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Abstract

Research on employee voice has more recently expanded to include the experiences of historically marginalized employees, such as employees of color and queer employees, but consideration of the concomitant impact that race and gender has on employee voice experiences is largely absent from the literature. Integrating the Backlash Avoidance Model and double jeopardy theory, this dissertation explores potential predictors of employee voice, both fear of backlash and psychological safety and the way in which race and gender may influence these relationships. Further, I examine how the impact of employee expressions of voice on work-related outcomes might vary as a function of others’ reactions to voice behavior. Findings suggest that the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice does vary by gender. Additionally, findings suggest that employee voice is a powerful tool that can increase positive work attitudes (job satisfaction) and behavior (OCBs) even in the face of the negative effects of hostile coworker reactions.
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Introduction

Employee Voice in the Workplace

Arundhati Roy once said, “There’s no such thing as the ‘voiceless.’ There are only the deliberately silenced, or the preferably unheard” (Roy, 2004). While she was using this expression in a more global sense, its implications for organizations are quite far-reaching as well; there are not voiceless employees in organizations, just those who have been historically and systemically silenced. Employee voice, defined as both the participation of employees in organizational decision-making and the ability to express and communicate complaints or grievances at work, has been documented through research since the 1980’s. The focus of extant work on employee voice, however, is predominantly homogenous, centering on White and male subjects (Dundon et al., 2004; Wilkinson et al., 2018). More recently, employee voice research has expanded to include the voice experiences (or lack thereof) of historically marginalized employees, (i.e., employees of color, queer employees; Felix et al., 2018; Hatipoglu & Inelman, 2018; Mcnulty et al., 2018; Tabassum & Thompson, 2018). Apart from these few exceptions, consideration of the roles of race and gender (multiple marginalized identities) in shaping voice experiences is largely absent from the employee voice literature.

Employee voice is a proactive tool that allows employees to further engage with their organization and its members, but marginalized employees do not always have access or feel safe to use this tool (Wilkinson et al., 2018). Some of the benefits of employee voice include increased participation (Rank, 2009), improved employee well-being (Myers et al., 2018), positive attitudes (Dundon et al., 2004), increased satisfaction (Alfayad & Arif, 2017), higher engagement (Ge, 2020), increased commitment to the organization and work team, improved
(individual and team-level) performance, and an improvement in managerial systems (Burris, 2012; Wilkinson & Fay, 2011). Considering the many benefits of employee voice, both to employees and organizations, it is critical to determine factors that either prevent or promote employee voice, particularly for racial minority women, since this group is largely absent from focus in the extant literature. While employee voice can be a particularly powerful tool that marginalized groups may use to gain participation and enhanced feelings of value and inclusion (Kamenou & Fearfull, 2006; Wang et al., 2014), without the proper resources and environment, this tool may not always be accessible to those who would benefit most.

In light of the above, the purpose of this dissertation is fourfold. First, I contribute to the employee voice literature by examining two potential determinants of employee voice, which is particularly important to understand for voices that are less heard. As voice scholars, we want to better develop conditions under which all employees can engage in voice, and for this we need to understand the factors that may enhance or constrain employee expression of voice. Specifically, I examine the extent to which both fear of backlash and psychological safety uniquely predict voice behavior. Notably, this dissertation will be the first to examine the relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice. In doing so, I will be able to assess the extent to which fear of backlash predicts unique variance in employee voice above and beyond the more established predictor of voice, psychological safety. Fear of backlash can be defined as the anticipation of economic and social penalties for engaging in behavior that is incongruent with others’ expectations. For example, for women in the workplace, behaving with assertiveness, outspokenness, and self-advocacy, might trigger unwanted reactions and penalties from others. Therefore, prior to engaging in these behaviors, women must often consider the cost-benefits of engaging in such expressions of voice (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; Moss-Racusin & Rudman,
For racial minorities, this fear of backlash may include concerns related to the long-term effects of discrimination, specifically for those having a specific ethnic identity (Nassar-McMillan et al., 2011). Therefore, I suggest that a fear of backlash will inhibit employee voice behavior. While research has found that fear of backlash may play a role in disclosure (which overlaps with components of voice behavior) for gender and sexual orientation minorities (Amanatullah & Morris, 2010; McNulty et al., 2018; Rudman & Phelan, 2008), the role that fear of backlash plays in determining voice behavior of racial minority women has been largely unexplored. Thus, I will address this gap with a longitudinal survey design.

Second, I propose that the presence of psychological safety will increase the likelihood of engaging in voice behaviors. Research indicates that employees of color often need an established environment of trust and openness to communicate mistakes, needs, values, and opinions sans the fear of negative repercussions (Edmondson & Roloff, 2008; McKibben & Joyce, 1980; Singh et al., 2013). Psychological safety is defined as the perception that the environment is safe to take interpersonal risks like speaking up, challenging convention, and expressing new ideas. Psychological safety has been found to be associated with positive organizational behaviors and workplace experiences, such as well-being, empowerment, and engagement in work processes, highlighting the significance of psychological safety in facilitating behaviors that are not only beneficial to employees’ own well-being but also beneficial to the organization of which they are a part (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016; Tucker & Edmondson, 2003). According to the persuasion and confrontation literature, feelings of psychological safety can mitigate some of the negative consequences of stereotyping and can increase the likelihood of engaging in proactive behavior like voice, particularly for gender and
racial minorities (Nkomo & Cox, 1996; Roberge & Van Dick, 2010; Schultz & Maddox, 2013). Thus, I suggest that psychological safety will facilitate voice behavior.

Third, I will examine whether race and gender interact with these two predictors (i.e., fear of backlash, psychological safety) to influence employee voice behavior. While a great deal remains unknown regarding the concomitant effects of race and gender on experiences of employee voice, a small body of work has shed light on the experiences of employees possessing a single marginalized identity in the voice literature (Bell et al., 2011; Farh et al., 2020; Felix et al., 2018; McFadden & Crowley-Henry, 2018). For example, McFadden and Crowley-Henry (2018) utilized a qualitative approach via semi-structured interviews to better understand how isolation faced by LGBT employees can affect their experiences of employee voice. This work suggested that while LGBT employee network groups may provide some increase in employee voice mechanisms for workers, this might not be enough compared to other employees.

Additionally, Bell and colleagues (2011) discuss the hinderance to career progression, safety, and organizational identity that LGBT employees face because of limited access to voice mechanisms or resources. The authors further contend that the combination of identity characteristics plus environmental factors will determine the extent to which an employee engages in voice. Indeed, the authors state that “what matters in applying these mechanisms to promote voice is introducing methods that allow workers whose voices have previously not been heard to participate” (Bell et al., 2011, p. 12). Whereas Bell and colleagues specifically focus on a single identity (sexual orientation), I build on their approach by examining the interactive effects of multiple identities (gender and race) on voice experiences. More specifically, I aim to determine whether the role of race, gender, and the intersection of these identities play a role in the relationship between my hypothesized predictors of employee voice (i.e., fear of backlash,
psychological safety) and subsequent employee voice behavior. As described in more detail below, I will argue that given psychological safety and fear of backlash are both critical factors in voice experiences, the links between each of these predictors and employee voice will be strongest for racial minority women as compared to men and White women.

Fourth, I take a relational perspective to better determine the influence of coworker reactions to voice behavior on employee-level outcomes of voice expression, including job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and turnover intentions. Specifically, I explore the extent to which others’ reactions to voice behavior moderate the effect of voice behaviors on these proposed outcomes. Inherently, interpersonal interactions with coworkers inform how we believe others perceive or judge us, which can potentially influence the likelihood and extent to which employees will lean into prosocial behaviors like employee voice (Babbit et al., 2018; Ma et al., 2022). Considering that interpersonal interactions in the workplace are typically a critical part of employees’ daily experiences, I aim to further understand the influence of coworker reactions in the aftermath of an employee’s expression of voice behavior. Past research has found that coworker reactions, whether supportive or hostile, in response to a range of behaviors (e.g., communication efforts, disclosure of a minority identity or an illness, speaking out against mistreatment) can have a strong influence on individual workplace outcomes such as job attitudes and well-being (Cancela et al., 2022; Cortina & Magley, 2003; Pryor et al., 1991). Thus, in the current work, I explore the extent to which coworker reactions dictate whether voice leads to beneficial or damaging effects on critical work-related outcomes. Figure 1 displays the hypothesized relationships in my theoretical model.
Figure 1.

*Graphical Representation of Hypothesized Model*

Taken together, in this dissertation, I intend to explore how the processes that manifest in employee voice and the outcomes that result from employee voice might differ for racial minority women, as compared to White women and men. The remainder of this dissertation will unfold as follows. First, I will discuss the backlash avoidance model (BAM; Rudman et al., 2012) and double jeopardy theory (Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Coon, 1986) which will provide the theoretical foundation of this dissertation, especially in terms of understanding the experience of minoritized employees. Second, I will review the literature for each of my focal constructs (i.e., employee voice, fear of backlash, psychological safety, and coworker reaction), through the lens of BAM and double jeopardy theory to highlight aspects of their interrelationships which inform my hypothesized model. Third, I will discuss the methods by which data were collected and analyzed to test my hypotheses. Next, I will report my results, noting the extent to which the observed data provided support for my formally proposed hypotheses. Finally, I will discuss how this dissertation will contribute to the literature, both theoretically and practically.
Theoretical Foundation

Backlash Avoidance Model

The BAM has recently been used to develop and better understand communication efforts of minoritized individuals (i.e., women, Black employees) and those who engage in behavior that is incongruent to stereotypical behavior associated with a particular identity group (i.e., modest men; Bosak et al., 2018; Keegin, 2018; Moss-Racusin et al., 2010; Smith & Huntoon, 2014; Wayne et al., 2022). I use this model to theoretically examine fear of backlash as an antecedent to employee voice and others’ reactions to this behavior, which also cyclically contributes to subsequent choices to engage in employee voice behavior. The BAM suggests that are several factors at play, such as the risk associated with a potential behavior, the cost and benefit, and under what circumstances individuals will most likely engage in the behavior.

Vanguards, individuals who challenge and disconfirm stereotypes of a social identity group they belong to, are sometimes applauded for challenging the status quo but can also provoke hostile reactions because of engaging in unpredictable behavior (Rudman et al., 2012). These potential hostile reactions can result in a fear of backlash for challenging the status quo, potentially diminishing the likelihood of even considering employing this behavior, which essentially can lead to barriers in the workplace for visibility, promotion, and even longevity (Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010; Phelan et al., 2008; Rudman & Phelan, 2008). The BAM specifies how a fear of backlash can weaken performance behaviors that are counter to others’ expectations. Employee voice, depending on the person engaging in it (i.e., vanguard), can be perceived as a behavior that is uncharacteristic of someone from a particular identity group. Since employee voice can be perceived as ‘counter to expectations,’ the BAM can be used to delineate this behavioral mechanism, which lays out an avenue to further explore the necessary
conditions for employees to engage in prosocial voice behavior despite the social and economic penalties that might be at stake. As mentioned, whereas the BAM has been previously utilized to explore workplace behaviors and outcomes for women (Phelan & Rudman, 2010), I draw from the BAM in the current work to build understanding of work-related behaviors and outcomes for racial minority women as compared to men and White women.

**Double Jeopardy Theory**

Double jeopardy theory considers the multiplicative marginalization faced by those with multiple minoritized identities and purports that the negative effects related to having two or more stigmatized identities will be greater than the negative effects related to having a single stigmatized identity (Petrie & Roman, 2004). This theory was originally introduced to better understand the aging population and how racial minority experiences are different than Whites’ experiences (Coon, 1986) and was adapted into the management literature to acknowledge and understand the pay disparity between women and racial minorities, as compared to the pay disparity between women and White men (Barnum et al., 1995). There are two versions of double jeopardy theory, additive and multiplicative, which both suggest that racial minority women have unique experiences compared to racial minority men, and White people, but approach this conclusion with different reasoning (Berdahl & Moore, 2006). The additive perspective suggests that all women experience equivalent levels of gender bias, all racial minorities experience equivalent levels of racial bias, and in turn, racial minority women experience the highest levels of bias overall. The multiplicative perspective asserts that social identities are not independent of one another, but rather the biases experienced from multiple social identities will be compounded, where the overall bias experienced by ethnic minority women is greater than what the additive hypothesis suggests (Browne & Misra, 2003, Weber,
This dissertation draws from the multiplicative perspective of the double jeopardy hypothesis to assert that racial minority women have unique workplace experiences resulting from the compounded effects of their status as both racial and gender minorities, as compared to White women, ethnic minority men, or White men.

In line with the multiplicative perspective, research has found that workplace harassment for racial minority women is qualitatively and quantitatively unique from harassment experienced by White women, men of color, and White men (Berdahl & Moore, 2006). Women experience more sexual harassment compared to men, racial minority employees experience more racial harassment than White employees, and racial minority women experience more harassment overall, confirming that “minority women face a double whammy of discrimination: they are discriminated against both as women and as minorities” (Berdahl & Moore, 2006, p. 427). Additionally, Petrie and Roman (2004) found that race and gender interact in shaping workplace autonomy such that Black women report less workplace autonomy as compared to Black men. Therefore, I draw from double jeopardy theory to explore whether racial minority women, as compared to racial minority men, White women, and White men, experience employee voice in unique ways.

Racial minority women have unique experiences in the workplace, for a plethora of reasons, such as different historical backgrounds, interpersonal encounters, behavioral expectations, and these expectations consequently can either inhibit or facilitate prosocial behavior, such as employee voice (Crenshaw, 1990; Sanchez-Huclés & Davis, 2010; Schultz & Maddox, 2013; Zinn & Dill, 1994). Women endure penalties, both economic and social, for engaging in agentic behaviors (e.g., Heilman, 2012), and this might indeed vary for different subgroups of racial minority women due to their individual group stereotypes based on their
combined gender and race. Thus, one of the primary goals of this dissertation is to explore the impact of the intersection of gender and race on the voice experiences of marginalized employees. As discussed above, I examine the extent to which the proposed predictors (fear of backlash and psychological safety) result in employee voice and how this relationship may vary in strength according to race and gender. In the next section, I will provide an overview on the central construct of interest in the hypothesized model—employee voice.

**Hypothesis Development**

**Employee Voice**

The original construct of employee voice was defined as “any attempt at all to change, rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority to force a change in management, or through various types of actions and protest, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion” (Hirschman, 1970, p. 30). The construct originally conveyed a need for emancipatory activism, in a situation of power dynamics between a manager and a subordinate, or an individual and leadership, to create change particularly for the benefit of the historically underrepresented (Bell et al., 2011; Hirschman, 1970). Similarly, Moașa (2013) concluded that past discourse had maintained that employees’ voice and silence were essentially a “state of being,” and employees who have acquired voice have the privilege of being able to construct their own identity, whereas employees who are silenced or have less leeway to express their voice, typically have less freedom in creating and being autonomous over their sense of self. As a result, marginalized employees, particularly those with multiple intersecting marginalized identities, such as racial minority women, might feel less able to express themselves freely and authentically (Moașa, 2013).
Employees often encounter circumstances in which they must decide to either assert their voice or remain silent about critical work issues. If an employee does decide to speak up, this can have consequential implications for job attitudes, performance, and even health outcomes (Phelan et al., 2008), making the decision to express voice a high stake one. In a purely organizational context, Bashshur and Oc (2015) distinguish prosocial employee voice as, “the discretionary or formal expression of ideas, opinions, suggestions, or alternative approaches directed to a specific target inside or outside of the organization with the intent to change an objectionable state of affairs and to improve the current functioning of the organization, group, or individual” (p. 1531). Employee voice is both proactive and prosocial considering its primary outcome is to enhance cooperation and positive change. Furthermore, due to the assertive nature of employee voice, it is particularly relevant to racial minority women, who face pervasive bias and stereotyping in organizational settings for engaging in these assured and strong-willed behaviors, which are also a necessary path to participation and inclusion in an organization (Bashshur & Oc, 2015; Morrison & Milliken, 2003; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). At minimum, organizations owe each employee a safe workplace, welcome to communication and feedback, and must understand the importance of the utilization, urgency, and value of engaging in employee voice, particularly for racial minority women (Bell et al., 2003; Singletary Walker et al., 2019). Moreover, racial minority women are at a disadvantage when it comes equal access to resources (participation) in the workplace, and within the context of gender and race, this present study will be the first to examine a unique predictor of employee voice, fear of backlash.

Fear of Backlash as a Predictor of Employee Voice

Given the critical benefits associated with employee voice discussed above, it is important to build understanding of the factors that may enhance or constrain it in the workplace.
by identifying potential predictors of voice. Here, I propose that employees who have a greater fear of backlash will be less likely to engage in employee voice. A fear of backlash makes salient the potential consequences that an individual might face at work if they engage in unexpected behavior, even if the unexpected behavior is beneficial to both the individual and the organization. I distinguish experienced backlash as an outcome from anticipated backlash as a determinant and propose that the anticipation of backlash will have an adverse effect on employee’s voice. Specifically, the presence of fear of backlash will decrease the likelihood of engaging in employee voice behavior. Formally, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 1**: Fear of backlash will negatively predict employee voice.

Phelan and Rudman (2010) extended the backlash research to racial stereotypes and found that compared to White employees, Black employees were more prone to negative reactions for violating racial stereotypes, which in turn led to career and interpersonal obstacles. Similarly, Schultz and Maddox (2013) examined backlash in response to confronting discriminatory behavior. Through experimental design, the authors found that a Black communicator, as compared to a White communicator, received more negative evaluations (backlash) from extreme claims of racial discrimination. Interestingly, if the quality of the argument was high, as compared to low, the backlash towards the Black communicator, was essentially erased (but quality of argument made no difference with the White communicator). This further supports the notion that the marginalized identity of the confronter who exhibits voice is a determining factor in the extent of backlash received. Thus, backlash is an active condition that minoritized individuals experience, are aware of, and can hinder them from proactive behavior that might be beneficial. Given this, I predict that:
Hypothesis 2a: The negative relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice will be stronger for racial minority employees as compared to White employees.

Rudman and Phelan (2008) examine an impression management dilemma faced by women during negotiation and self-promotion situations—another type of proactive behavior which overlaps with characteristics of employee voice. In management positions, characteristics such as assertiveness and decisiveness, which are typically associated with male behavior, are considered to be critical and valuable. However, this study found that female agency, which is often deemed as counter-stereotypical to gender role expectations for women, can result in backlash effects against agentic women. Specifically, when women managers displayed these characteristics, they were more likely to receive higher competency ratings but were also rated as less likeable, leading to an overall negative effect on their promotions, salary negotiations, and interpersonal interactions. Unfortunately, this strategy, which bears resemblance to employee voice, did not benefit women to the same extent that it benefitted men. This evidence is consistent with Moss-Racusin and Rudman (2010), who argue that women must contend with backlash when displaying behavior that does not align with traditional female “values.” Hence, I suggest the following:

Hypothesis 2b: The negative relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice will be stronger for women as compared to men.

In the above studies collectively, backlash is experienced as an outcome when women (Rudman & Phelan, 2008; Moss-Racusin & Rudman, 2010) or racial minorities (Phelan & Rudman, 2010; Schultz & Maddox, 2013) challenge the status quo by engaging in voice behavior, as per Moasa (2013) and Bashshur & Oc (2015). In line with the multiplicative perspective of double jeopardy discussed above (Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Williams, 2014),
substantial research has found that the bias experienced by those who belong to multiple marginalized social groups is greater than and uniquely different from the bias experienced by those who belong to a single marginalized social group (Greenman & Xie, 2008; Millar & Brooks, 2022; Petrie & Roman, 2004). Indeed, these biases carry over into the workplace and influence interpersonal experiences which can lead to disparate treatment. Within the context of employee voice, the influence of fear of backlash will likely be stronger for racial minority women as compared to other subgroups because the prior experienced backlash will likely be greater and more impactful for those who belong to multiple vulnerable social groups. Therefore, I contend that the relationship hypothesized between fear of backlash and employee voice will be strongest for racial minority women. Formally, I predict that:

_Hypothesis 2c: The negative relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice will be stronger for racial minority women as compared to all other race-gender subgroups._

**Psychological Safety as a Predictor of Employee Voice**

Psychological safety was introduced to the management literature to understand workplace environments that are conducive to learning (Edmondson, 1999), interpersonal relationships (Carmeli et al., 2009), engagement (Dollard & Bakker, 2010; May et al., 2004), and organizational climate (Baer & Frese, 2003). As noted above, psychological safety reflects an individual’s confidence in being able to express one’s beliefs without fear of unfavorable consequences, particularly in the frame of image and career (Chrobot-Mason & Aramovich, 2013; Singh et al., 2013). This intrapsychic state of safety encompasses beliefs of how others will perceive or respond to admitting a mistake, asking for feedback, or communicating new ideas (Edmondson et al., 2004; Edmondson & Lei, 2014). Extant research indicates that a
psychologically safe work environment is pertinent to employees being able to express and exhibit their true self without fear of judgment or negative repercussions (Carmeli et al., 2009; 2010; Edmondson & Roloff, 2008). Interestingly, research has found that the positive impact of benevolent leadership on well-being was strengthened when psychological safety was higher (Erkutlu & Chafra, 2016). In a similar vein, Tucker and Edmondson (2003) showed that a psychologically safer environment can produce more engagement in work processes in terms of learning and sharing experiences of failure. Finally, other research has shown that psychological safety leads to positive outcomes for interpersonal relationships, inclusive leadership, and openness amongst dissimilar team members (Carmeli et al., 2010; Singh & Winkel, 2011; Singh et al., 2013; Tröster & Van Knippenberg, 2012). Thus, I propose that the presence of psychological safety will increase the likelihood of engaging in voice behaviors. Formally, I predict that:

_Hypothesis 3: Psychological safety will positively predict employee voice._

Overall, research has demonstrated that psychological safety is integral to the socialization and authentic interpersonal interaction of stigmatized groups, particularly in the workplace. For instance, Singh and colleagues (2013) integrated social and racial identities to explore the intersection of psychological safety and race, finding that the relationship between psychological safety and performance was positive and stronger for employees of color as compared to White employees. Furthermore, racial minority employees were more likely to engage in extra-role behaviors in more psychologically safe work environments, which is particularly relevant given that employee voice is a form of extra-role behaviors (Singh et al., 2013; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Based on this evidence, I suggest that:
Hypothesis 4a: The positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice will be stronger for racial minority employees as compared to White employees.

I further argue that the perception of psychological safety and its effect on voice expression will be different for women as compared to men. Men likely do not have to be as concerned with a sense of safety or possible negative repercussions from taking risks because voice expression is not deemed as counter stereotypical or risky behavior for men. Thus, it is unlikely that men would be concerned about violating a stereotype or behaving in a way that is not advantageous to themselves and the organization because they do not have a predisposition or past experiences to confirm a negative reaction (Moss-Racusin et al., 2010). In contrast, women already bear the burden of feeling the need to behave in accordance with stereotypes or perceptions associated with their gender (Heilman, 2012). Indeed, if women act as a vanguard, they will likely face negative interpersonal repercussions for such counter stereotypical behavior. Thus, when women do in fact perceive a safe environment, this will be especially encouraging to them and send the message that it is safe to engage in more voice expression. Therefore, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 4b: The positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice will be stronger for women as compared to men.

The above evidence suggests then that psychological safety is of particular importance for minority groups to proactively express themselves, specifically through engaging in employee voice, and this can only happen if individuals feel a sense of security and protection in their environment (Dollard & Bakker, 2010; May et al., 2004; Walker et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2016). Considering the necessity of psychological safety for minority groups, I expect that this sense of safety will be particularly relevant for racial minority women given the risk
associated with membership of a vulnerable or marginalized social group intensifies if an individual holds membership in more than one group (Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Weber, 2001; Williams, 2014). I suggest that a sense of psychological safety can lower the perceived risk associated with engaging in proactive (and likely counter stereotypical) behaviors, particularly for racial minority women, who as potential vanguards face a compounded risk for belonging to visible gender and racial minority groups, and therefore would benefit the most from a higher psychological safety (Petrie & Roman, 2004; Rudman et al., 2012). Taken together, I suggest that psychological safety will be most beneficial for facilitating employee voice of racial minority women as compared to other subgroups. Formally, I predict that:

\[ \text{Hypothesis 4c: The positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice will be stronger for racial minority women as compared to all other race-gender subgroups.} \]

The Consequences of Voice Depend on Coworker Reactions

Past research has shown that engaging in extra-role behaviors such as employee voice leads to enhanced commitment and dedication to the organization if the expected response to engaging in voice is reciprocated (Rees et al., 2013). The reason that employees engage in employee voice is to provide feedback and construct some beneficial change, and the outcomes of such voice will depend on how responsive the organization and relevant supervisors are to the expression of the message. In contrast to what employees might expect when speaking up, research has found that when employees engage in prosocial voice behaviors, managers and supervisors may not respond agreeably because they perceive this voice as challenging the status quo, rather than enhancing unity and collaboration, particularly when women enact these voice behaviors (Burris, 2012). Indeed, challenging norms and established policies might threaten the
status quo and subsequently who benefits from the status-quo (Rank, 2009; Williams & Tiedens, 2016). Therefore, criticisms, expressed through prosocial voice, might in turn be viewed as disruptive rather than constructive, which may result in negative reactions from management (Burris, 2012).

Extant research has explored the relationship between employee voice and relevant individual-level outcomes, such as well-being and job attitudes, and typically these outcomes will be influenced by how others react (Burris et al., 2013). Consequently, it is important for employees to feel as if their voice is heard and reciprocated, which will, in turn, have positive work-related implications such as improved job attitudes (Alfayad & Arif, 2017). While past research has established the positive relationship between employee voice and job attitudes, I argue that this relationship will depend on how others respond to voice behavior. Specifically, if coworkers respond in a supportive manner, voice will lead to greater improvements in job attitudes. Formally, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 5:** The positive relationship between employee voice and job satisfaction will be stronger when coworker reaction is more supportive as compared to less supportive.

Research has established a positive relationship between employee voice and helping behaviors, which are indicative of an employee’s commitment to their work and organization. However, an employee must feel valued, supported, and engaged in their job before they can be expected to perform extra-role behaviors (Ng & Feldman, 2012). One possible way of maximizing such feelings and subsequent citizenship behaviors is to meet employee expressions of voice with a supportive response. Integrating the employee voice and disclosure literatures, I contend that the response to employee voice behavior will enhance the likelihood that prosocial
behaviors will follow. More specifically, if coworkers respond to employee voice behaviors in a supportive manner, this will further increase the likelihood of the employee engaging in subsequent helping behavior such as OCBs. Indeed, the disclosure literature has found that when a confidant reacts positively to the disclosure of a stigma, individuals have better outcomes including improved job attitudes (Griffith & Hebl, 2002; Hebl & Skorinko, 2005; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Ragins et al., 2007; Roberts, 2005), lower instances of perceived discrimination (Button, 2001; Chrobot-Mason et al., 2001), increased psychological and physical well-being (Jones & King, 2014; King et al., 2017) and increased helping behavior (Chaudoir & Fisher, 2010; Clair et al., 2005), emphasizing the benefits and importance of a supportive response. Thus, I predict that:

**Hypothesis 6: The positive relationship between employee voice and OCBs will be stronger when coworker reaction is more supportive compared to less supportive.**

The established relationship between employee voice and withdrawal behaviors (Spencer, 1986) suggests that increased voice behavior will reduce intentions to leave an organization within different contexts, such as ethical leadership (Lam et al., 2016), a supportive union (Chaudry et al., 2022) and the influence of social identities (Hunjra et al., 2010). Within the context of a coworker responding to employee voice behaviors, I argue that this negative relationship between employee voice and turnover intentions will be further enhanced when the recipient of voice responds in a supportive manner. Indeed, supportive interpersonal experiences can not only strengthen positive work attitudes and behaviors, but they can also reduce negative workplace outcomes, such as withdrawal behaviors (Spencer, 1986). Thus, I expect that:
Hypothesis 7: The negative relationship between employee voice and turnover intent will be stronger when coworker reaction is more supportive compared to less supportive.

Methods

Participants

A sample consisting of full-time working women and men in the U.S. over the age of 18 were recruited using services offered by Qualtrics Research Services who were also responsible for recruiting and compensating the participants throughout the data collection period. At the first timepoint, a total of 4,899 participants completed the survey. Of those, 3,259 participants completed the second survey. Of those, 2,654 participants completed the third survey. Thus, 2,654 participants completed all three surveys, yielding an overall response rate of 54% from the first timepoint to the third and final timepoint. Additionally, there were two attention checks included at each time point, asking the participant, “If you are reading this right now, click X”, and the participants who did not pass the attention check were removed from the sample. After removing participants who failed one or more attention checks, the final sample included 2,626 participants. Women comprised 56% of the sample, with 44% men. Notably, we used purposive sampling to recruit approximately equivalent sample sizes across four racial subgroups, which resulted in 27% Black, 19% Asian, 20% Latinx, and 33% White participants.

Procedure

Participants completed an online survey assessing the focal constructs over three timepoints with each timepoint separated by three weeks: They completed the first survey at
baseline (T1), the second survey three weeks later (T2), and the final survey was administered six weeks after baseline (T3).

Measures

**Fear of backlash (Time 1).** Fear of backlash was measured at Time 1 using an adapted thirteen-item scale from Rudman and Fairchild (2004). Participants read the following: “When I think about expressing constructive opinions, concerns, or ideas about work-related issues on my team at work...” and indicated their agreement with a list of statements rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “I worry that others will think I am too assertive,” “I worry that someone of my race should not be critical,” and “I worry that others might think I acted out of character for someone of my gender.”

**Psychological safety (Time 1).** Psychological safety was measured at Time 1 using an adapted version of a seven-item scale from Edmondson (1999). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “People on this team sometimes reject others for being different” (reverse-coded) and “It is safe to take a risk on this team.”

**Employee voice (Time 2).** Employee voice was measured at Time 2 using an adapted version of the ten-item scale from Liang and colleagues (2012). Participants were instructed to “Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about how you have interacted with your team members at work during the PAST 3 WEEKS” and rated items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “I proactively developed and made suggestions for issues that may influence the team” and “I
spoke up honestly with problems that might cause serious loss to the team, even when/though dissenting opinions existed.”

**Coworker reaction (Time 2).** Coworker reaction to employee voice was measured at Time 2 immediately following the employee voice scale described above using an adapted version of a ten-item scale from Griffith and Hebl (2002). Participants were instructed as follows: “Reflecting on the above as a whole, how have your team members responded to you voicing your opinions, concerns, and/or ideas during the PAST 3 WEEKS?” and rated items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “My team members were hostile towards me” and “I felt alienated and like an outsider on my team because I spoke up.”

**Job satisfaction (Time 3).** Job satisfaction was measured using a three-item job satisfaction scale from Cook and colleagues (1981). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job” and “Overall, I do not like working on my job” (reverse-coded).

**Organizational citizenship behaviors (Time 3).** Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured using an eight-item scale from Dalal and colleagues (2009). Participants were instructed as follows: “During the PAST 3 WEEKS, how frequently have you engaged in the following behaviors at work?” and rated items on a five-point Likert scale (1 = never to 5 = always). Sample items included: “went out of my way to be a good employee” and “volunteered to do something that was not required.”

**Turnover intentions (Time 3).** Turnover intentions were measured using the three-item turnover intent scale from Cohen (1999). The items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (1 =
do not agree to 5 = strongly agree). Sample items included: “I think a lot about leaving the organization” and “I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization.”

Results

Preliminary Analyses

I first ran a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in Mplus to determine whether fear of backlash and psychological safety were independent constructs or whether they were indicators of the same underlying construct. To do so, I loaded all items for fear of backlash and psychological safety onto a single factor ($\chi^2(152) = 7840.17, p < .01; \text{CFI} = .73, \text{RMSEA} = .136, \text{SRMR} = .10$). Next, I loaded all the items from fear of backlash onto one factor and all the items from psychological safety onto a second factor. As compared to the single-factor model, the two-factor model yielded better fit ($\chi^2(151) = 5151.15, p < .01; \text{CFI} = .82, \text{RMSEA} = .113, \text{SRMR} = .08$). Thus, the fit statistics provide evidence that fear of backlash and psychological safety are indeed measuring independent constructs.

To provide additional insight on this question, I then ran a stepwise multiple regression in SPSS wherein I entered psychological safety in Step 1 and fear of backlash in Step 2 of a regression predicting employee voice, allowing me to assess whether fear of backlash predicted additional variance in employee voice above and beyond the variance already accounted for by psychological safety in Step 1. The results of the regression indicated the two predictors, psychological safety and fear of backlash accounted for significant variance in employee voice ($R^2 = .022, F (1, 2622) = 29.184, p < .001$). Specifically, in Step 1 of the model, psychological safety positively predicted employee voice ($\beta = .142, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.102, .176]$). In Step 2 of the model, psychological safety remained positively related to employee voice ($\beta = .177, p <$
.001, 95% CI [.132, .215]), and the added predictor of fear of backlash was also related to employee voice (β = .078, p < .001, 95% CI [.032, .108]). Notably, the predictor in Step 1 accounted for 2.0% of the variance in employee voice (R² = .020, p < .001), and the predictors in Step 2 accounted for 2.5% of the variance in employee voice (R² = .025, p < .001). Importantly, the change in R² when moving from Step 1 to Step 2 was significant (ΔR² = .005, p < .001), providing additional evidence supporting the inclusion of both predictors (i.e., psychological safety and fear of backlash) of employee voice in the hypothesized model. Means, standard deviations, and correlations among each of my focal variables can be found in Table 1.

Given the most recent version of PROCESS does not allow for a three-way interaction on the ‘a’ path concomitantly with a two-way interaction on the ‘b’ path, I first sought to examine whether my hypothesized three-way interaction on the ‘a’ path was significant using Model 11 in PROCESS, which allows for a three-way interaction on the ‘a’ path and no moderators on the ‘b’ path. In the case that the three-way interaction between the predictor (either psychological safety or fear of backlash), race, and gender, was not significant in predicting employee voice, I could then proceed with testing two-way interactions between each predictor and race or gender separately for the remainder of my analyses. Thus, I first examined the three-way interaction between each predictor (either psychological safety or fear of backlash), race, and gender, in predicting employee voice using Model 11 in PROCESS. I coded race as White (0) and non-White (1), and I coded gender as male (0) and female (1). The results showed that the interaction between fear of backlash, race, and gender, in predicting employee voice was not significant (β = -.1488, p = .057, 95% CI [-.302, .005]), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 2c. Similarly, the interaction between psychological safety, race, and gender, in predicting employee voice was not significant (β = .023, p = .775, 95% CI [-.136, .183]), failing to provide support for
Hypothesis 4c. Because neither of these three-way interactions were significant, I proceeded with testing the remainder of my analyses using a series of Model 21’s in PROCESS, which allows for one moderator on the ‘a’ path (either gender or race) and one moderator on the ‘b’ path (coworker reaction).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Fear Of Backlash</th>
<th>Psychological Safety</th>
<th>Employee Voice</th>
<th>Coworker Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.05**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Of Backlash</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Voice</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Reaction</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

*Descriptive Statistics, Reliability Estimates, and Zero-Order Correlations Among Primary Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Employee Voice</th>
<th>Coworker Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear Of Backlash</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Voice</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworker Reaction</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01*
Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. JSAT = Job Satisfaction, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior, TI = Turnover Intention, FOB = Fear of Backlash, PSAF = Psychological Safety, EV = Employee Voice, CWR = Coworker Reaction, GEN (Gender) coded where 0 = male, 1 = female. RACE coded where 0 = White, 1 = non-White
Hypothesis Testing

To test my hypothesized model, I ran a total of twelve Model 21’s, entering fear of backlash and psychological safety for the independent (X) variable, race and gender as the first-stage moderator (W), and job satisfaction, OCBs, and turnover intention as the dependent (Y) variable. Coworker reaction was always entered as the second-stage moderator (Z). When fear of backlash was included as the (X) variable, psychological safety was entered as a control variable. Similarly, when psychological safety was included as the (X) variable, fear of backlash was entered as a control variable. This series of analyses allowed me to determine the effect of fear of backlash on employee voice (Hypothesis 1) and whether race (Hypothesis 2a) or gender (Hypothesis 2b) influenced that effect. Similarly, I was then able to examine the effect of psychological safety on employee voice (Hypothesis 3) and whether race (Hypothesis 4a) or gender (Hypothesis 4b) influenced that effect. Following this, turning to the right-hand side of the model, I was then able to examine the influence of coworker reaction on the ‘b’ path. That is, I was able to assess whether coworker reaction moderated the effects of employee voice on job satisfaction (Hypothesis 5), OCBs (Hypothesis 6), and turnover intentions (Hypothesis 7).

I will first discuss the results of the left-hand side of the model. When race was included as the first-stage moderator (W), the relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was significant and positive ($\beta = .093, p = .007, 95\% \text{ CI } [.034, .073]$), meaning as fear of backlash increased, voice behaviors increased, counter to what was expected and failing to provide support for Hypothesis 1. Further, the interaction between fear of backlash and race was not significant in predicting employee voice ($\beta = -.040, p = .298, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.116, .036]$), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 2a which predicted that racial minority employees would experience the negative relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice more strongly.
as compared to White employees. Interestingly, the interaction between fear of backlash and gender in predicting employee voice was positive and significant ($\beta = .077, p = .026, 95\% \text{ CI} [.009, .144]$), but the pattern of the results was counter to what was predicted in Hypothesis 2b (see Figure 2). Thus, Hypothesis 2b was not supported. Specifically, I originally predicted that the negative effects of fear of backlash on voice would be stronger for women as compared to men; however, as Figure 2 illustrates, the slope reflecting the effect of fear of backlash on employee voice was positive and stronger for women, as compared to men, whose expressions of voice were not impacted by fear of backlash. The simple slope test for men was not significant ($t = .706, p = .480$), whereas for women, the simple slope was positive and significant ($t = 3.93, p < .001$) indicating that for women, the positive relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was significantly different from zero. These results detailing the relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice, as well as the interactions pertaining to race and gender are displayed in Table 2.
Figure 2.

*Interaction between fear of backlash and gender on employee voice.*

Table 2

*Results for PROCESS models related to Hypotheses 1 and 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>M = EV</th>
<th>Y = JSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coef</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>50.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X FOB</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Race</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT 1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .01. FOB = Fear of Backlash, EV = Employee Voice. Race coded where 0 = White, 1 = POC, Gender coded where 0 = male, 1 = female, INT 1 = interaction between FOB and Race, and INT 2 = interaction between FOB and Gender.
The relationship between psychological safety and employee voice was significant and positive ($\beta = .246, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [.178, .312]$), providing support for Hypothesis 3. Further, the interaction between psychological safety and race in predicting employee voice was negative and significant ($\beta = -.117, p = .004, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.195, -.038]$); however, the pattern of results was counter to what was predicted, failing to provide support for Hypothesis 4a. Specifically, I hypothesized the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice would be stronger for racial minority employees as compared to White employees. As can be seen in Figure 3, although the effects of psychological safety on employee voice were significant for both racial minority employees (95% CI [.052, .144]) and White employees (95% CI [.147, .276]), the positive slope reflecting the effect of psychological safety on employee voice was stronger for White employees as compared to racial minority employees. Further, the simple slopes for both White employees ($t = .779 p < .001$) and racial minority employees ($t = 6.475, p < .001$) were positive and significant indicating that both slopes were significantly different from zero.
Further, the interaction between psychological safety and gender in predicting employee voice was negative and significant ($\beta = -0.117, p = 0.002, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.192, -0.041])$, but the pattern of the interaction was counter to what was predicted, failing to provide support for Hypothesis 4b. Specifically, Hypothesis 4b predicted that the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice would be stronger for women as compared to men. While the effects of psychological safety on employee voice were significant for both women ($95\% \text{ CI } [0.028, 0.124]$) and men ($95\% \text{ CI } [0.123, 0.239]$), Figure 4 shows that the slope reflecting the effect of psychological safety on employee voice was stronger for male employees as compared to women employees. Additionally, the simple slopes for both men ($t = 7.434, p < 0.001$) and women ($t = 4.248, p < 0.001$) were significant, confirming that both slopes were significantly different from zero. The results relating to the relationship between psychological safety and employee voice and the interactions pertaining to race and gender can be found in Table 3.
Figure 4.

*Interaction between psychological safety and gender on employee voice.*

Table 3

*Results for PROCESS models related to Hypotheses 3 and 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>M = EV</th>
<th>Y = JSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coef</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X PSAF</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Race</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT 1</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT 2</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .01. PSAF = Psychological Safety, EV = Employee Voice, Race coded where 0 = White, 1 = non-White, Gender coded where 0 = male, 1 = female, INT 1 = interaction between PSAF and Race, and INT 2 = interaction between PSAF and Gender.
Next, I turn to the results of the right-hand side of the model pertaining to the hypothesized interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction in predicting outcomes of employee voice. Specifically, I predicted that expressions of employee voice would lead to more advantageous outcomes when coworker reactions were more supportive as compared to less supportive. Results suggested that coworker reaction interacted with employee voice to predict job satisfaction, but the effect was counter to what was hypothesized ($\beta = .119, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.070, .167]$), such that a less supportive coworker reaction strengthened the positive relationship between employee voice and job satisfaction, failing to provide support for Hypothesis 5. As can be seen in Figure 5, the positive slope for a less supportive coworker reaction is more positive as compared to the slope for a more supportive coworker reaction. Additionally, the simple slopes for a more supportive coworker reaction ($t = 5.96, p < .001$) and a less supportive coworker reaction ($t = 12.085, p < .001$) were significant, indicating that both positive simple slopes were significantly different from zero.
Similarly, employee voice and coworker reaction interacted to predict OCBs, such that a less supportive coworker reaction strengthened the positive relationship between employee voice and OCBs ($\beta = .055, p = .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [.023, .088]$), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 6. As can be seen in Figure 6, the positive slope for a less supportive coworker reaction is stronger than the positive slope for a more supportive coworker reaction. Moreover, the simple slope tests showed that the simple slope for both a more supportive ($t = 8.236, p < .001$) and less supportive ($t = 10.145, p < .001$) coworker reaction were significant, confirming that both simple slopes were significantly different from zero.

Figure 5.

*Interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on job satisfaction.*
Finally, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction was not significant in predicting turnover intention ($\beta = -.029, p = .3853, 95\% \text{ CI} [-.097, .037])$, failing to provide support for Hypothesis 7. Results relating to these hypotheses are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR</th>
<th>JSAT</th>
<th>OCBs</th>
<th>TI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coef</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M EV</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z CWR</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.

*Interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on OCBs.*
INT 1   .11   4.79   .000**
INT2    .05   3.01   .002*
INT3    

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01. EV = Employee Voice, CWR = Coworker Reaction, JSAT = Job Satisfaction, OCBs = Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, TI = Turnover Intention, INT 1 = interaction between EV and CWR on JSAT, and INT 2 = interaction between EV and CWR on OCBs, and INT3 = interaction between EV and CWR on TI.

Supplemental Analyses

To better understand the overall effect of each of the independent variables on the outcome variables through employee voice, I ran a series of simple mediations in PROCESS using Model 4. The indirect effect of fear of backlash on job satisfaction through employee voice was not significant (Effect = -.0004, 95% CI [-.011, .009]). Similarly, the indirect effect of fear of backlash on OCBs through employee voice was not significant (Effect = -.0003, 95% CI [-.008, .007]). Finally, the indirect effect of fear of backlash on turnover intention through employee voice was not significant (Effect = .0002, 95% CI [.007, .007]). Psychological safety, on the other hand, had a significant indirect effect on job satisfaction through employee voice (Effect = .0304, 95% CI [.019, .043]). Similarly, the indirect effect of psychological safety on OCBs through employee voice was significant (Effect = .0243, 95% CI [.016, .034]). Finally, the indirect effect of psychological safety on turnover intention through employee voice was negative and significant (Effect = -.0147, 95% CI [-.025, -.006]).

Furthermore, of the twelve Model 21’s run above for the primary analyses, I examined the significance of each index of moderated mediation to assess whether any of the indirect effects of the predictors on outcomes via employee voice were contingent upon race, gender, or coworker reaction. The index of moderated mediation representing the relationship between psychological safety and job satisfaction through employee voice with race moderating the ‘a’
path and coworker reaction moderating the ‘b’ path was significant (Effect = -.0123, 95% CI [-.026, -.002]). Specifically, for White employees, the indirect effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction through employee voice was significant at 1SD below the mean (Effect = .045, 95% CI [.028, .066]), the mean (Effect = .048, 95% CI [.030, .069]), and 1SD above the mean (Effect = .091, 95% CI [.059, .125]) on coworker reaction. Further, the effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction via employee voice for racial minority employees was also significant at 1SD below the mean (Effect = .025, 95% CI [.014, .038]), the mean (Effect = .027, 95% CI [.016, .039]), and 1SD above the mean (Effect = .051, 95% CI [.028, .074]), on coworker reaction. What this suggests is that the moderating strength of coworker reaction was contingent upon race such that although the indirect effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction via employee voice became stronger for both White and racial minority participants as coworker reactions to voice became more hostile, this moderating influence of coworker reactions on the indirect effect was stronger for White as compared to racial minority participants.

The index of moderated mediation representing the relationship between psychological safety and job satisfaction through employee voice with gender moderating the ‘a’ path and coworker reaction moderating the ‘b’ path was significant (Effect = -.014, 95% CI [-.026, -.004]). For men, the indirect effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction through employee voice was significant at 1SD below the mean (Effect = .041, 95% CI [.026, .059]), the mean (Effect = .044, 95% CI [.028, .062]), and 1SD above the mean (Effect = .083, 95% CI [.056, .114]) of coworker reaction. Further, the effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction via employee voice for women was also significant at 1SD below the mean (Effect = .020, 95% CI [.009, .032]), the mean (Effect = .021, 95% CI [.010, .034]), and 1SD above the mean (Effect = .040, 95% CI [.019, .065]), of coworker reaction. Similar to above, what this suggests is that the
moderating strength of coworker reaction was contingent upon gender such that although the indirect effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction via employee voice became stronger for both men and women as coworker reactions to voice became more hostile, this moderating influence of coworker reactions on the indirect effect was stronger for men as compared to women.

The index of moderated mediation representing the effect of psychological safety on OCBs through employee voice as second stage moderated by coworker reaction with regard to both race (Effect = -.006, 95% CI [-.015, .000]) and gender (Effect = -.006, 95% CI [-.017, .000]) were not significant. Similarly, the index of moderated mediation representing the effect of psychological safety on turnover intentions through employee voice as second-stage moderated by coworker reaction with regard to race (Effect = .000, 95% CI [-.008, .008]) and gender (Effect = .000, 95% CI [-.009, .008]) were not significant. These results suggest that the moderating influence of coworker reactions on the above specified indirect effects was not contingent upon race or gender. Rather, the strength of the coworker reactions moderator on these indirect effects was similar for women, men, racial minority employees, and White employees.

Next, I wanted to further investigate the proposed theoretical relationships in accordance with double jeopardy theory. More specifically, I wanted to determine whether the hypothesized relationships were significant for racial minority women, White women, racial minority men, and White men. To gain a better understanding of possible differences in the experiences of each subgroup, means and standard deviations on each of the focal variables by subgroup are displayed in Table 5. Furthermore, I ran Model 14 in SPSS Process for each subgroup in which fear of backlash or psychological safety was entered as the predictor (X), employee voice was
entered as the mediator (M), coworker reaction was entered as the second-stage moderator (Z), and either job satisfaction, OCBs, or turnover intentions was entered as the outcome (Y). The results showed that relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was positive and significant for White men ($\beta = .102, p = .041, 95\% \text{ CI} [.004, .201]$) and White women ($\beta = .216, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.102, .331]$) but was not significant for racial minority men or racial minority women. The relationship between psychological safety and employee voice was positive and significant for all groups including White men ($\beta = .319, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.212, .426]$), racial minority men ($\beta = .155, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.075, .235]$), White women ($\beta = .234, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.128, .340]$), and racial minority women ($\beta = .079, p = .017, 95\% \text{ CI} [.014, .143]$).

The interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on job satisfaction was significant for White women ($\beta = .156, p = .008, 95\% \text{ CI} [.040, .272]$) and racial minority women ($\beta = .186, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.098, .274]$) but was not significant for White men or racial minority men. Specifically, these significant interactions displayed the same patterns as mentioned above such that for women (both White women and racial minority women), the positive relationship between employee voice and job satisfaction was stronger when the coworker reaction was hostile as compared to supportive.

The interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on OCBs was significant only for racial minority women ($\beta = .112, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.052, .171]$) but not for White women, racial minority men, or White men. Specifically, for racial minority women, the positive relationship between employee voice and OCBs was stronger when coworker reaction was more hostile as compared to supportive.

Interestingly, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on turnover intentions was significant only for racial minority men ($\beta = .168, p = .008, 95\% \text{ CI} [.044, .291]$ but not for racial minority women, White women, or White men). Specifically, the pattern of this
significant interaction suggested that for racial minority men, the negative relationship between employee voice and turnover intention was stronger when coworker reaction was supportive as compared to hostile.

I also wanted to further understand the proposed theoretical model for each of the race-gender subgroups. The means and standard deviations of each focal variable by the eight race-gender subgroups can be found in Table 5. Furthermore, I ran Model 14 for all 8 subgroups (i.e., Black women, Latinx women, Asian, women, White women, Black men, Latinx men, Asian men, and White men) and for each outcome variable (job satisfaction, OCBs, and turnover intentions). I found that the ‘a’ path, the relationship between psychological safety and employee voice, was positive and significant for White women ($\beta = .151, p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI} [.053, .248]$), Black men ($\beta = .219, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.097, .343]$), and White men ($\beta = .250, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.166, .335]$).

As for the right-hand side of the model, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on job satisfaction was significant for Black women ($\beta = .211, p = .006, 95\% \text{ CI} [.059, .362]$), White women ($\beta = .158, p = .008, 95\% \text{ CI} [.042, .274]$), and Latinx women ($\beta = .233, p = .002, 95\% \text{ CI} [.086, .381]$) such that the positive effect of employee voice on job satisfaction was strengthened by a hostile coworker reaction and was significantly stronger for the aforementioned subgroups as compared to the other race-gender subgroups. The interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on OCBs was only significant for Black women ($\beta = .168, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} [.075, .261]$) such that the positive effect of employee voice on OCBs was strengthened by a hostile coworker reaction and was significantly stronger for Black women as compared to the other race-gender subgroups. Finally, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on turnover intentions was significant for Black women
(β = -.236, p = .018, 95% CI [-.431, -.042]) and White women (β = -.153, p = .046, 95% CI [-.304, .003]) such that the negative effect of employee voice on turnover intentions was strengthened by a hostile coworker reaction and was stronger for the aforementioned subgroups as compared to the other race-gender subgroups. Surprisingly, for Black men, as compared to the other race-gender subgroups, the relationship was significant but in the opposing direction (β = .249, p = .046, 95% CI [.004, .494]), indicating that the negative effect of employee voice on turnover intentions was strengthened by a supportive coworker reaction.
Table 5

Means of Focal Variables Across Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Fear of Backlash Mean</th>
<th>Fear of Backlash SD</th>
<th>Psych Safety Mean</th>
<th>Psych Safety SD</th>
<th>Employee Voice Mean</th>
<th>Employee Voice SD</th>
<th>Coworker Reaction Mean</th>
<th>Coworker Reaction SD</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Mean</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction SD</th>
<th>OCB Mean (SD)</th>
<th>OCB SD</th>
<th>Turnover Intention Mean</th>
<th>Turnover Intention SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Women</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx Women</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Men</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Men</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>4.04)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.66)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.68
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>JSAT</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>FOB</th>
<th>PSAF</th>
<th>EV</th>
<th>CWR</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latinx Men</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Men</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Minority Men</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Minority Women</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01. JSAT = Job Satisfaction, OCB = Organizational Citizenship Behavior, TI = Turnover Intention, FOB = Fear of Backlash, PSAF = Psychological Safety, EV = Employee Voice, CWR = Coworker Reaction, GEN (Gender) coded where 0 = male, 1 = female. RACE coded where 0 = White, 1 = non-White.
Discussion

This dissertation explores the voice experience of racial minority women relative to White women, racial minority men, and White men. Additionally, it aims to understand the extent to which a supportive response to employee voice behavior will affect workplace outcomes, especially for racial minority women. Building on past employee voice research (Bashshur & Oc, 2015; Bell et al., 2003; Moasa, 2013, Singletary et al., 2019), this study takes a different theoretical approach to further understand the employee voice experience for employees with multiple marginalized identities. Although I did not find any significant three-way interactions between gender and race and the predictor variables in predicting employee voice, several interesting findings emerged that are both theoretically and practically relevant.

First, although the main effect of fear of backlash on employee voice was not statistically significant, my preliminary analyses did demonstrate that the addition of fear of backlash as a predictor variable of employee voice did explain unique variance in employee voice, over and above psychological safety. While the results did not indicate that the interaction between fear of backlash and race influence employee voice experiences, interestingly, when race was included, in the overall model, the relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was significant but positive, suggesting that after holding race constant, if an employee has a high fear of backlash, they are more likely to engage in voice behaviors. Interestingly, counter to what was hypothesized, a signification interaction between fear of backlash and gender emerged, demonstrating that the aforementioned positive relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was stronger for women as compared to men. Upon closer examination of the interaction graph (see Figure 2), at low levels of fear of backlash, there is a noticeable difference
in mean levels of employee voice between men and women such that women report much lower levels of employee voice. As fear of backlash increases, women report more voice behaviors, whereas men remain relatively consistent in voice behaviors regardless of their level of fear of backlash. Importantly, when women report high fear of backlash, they also report an increase in voice behaviors. Perhaps employee voice functions as a coping mechanism for women, particularly when they feel they are likely to receive more backlash for proactive or assertive behavior. This sheds light on how managers and organizations can support their more vulnerable employees by encouraging and increasing access to employee voice to counter negative interpersonal experiences.

Psychological safety, as predicted, was positively related to employee voice, suggesting that employees must feel safe and comfortable in their work environment before deciding to engage in voice behaviors. This emphasizes that people consider the degree of rejection associated with taking a risk or even being themselves when that might be perceived as non-conforming. Surprisingly, the pattern that emerged in the significant interactions between psychological safety and race and gender effects was counter to expectations. Whereas it was originally hypothesized that the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice would be stronger for racial minority employees as compared to White employees, the findings suggested the opposite was true. Upon closer examination of the graph (see Figure 3), it can be seen that at low levels of psychological safety, White employees reported lower levels of employee voice, as compared to racial minority employees. At high levels of psychological safety, White employees reported an increase in voice expression whereas for racial minorities, employee voice remained consistent. Equally surprisingly, the interaction graph (see Figure 4) displayed that the positive relationship between psychological safety and voice was in fact
stronger for men as compared to women, again counter to original expectations. Specifically, at low levels of psychological safety, men and women report similar levels of voice behavior. However, at higher levels of psychological safety, men reported more voice behavior, whereas women reported consistent voice behavior across both low and high psychological safety. Overall, these results suggest that while psychological safety had a significantly positive effect on voice behaviors for all employees, this impact was statistically stronger for White employees relative to racial minority employees and for male employees relatively to female employees. This could be perhaps because minoritized employees have a lesser likelihood of engaging in voice behavior due to stereotypes associated with their identities, and their response could reflect a tendency to remove themselves from this negative, and even stigmatized stereotype. It is also quite likely that our measure of psychological safety does not adequately capture important voice behaviors that could be differentially relevant for racial minorities and women. Thus, future research could aim to identify additional factors that could potentially increase voice behaviors for marginalized groups of employees.

The results on the right side of the model suggested that the supportiveness of a coworker’s response to voice behavior influences the effect of voice behavior on job outcomes, but in a different manner than hypothesized. More specifically, coworker reaction interacted with employee voice to predict job satisfaction, such that a hostile coworker reaction (as compared to supportive) strengthened the positive relationship between employee voice and job satisfaction. The slopes of the hostile coworker reaction and supportive coworker reaction (see Figure 5) suggest that when employees report low employee voice behaviors, job satisfaction is markedly higher when the coworker reaction is more supportive as compared to more hostile. However, when employees report engaging in higher levels of voice behaviors, reports of job satisfaction
are relatively similar regardless of whether the coworker responds in a supportive or hostile manner. Similarly, a more hostile coworker reaction strengthened the positive relationship between employee voice and OCBs. The slopes of the hostile and supportive coworker reactions (see Figure 6) indicate that at low levels of employee voice behavior, employees reported markedly less OCBs when the coworker reaction is hostile as compared to supportive; however, when employee voice is high, OCBs were relatively similar regardless of the way the coworker reacted. This suggests that high levels of engagement in employee voice behavior may help to counteract the otherwise damaging effects of an unsupportive coworker. Overall, these results indicate that while employee voice has a positive effect on job outcomes, it may also help to mitigate negative effects of a hostile coworker reaction. This demonstrates that employee voice may serve as a particularly powerful tool in the face of an environment that is hostile as compared to more supportive. Additionally, it is possible that when an employee engages in voice behaviors, they may value a more supportive response from management or the organization rather than their peers. Indeed, it could be that employees do not find coworkers hostility to be representative of the organization, and instead of leaning away from organization, they lean more into their role.

The supplemental analyses provided additional information on the indirect effect of the predictor variables on each outcome variable, and while fear of backlash did not seem to be relevant in the employee voice process, psychological safety was found to have a significant indirect effect on all three outcome variables (job satisfaction, OCBs, turnover intentions) through employee voice, further emphasizing the benefits of feeling psychologically safe in one’s working environment. Additionally, the indirect effect of psychological safety on job satisfaction via employee voice was found to be contingent upon coworker reaction such that this
indirect effect strengthened as coworker reactions became more hostile. Significant indices of moderated mediation further suggested that this was particularly true for White employees as compared to racial minority employees and for men as compared to women.

When I ran the model across the double jeopardy groups (i.e., racial minority women, White women, racial minority men, and White men), the relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice was significant for White women and White men and the relationship between psychological safety and employee voice was significant for all groups. This highlights the crucial role psychological safety plays in voice behaviors for all employees. The interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on job satisfaction was significant for racial minority women and White women only, suggesting that employee voice is a powerful tool for women to cope in more hostile environments. Additionally, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on OCBs was significant only for racial minority women, emphasizing the value of prosocial and helping behaviors for those who are multiplicatively marginalized, particularly in the face of hostility. Interestingly, for racial minority men, the negative relationship between employee voice and turnover intention was stronger when the coworker reaction was more supportive as compared to more hostile. This emphasizes the importance of a supportive coworker environment in response to voice behaviors, for racial minority men to remain committed to their organization.

When I ran the model across race-gender subgroups the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice was significant for only White women, White men, and Black men. The reason for these counterintuitive results could be due to reduced sample sizes when the data is analyzed separately for each subgroup or perhaps our measure of psychological safety did not effectively capture factors that may be uniquely relevant to feelings of
psychological safety for racial minority women. Additionally, the interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction on job satisfaction suggested that a more hostile response from a coworker after displaying voice behaviors would lead to a higher report of job satisfaction, for Black women, White women, and Latinx women. The interaction between employee voice and coworker reaction was not a significant predictor of job satisfaction for Asian women. The interaction between coworker reaction and employee voice on OCBs, where a more hostile coworker reaction strengthened the positive relationship between employee voice and OCBs, was only significant for Black women. The interaction between coworker reaction and employee voice on turnover intentions was significant for Black women and White women, meaning that for these race-gender subgroups, the negative relationship between employee voice and turnover intention was stronger when coworker reaction was more hostile as compared to more supportive. Interestingly, for Black men, more voice behaviors led to a lower intent to turnover and a supportive coworker reaction, as compared to hostile, strengthened this negative relationship. These results provide us with more information on the role of interpersonal interactions and how to cope in a hostile environment by engaging in employee voice behaviors. Further, the preceding effect of proactive employee behavior (employee voice) on helping behaviors (OCBs) is particularly beneficial for those who belong to multiple vulnerable social groups and are treated with hostility.

**Theoretical Implications**

Taken together, the findings make several contributions to the literature on employee voice. One of the goals of this dissertation was to highlight the gender and race differences in the employee voice experience; there were some interesting findings that have implications for both double jeopardy theory and the BAM. This dissertation explored the gender and racial
differences in the events preceding employee voice, and the pattern of results suggested that
gender and race differences did indeed emerge. I theorized that women would be concerned
about what others might think in relation to expressing opinions and concerns about work-related
items, and this in turn would limit their engagement in voice behaviors. The slope reflecting the
relationship between fear of backlash and employee voice indicated that for women, as fear of
backlash increased, so did voice behaviors, suggesting that voice behavior might in fact serve as
a method of coping in the face of potential backlash. Further, the positive slope reflecting the
effect of psychological safety on employee voice was stronger for White employees as compared
to racial minority employees and for men as compared to women. It is possible that women and
racial minorities have lower expectations of the environment around them and do not necessarily
expect or perceive a supportive environment, so this has a limited effect on their voice behavior.
The supplemental analyses demonstrated that the positive relationship between psychological
safety and employee voice was significant for all subgroups suggesting that while psychological
safety is valuable for encouraging all employees to engage in voice behavior, there might be
other unique predictors and outcomes of voice behavior for racial minority women. Future
research can address this issue with research questions that specifically focus on the experience
of multiple marginalized employees before and after engaging in proactive behaviors.

Another important theoretical finding from this work is the influence of coworker
reaction in the aftermath of employee voice expression. My primary analyses suggest that when
an employee does engage in voice expression, if a coworker responds in a hostile fashion, this
strengthens the relationship between voice and positive job outcomes, such as job satisfaction
and OCBs. This makes salient the relevance of others in the entire voice experience. While
counterintuitive, these results reinforce the strength of voice behaviors, particularly the ability to
counteract hostile feedback and strengthen positive job outcomes. The supplementary analysis provided a bit more insight into which groups specifically experienced this counterintuitive response to a hostile coworker reaction. This interaction between coworker reaction and employee voice on job satisfaction was significant for White women and racial minority women. More specifically, the relationship was significant for Black, Latinx, and White women (although not Asian women, but this subgroup had the smallest sample size). The same pattern of interaction effect with regard to OCBs was also significant for racial minority women, particularly Black women. This supports double jeopardy theory in that racial minority women, as compared to men and White women, may utilize employee voice behaviors to combat the negative effects of a hostile environment.

Both double jeopardy theory and the BAM are premised on the condition that stereotypes indeed exist and are subsequently reinforced through social interactions and overall societal experiences (Bosak et al., 2018; Keegin, 2018; Petrie & Roman, 2004). I do find support for the BAM regarding how employees will consider the reaction of others prior to engaging in behaviors. However, counter to what was hypothesized, an increase in fear of backlash increased voice behaviors, particularly for women. In contrast, a fear of backlash did not appear to play a role in predicting voice behaviors for men. This suggests that women do consider possible negative outcomes prior to engaging in proactive and assertive behaviors, but an increase in fear of backlash encourages them to lean into voice behaviors, further emphasizing employee voice as a coping mechanism for marginalized employees.
Practical Implications

A practically significant finding of this research is confirming that psychological safety is an important predictor of engaging in employee voice behavior. Past research has determined the benefits of employee voice, and this dissertation provides insight into how managers can create an environment of safety where mistakes are seen as learning opportunities and issues and concerns can be freely expressed. Additionally, ensuring that employees have an environment where their unique skills, abilities, and differences are valued is critical to ensure a space for receiving feedback.

Another practically important finding from this research is the impact of coworker reaction and showing how critical employee voice behaviors can be in mitigating potentially damaging effects of a hostile environment. This emphasizes that not only is it critical to create an environment for employees to safely engage in employee voice, but the utility of employee voice can indeed counteract a hostile coworker response and facilitate positive job outcomes. Accounting for the influence of coworker reactions on the work-related implications of employee voice can highlight how interpersonal relationships play a role in shaping workplace experiences. We already know the value of employee voice and how it is a critical tool for creating a sense of belonging, support, and inclusion (Hirschman, 1970; Moasa, 2013). Remaining silent and not having access to voice can lead to disengagement, withdrawal, and turnover, particularly for those who are societally or economically disadvantaged (Bell et al., 2011). Organizations can use information gleaned from this study to implement a culture that is rooted in psychological safety and supportiveness. This research provides us with guidance as to what managers and organizations can specifically do to create and sustain an environment where employees can speak up, communicate their mistakes and needs, and provide valuable insight and input.
Limitations and Future Research Directions

Notably, there are some limitations to this research that should be addressed. First, the measures were all self-reported, so I was unable to capture multiple perspectives which would have enhanced objectivity. Future research should seek to explore how employees who engage in voice behaviors are perceived by others including coworkers and managers. Additionally, while the goal of the study was to recruit purposefully across subgroups, sample size differences might have impacted my ability to determine the full impact of race and gender on experiences of employee voice.

Moreover, this study aimed to understand the experience of racial and gender minorities, but there are certainly other marginalized groups that deserve attention in the employee voice literature. For example, racial and sexual minorities might have unique voice experiences, based on their combination of visible and invisible marginalized identities. Additionally, different generations of workers might have their own unique employee voice experiences, and considering these complex identities is important to gain a more comprehensive understanding of employee experiences. Thus, future research should aim to investigate the experiences of other multiple marginalized employees and build understanding of the unique ways they may navigate employee voice in the workplace.

Finally, this study’s reliance on quantitative methods may be limiting when trying to understand the rich complexities faced by marginalized populations at work. To truly parse the unique voice experiences of ethnic minority women, an added qualitative research design may provide more nuanced and valuable information that could not be captured quantitatively. Future research could take a narrative approach these questions, which can be applied to understand
how human beings perceive and reconstruct their past experiences through a combination of storytelling and theorizing (Elliot, 2005; Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). For example, future research could gather data through semi-structured interviews and use a thematic analysis to distinguish patterns and identify relevant themes.

Conclusion

Taken together, this dissertation aimed to extend the employee voice literature by exploring the conditions which facilitate employees’ expressions of voice, with a particular focus on racial minority women. Overall, results suggested that while a fear of backlash increased voice behaviors for women, a sense of psychological safety is a critical factor that can encourage all employees to engage in employee voice. Interestingly, the positive relationship between psychological safety and employee voice was stronger for White employees as compared to racial minority employees, and it was also stronger for men as compared to women. Further, results suggested that voice behaviors can in fact strengthen positive work outcomes, particularly for racial minority women who face hostile coworker reactions to voice. To conclude, the primary purpose of this dissertation was to lighten the burden on minoritized individuals, gain a better understanding of their holistic experiences, and provide guidance to organizations and managers to implement changes to better support those who hold multiple marginalized identities.
References


Appendix
Survey Measures

Ethnicity (Time 1):

Please indicate your ethnicity.

__ African-American/Black
__ Asian, Asian American/Pacific Islander
__ Caucasian/White American, European, not Hispanic
__ Latino(a)/Hispanic American/Chicano(a)/Mexican American
__ Mixed; parents are from two different groups

Other (please specify):________________________

Please select ONE of the following options that most closely aligns with your gender and racioethnic identity:

1__ African American/Black female
2__ Asian/Asian American female
3__ Caucasian/White American female
4__ Latinx/Hispanic American female
5__ Other (please specify) ________
Gender (Time 1):

__Female

__Male

__ Other (please specify)____________

Current level of education (Time 1):

__ Less than high school diploma

__ High school diploma

__ Some college/tech school

__ Bachelor’s degree

__ Some graduate school

__ Master’s degree

__ More than a master’s degree

__ Doctoral degree

Job position level (Time 1):

Which of the following numbers best corresponds to the level of your current position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Supervisor</th>
<th>First-Line Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Mid-Level Manager</th>
<th>Upper-Level Manager</th>
<th>High-Level Manager</th>
<th>Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fear of Backlash (Time 1):

Rated on a scale from 1 = Do not agree, 2 = Slightly agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Now, please think about your immediate team at work. As a reminder, your team is typically comprised of the people you interact with on a daily basis to meet work objectives.

*When I think about expressing constructive opinions, concerns, or ideas about work-related issues on my team at work...*

1. I worry that others might think I am odd.
2. I am concerned that I might be disliked.
3. I feel proud. (reverse coded)
4. I feel embarrassed.
5. I worry that others will think I am too confident.
6. I worry that others will think I am too assertive.
7. I worry about I will be called vain.
8. I worry that someone of my gender should not be critical.
9. I worry that someone of my race should not be critical.
10. I worry that others might think I acted out of character for someone of my gender.
11. I am concerned that others wouldn’t like me because I acted out of character for someone of my gender.

12. I worry that others might think I acted out of character for someone of my race.

13. I am concerned that others wouldn’t like me because I acted out of character for someone of my race.

**Psychological Safety (Time 1):**


Rated on a scale from 1 = Do not agree, 2 = Slightly agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

1. If you make a mistake on this team, it is often held against you. (R)

2. Members of this team are able to bring up problems and tough issues.

3. People on this team sometimes reject others for being different. (R)

4. It is safe to take a risk on this team.

5. It is difficult to ask other members of this team for help. (R)

6. No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts.

7. Working with members of this team, my unique skills and talents are values and utilized
Employee Voice (Time 2):


Employee voice will be measured using an adapted version of six-item scale from Van Dyne and LePine (1998).

Please indicate the extent to which you have engaged in the following behaviors at work during the PAST 3 WEEKS?

1 = Never

2 = Once or twice

3 = A few times

4 = Several times

5 = Most of the time

1. I developed and made recommendations concerning issues that affect my work group.

2. I spoke up and encouraged others on my team to get involved in issues that affect the group.

3. I communicated my opinions about work issues to others in the groups even if their opinion was different and others in the group disagreed with me.

4. I was well informed about issues where my opinion might be useful to my work group.

5. I got involved in issues that affect the quality of work life in my work group.

6. I spoke up in this group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures.
Team Members Reactions to Employee Voice (Time 2):


Rated on a scale from 1 = Do not agree, 2 = Slightly agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

*Reflecting on the above as a whole, how have your team members responded to you voicing your opinions, concerns, and/or ideas during the PAST 3 WEEKS?*

1. My team members ridiculed me/told jokes about me because I spoke up.
2. Speaking up negatively affected my interpersonal relationships with my team members.
3. I experienced job discrimination in my team (e.g. passed over for promotion, salary increase, good work assignments).
4. My team members treated me unfairly because I spoke up.
5. I felt alienated and like an outsider on my team because I spoke up.
6. My team members were hostile towards me.
7. I felt excluded in conversations with my team members.
8. My team members seemed to avoid me at work.
9. My team members seemed tense and uncomfortable around me.
10. I think that my team members talked about me behind my back.
Turnover Intent (Time 3):


Rated on a scale from 1 = Do not agree, 2 = Slightly agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

1. I think a lot about leaving the organization.
2. I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization.
3. As soon as it is possible, I will leave the organization.

Job Satisfaction (Time 3):


Rated on a scale from 1 = Do not agree, 2 = Slightly agree, 3 = Somewhat agree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree

1. In general, I like my job.
2. Overall, I do not like working on my job. (R)
3. All in all, I was satisfied with my job.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Time 3):


Rated on a scale from 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always

During the PAST 3 WEEKS, how frequently have you engaged in the following behaviors at work?

OCBs

1. Went out of my way to be a good employee.
2. Was respectful of other people’s needs.
3. Displayed loyalty to my organization.
4. Praised or encouraged someone.
5. Volunteered to do something that was not required
6. Showed genuine concern for others
7. Tried to uphold the values of my organization.
8. Tried to be considerate to others