suggestions, programs, etc.) to communicate your suggestions and concerns.	

Leck & Saunders, 1992

Organizational Dissent Scale

Survey Item	Response Scale
I am hesitant to raise questions or contradictory opinions in my organization.	Fully labeled 5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree
I refuse to discuss work concerns at home.	
I criticize inefficiency in this organization in front of everyone.	
I do not question management.	
I'm hesitant to question workplace policies.	
I join in when other employees complain about organizational changes.	
I make it a habit not to complain about work in front of my family.	
I make certain everyone knows when I'm unhappy with work policies.	
I don't tell my supervisor when I disagree with workplace decisions.	
I discuss my concerns about workplace decisions with family and friends outside of work.	
I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management.	
I let other employees know how I feel about the way things are done around here.	
I speak with my supervisors or someone in management when I question workplace decisions.	
I rarely voice my frustrations about workplace issues in front of my spouse/partner or nonwork friends.	
I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization.	
I talk about my job concerns to people outside of work.	
I do not express my disagreement to management.	
I hardly ever complain to my coworkers about workplace problems.	
I tell management when I believe employees are being treated unfairly.	
I talk with family and friends about workplace decisions that I am uncomfortable discussing at work.	

Kassing, 1998

Bibliography

- Boxall, P., and John Purcell. *Strategy and Human Resource Management* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).
- Bryson, A. "Managerial Responsiveness to Union and Nonunion Worker Voice in Britain," *Employee Relations* 43 (2004): 213.
- Bryson, A. *Have British Workers Lost their Voice, or Have they Gained a New One?* (London, UK: Policy Studies Institute, 2000).
- Burris, E.R., James R. Detert, and Dan S. Chiaburu. "Quitting before leaving: the mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2008).
- Detert, J.R., Ethan R. Burris, Nathaniel Foote, Kelly Delaney-Klinger, Amy Ed, Dave Harrison, Kathleen O'Connor, Chad Pro, Steve Sauer, and Melissa Thomas-Hunt. "Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open?" *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (2007): 869.
- Detert, J.R., and Linda K. Trevino. "Speaking Up to Higher-Ups: How Supervisors and Skip-Level Leaders Influence Employee Voice," *Organization Science* (2010).
- Farrell, D. "Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 596.
- Freeman, R.B., and James L. Medoff. *What do unions do?* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).
- Google Inc., Google Scholar, <<http://scholar.google.com/>> (20 December 2010).
- Gorden, W.I., Dominic A. Infante, L. Wilson, and C. Clarke. "Rationale and development of an employee rights scale," *Free Speech Yearbook 1984* (1985): 66.
- Gorden, W.I., Dominic A. Infante, and Elizabeth E. Graham. "Corporate Conditions Conducive to Employee Voice: A Subordinate Perspective," *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 1 (1988): 101.
- Gorden, W.I., and Dominic Infante. "Test of a Communication Model of Organizational Commitment," *Communication Quarterly* 39 (1991): 144.
- Graham, J.W. "Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay," in *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Eds. B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1986), 1.
- Gundlach, M.J., Scott C. Douglas, and Mark J. Martinko. "The Decision to Blow the Whistle: A Social Information Processing Framework," *Academy of Management Review* 28 (2003):107.
- Harvey, P., Mark J. Martinko, and Nancy Borkowski. "A re-examination of the attribution-emotion-behavior framework in the context of unethical behavior," in *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, Eds. Neal M. Ashkanasy, Wilfred J. Zerbe, and Charmine E. J. Härtel (West Yorkshire, England: Emerald, 2008).
- Hirschman, A.O. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970).
- Infante, D.A., and Andrew S. Rancer. "A Conceptualization and Measure of Argumentativeness," *Journal of Personality Assessment* 46 (1982): 72.
- Infante, D.A., and Charles J. Wigley. "Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure," *Communication Monographs* 53 (1986): 61.
- Kassing, J.W. "Development and Validation of the Organizational Dissent Scale," *Management Communication Quarterly* 12 (1998): 183.
- Leck, J.D., and David M. Saunders. "Hirschman's Loyalty: Attitude or Behavior?" *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 5 (1992): 219.
- LePine, J.A., and Linn Van Dyne. "Predicting voice behavior in work groups," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (1998).
- Morrison, E.W., Sara L. Wheeler-Smith, and Dishan Kamdar. "Speaking Up in Groups: A Cross-Level Study of Group Voice Climate and Voice," *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2010).
- Rusbult, C.E., Dan Farrell, Glen Rogers, and Arch G. Mainous III. "Impact of Exchange Variables on Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect: An Integrative Model of Responses to Declining Job Satisfaction," *Academy of Management Journal* 31 (1988) 599.
- Saunders, D.M., Blair H. Sheppard, Virginia Knight, and Jonelle Roth. "Employee Voice to Supervisors," *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 5 (1992): 521.
- Schultz, B.M. *Development of a scale to measure an organization's tolerance or dissent*, unpublished master's thesis (San Jose, CA: San Jose State University, 1992).

Tangirala, S. and Rangaraj Ramanujam. "Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross-level effects of procedural justice climate," *Personnel Psychology* (2008).

U.S. Department of Labor. *Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2011-2016*. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 2010.

U.S. Department of Labor. *DOLQ109631003 Blanket Purchase Agreement*. Washington, D.C.: 2010.

UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills. "The 1998 Workplace Employee Relations Survey," *UK Department for Business Innovation & Skills*, 2010, <<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/employment/research-evaluation/wers-98/index.html>> (04 April 2010).

Van Dyne, L., J.W. Graham, & R.M. Dienesch, "Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation," *Academy of Management Journal*, 37 (1994): 765.

Van Dyne, L., and Jeffrey A. LePine. "Helping and Voice Extra-Role Behaviors: Evidence of Construct and Predictive Validity," *Academy of Management Journal* 41 (1998): 108.

Withey, M.J., and William H. Cooper. "Predicting Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 34 (1989): 521.

GALLUP®

World Headquarters

The Gallup Building
901 F Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

t +1.877.242.5587

f +1.202.715.3045

www.gallup.com