

## How Do Employees Voice in Adversity? The Formation Mechanism and Effects of Employee Voice Resilience from an Achievement Goal Perspective

**Authors:** Wang Yao, Luo Wenhao, Hou Liang, Luo Wenhao

**Date:** 2022-04-30T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

In dynamic and complex business environments, employee voice holds significant importance for organizational development. Previous voice research has generally posited that employees reduce voice behaviors when the environment is unsupportive of voice. However, not all employees abandon voice in adversity; some even exhibit increased voice behaviors under adverse conditions. To address the fundamental question of how employees sustain voice in adversity and to explore the formation mechanisms and effects of sustained voice in unfavorable circumstances, this paper will first examine the conceptual connotation of voice resilience and develop a measurement instrument for voice resilience. Then, grounded in achievement goal theory, it will analyze the pathways and conditions through which three types of goal orientations promote or inhibit employee voice resilience. Finally, it will investigate the influence of voice resilience on employees' subsequent voice behaviors and leaders' voice endorsement. This paper responds to and extends frontier issues in voice research, while also providing practical implications for organizations to understand and cultivate employee voice resilience.

### Full Text

## How Do Employees Engage in Voice Behavior Despite Adversity? The Formation Mechanism and Outcomes of Employee Voice Resilience from the Perspective of Achievement Goal Theory

**Wang Yao<sup>1</sup>, Luo Wenhao<sup>2</sup>, Hou Liang<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Business School, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, 100088

<sup>2</sup> School of Economics and Management, North China University of Technology,

Beijing, 100144

<sup>3</sup> School of Business, Renmin University of China, Beijing, 100872

### Abstract

Employee voice has become increasingly important for organizational development in today's dynamic and complex business environment. Previous research has generally shown that employees reduce voice behaviors when the environment is unsupportive. However, not all employees abandon voice in adverse conditions; some even exhibit more voice behavior when faced with obstacles. To address the fundamental question of how employees sustain voice despite adversity and to explore the formation mechanisms and outcomes of such persistence, this paper first examines the conceptual nature of voice resilience and develops a measurement instrument. Grounded in achievement goal theory, we then analyze the pathways and conditions through which three types of goal orientations either promote or inhibit employee voice resilience. Finally, we investigate how voice resilience influences employees' subsequent voice behavior and leaders' voice endorsement. This research responds to and extends frontier issues in voice research while providing practical insights for organizations to understand and cultivate employee voice resilience.

**Keywords:** voice behavior, voice resilience, achievement goals, subsequent voice behavior, voice endorsement

**Classification Code:** B849: C93

*Received: December 29, 2021*

*Funded by: National Natural Science Foundation of China Youth Project (72102228)*

**Corresponding Author:** Luo Wenhao, E-mail: whluo1988@hotmail.com

## 1 Problem Statement

Voice refers to employees' proactive behavior of offering suggestions, opinions, or ideas to improve their team, department, or organization (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). In an era of rapid technological development and market volatility, organizations increasingly need employees to speak up to successfully address emerging business challenges (Duan et al., 2016). Extensive empirical evidence and practical experience demonstrate that employee voice provides crucial "intellectual resources" for managerial decision-making and serves as an important guarantee for organizational innovation and performance improvement (Bashshur & Oc, 2015; Li et al., 2018).

Despite its importance, numerous factors in the workplace may hinder employee voice, such as leader resistance, distant supervisor-subordinate relationships, inadequate voice channels, and lack of a safe voice climate. Existing voice research generally assumes that when these factors exist, employees reduce voice or remain silent due to concerns about negative consequences (Milliken et al., 2003; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Chen & Tang, 2019). However, not all employees decrease voice in adverse conditions; in fact, adversity may

even stimulate voice behavior. For instance, some employees are not afraid of rejection, reflect on failed experiences, and continuously improve both the content and manner of their voice. Others willingly assume risks, transform pressure into motivation, and persist in speaking up when colleagues remain silent.

How do employees voice despite adversity? What are the underlying mechanisms of this phenomenon, and what outcomes does it produce? Although research on antecedents and consequences of employee voice is abundant (e.g., Li et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2020), studies that directly address these questions remain limited. To investigate voice in adverse contexts, King et al. (2019) introduced the concept of voice resilience, defining it as employees' continued voice behavior despite voice adversity (i.e., when suggestions are rejected by leaders). This concept provides an important foundation for explaining and predicting employee voice under adverse conditions.

Nevertheless, voice resilience research is still in its infancy, with theoretical development and empirical investigation facing three major limitations. First, the conceptual nature of voice resilience requires further elaboration, and corresponding measurement tools urgently need development. Current research equates voice resilience with the behavioral outcome of persistent voice in adversity (King et al., 2019), overlooking the psychological and behavioral processes employees undergo to sustain voice—processes that constitute the essence of resilience. Moreover, no existing measurement system can quantify the psychological and behavioral processes of adapting to voice adversity, hindering empirical research on its antecedents and consequences. Second, research on voice resilience antecedents lacks examination of employee characteristics. While King et al. (2019) explored leader influences, research on how employee characteristics affect voice resilience remains scarce. Third, the effectiveness of voice resilience remains unexplored. Voice resilience enables employees to overcome difficulties and persist in speaking up, which likely produces positive effects for both employees and leaders, yet relevant empirical research is rare.

To deepen understanding of the nature and consequences of voice in adversity, this paper presents a series of studies on voice resilience. Study 1 uses theoretical analysis and in-depth interviews to further explore the conceptual nature of voice resilience and develop a measurement instrument, laying the foundation for subsequent empirical research. Study 2 draws on achievement goal theory to analyze how different achievement goal orientations influence voice resilience and examines boundary conditions of this process. Study 3 investigates how voice resilience, driven by achievement goals, affects employees' subsequent voice behavior and leaders' voice endorsement, providing a more complete understanding of voice resilience outcomes.

Centered on the core construct of “voice resilience,” the following theoretical and literature overview first reviews the background of voice resilience research, introduces existing definitions and measurements, and identifies current limitations. Second, it examines the frontiers of employee resilience research to inform the conceptual expansion and measurement development of voice resilience. Fi-

nally, it introduces the main tenets of achievement goal theory as the theoretical framework and logical foundation for our research model.

## 2.1 Voice Resilience

Voice behavior research has accumulated substantial achievements over the past two decades. However, previous studies have generally adopted a static perspective, examining isolated voice behaviors while ignoring the dynamic process through which employees adjust their voice behaviors to adapt to environmental changes (Zhang et al., 2020; King et al., 2019). Particularly when environmental factors such as leader nonsupport or unsafe climates inhibit voice, existing research typically assumes employees reduce voice or remain silent due to concerns about negative consequences (Milliken et al., 2003; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Chen & Tang, 2019). In practice, however, many employees can adapt to voice adversity and sustain their voice behavior, suggesting the existence of mechanisms that motivate and maintain voice in adverse conditions—mechanisms that remain largely unexplored.

Addressing this limitation, King et al. (2019) called for research on voice in adversity and proposed the concept of voice resilience, defining it as continued voice behavior in the face of voice adversity (i.e., leader rejection) and measuring it through subsequent voice frequency. However, equating voice resilience with a behavioral outcome fails to capture its essence. Theoretically, resilience is a necessary condition for overcoming workplace adversity (Zhu et al., 2019); thus, voice resilience should be an antecedent of sustained voice in adversity rather than the behavioral outcome itself. To better answer how employees voice despite adversity, the conceptual nature of voice resilience requires further expansion.

Beyond conceptual refinement, research on antecedents and consequences of voice resilience also needs advancement. King et al. (2019) examined leader influences on voice resilience, but what employee characteristics might positively affect voice resilience? What are the effects of voice resilience? Current voice resilience research is still nascent, and these questions await answers.

## 2.2 Employee Resilience

Employee resilience refers to positive adaptation in the face of adversity and represents a key factor determining whether employees can maintain or even improve performance during difficult times (Zhu et al., 2019). Previous research has defined employee resilience from three perspectives: trait/resource, outcome, and process (Hartmann et al., 2020). The trait/resource perspective defines resilience as inherent individual or environmental potentials (e.g., personality traits, knowledge, skills) that facilitate adaptation to adversity. The outcome perspective views resilience as behavioral patterns exhibited after successfully adapting to adversity (e.g., maintaining status quo, perseverance). The process perspective defines resilience as the psychological and behavioral processes that

enable successful adaptation to adversity (Britt et al., 2016; Fisher et al., 2019; Hartmann et al., 2020; Rabenu & Tziner, 2016).

As employee resilience research has evolved, limitations of the trait/resource and outcome perspectives have become apparent. Fisher et al. (2019) argue that traits and resources can exist independent of adversity, whereas true resilience only manifests during adversity. Although traits and resources may facilitate resilience, they are fundamentally distinct from it. McLarnon and Rothstein (2013) contend that positive behavioral patterns in adversity are outcomes of resilience; defining resilience solely through behavioral outcomes neglects the recovery process and fails to reflect resilience's essence. King et al.'s (2019) definition of voice resilience adopts the outcome perspective and thus faces similar problems, unable to accurately capture the essential characteristics of voice resilience.

In recent years, an increasing number of researchers have adopted the process perspective to study employee resilience. Proponents argue that this perspective facilitates investigation of dynamic mechanisms through which individuals adapt to or overcome adversity in specific contexts (Fisher et al., 2019; Hartmann et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2019). Moreover, the process perspective provides a foundation for examining how multiple factors (e.g., behaviors, abilities, traits) jointly influence employee resilience (Fisher et al., 2019; Kossek & Perrigino, 2016). From this perspective, the core of voice resilience lies in the psychological and behavioral processes employees undergo to overcome voice adversity.

### 2.3 Achievement Goal Theory

Achievement goal theory examines individual achievement motivation types and corresponding behavioral patterns from a social-cognitive perspective (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; VandeWalle, 1997). Goal orientation refers to individuals' fundamental tendencies in selecting and pursuing achievement goals in achievement situations (Dweck & Leggett, 1988).

In work contexts, the three achievement goal orientations proposed by VandeWalle (1997) have gained widespread recognition and application (e.g., Alexander & Van Knippenberg, 2014; Ma et al., 2021; Rhee & Choi, 2017). According to VandeWalle (1997), achievement goals include learning goal orientation, performance-prove goal orientation, and performance-avoid goal orientation. Learning goal orientation involves pursuing competence improvement and better task mastery. Performance-prove goal orientation involves demonstrating oneself and proving superior ability compared to others. Performance-avoid goal orientation involves hiding weaknesses and avoiding exposure of inferior ability (Elliot et al., 2017).

Achievement goals organize individuals' psychological processes and serve as the foundation for understanding situations and responding to them (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Previous research indicates that individuals with dominant learning goals, seeking to complete tasks effectively, are often unafraid of fail-

ure and criticism, willing to develop competence through problem-solving, and ultimately achieve self-transcendence (VandeWalle & Cummings, 1997; VandeWalle et al., 2000). Those with dominant performance-prove goals, seeking to highlight themselves, prefer assuming important responsibilities and tackling difficult tasks alone to obtain achievements surpassing others (VandeWalle & Cummings, 1997; Hirst et al., 2011). Conversely, individuals with dominant performance-avoid goals, seeking to reduce failure, tend to avoid challenges and withdraw when facing difficult tasks (Payne et al., 2007). Thus, achievement goals substantially influence individual performance and outcomes in adversity (Elliot et al., 2017; VandeWalle et al., 2019), providing an important theoretical foundation for studying the formation mechanisms and outcomes of voice resilience.

## 2.4 Literature Review

Despite over two decades of voice research yielding substantial achievements, the phenomenon of employees voicing despite adversity has received limited scholarly attention. As employee resilience research has gradually expanded in organizational behavior, scholars have recently proposed the concept of voice resilience. Current voice resilience research is still in its early stages, with three key areas requiring exploration.

First, reconceptualizing voice resilience from a process perspective and developing corresponding measurement tools. As discussed above, theoretical perspective limitations have prevented existing research from fully revealing voice resilience' s nature. To deepen understanding of voice in adversity, future research should draw on frontier employee resilience research, analyzing the specific psychological-behavioral processes employees undergo to overcome voice adversity to expand the conceptual nature of voice resilience. Additionally, to thoroughly examine voice resilience' s antecedents and outcomes, subsequent research must develop appropriate measurement tools based on this reconceptualization.

Second, analyzing and testing the influence of achievement goal orientations on voice resilience based on achievement goal theory. Currently, research on voice resilience antecedents remains very limited, particularly regarding how employee characteristics affect voice resilience. Given achievement goals' important organizing role in individual psychological-behavioral processes—especially during difficulties, where they largely determine whether employees confront or withdraw from challenges (Elliot et al., 2017; VandeWalle et al., 2019)—future research should examine how achievement goal orientations influence voice resilience and identify factors that moderate these relationships.

Third, examining voice resilience outcomes from both employee subsequent voice and leader voice endorsement perspectives. Overcoming adversity to sustain voice holds significant meaning for both individual growth and organizational development (King et al., 2019). Many studies show that through overcoming

adversity, employees can return to normal performance levels or even exceed pre-adversity performance (Britt et al., 2016). Accordingly, employees may adapt to voice adversity and achieve normal or even higher levels of voice behavior, representing important progress for employees and the most direct manifestation of voice resilience effects. Meanwhile, employee voice only contributes to the organization when adopted by leaders; thus, whether leaders endorse voice constitutes an important indicator for evaluating voice resilience effectiveness.

### 3 Research Framework

This research comprises three interrelated sub-studies. Study 1 focuses on conceptual clarification and scale development for voice resilience. Study 2 examines the formation mechanism of voice resilience from an achievement goal theory perspective and the moderating role of voice efficacy. Study 3 tests the effects of voice resilience on employees and leaders. The overall research framework is shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper].

#### 3.1 Study 1: Conceptual Development and Scale Development of Voice Resilience

From a process perspective (Fisher et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2019), this study defines voice resilience as the psychological-behavioral process through which employees dynamically interact with and overcome voice adversity, where voice adversity refers to various obstacles, conflicts, and failure situations employees may encounter during the voice process.

Reviewing previous research, individuals' adversity-overcoming processes can be temporally divided into two stages: appraisal and coping (Fisher et al., 2019). Appraisal involves individuals' perception and interpretation of adversity when it occurs. Coping involves sustained self-regulation after adversity produces negative effects (Fisher et al., 2019; Folkman et al., 1986). This self-regulation typically employs two strategies: emotion management (regulating emotional responses to adversity) and problem-solving (altering the adversity or one's relationship to it) (Fisher et al., 2019; Folkman et al., 1986; Kinicki et al., 2000). Through positive appraisal, active emotion regulation, and effortful problem-solving, individuals ultimately overcome adversity and achieve personal growth (Fisher et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2019).

Based on this framework, we propose that employees' voice adversity-overcoming process includes three components: (1) positively appraising voice adversity; (2) actively regulating emotional states; and (3) effortfully adjusting voice behaviors. Thus, voice resilience may be a three-dimensional construct. Integrating voice behavior characteristics and specific situations encountered in voice adversity, we propose that voice resilience comprises the following elements:

- (1) **Appraising voice adversity.** In voice adversity, employees may encounter situations such as blocked voice channels, lack of voice climate, or

leader resistance and rejection (Milliken et al., 2003; Chen & Tang, 2019). However, individuals' emotions, motivations, and behaviors do not stem directly from objective reality but depend on their appraisal of it (Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Weiner, 1985). For example, some view failure as the mother of success while others see it as humiliating (Payne et al., 2007); some perceive stress as a challenge while others see it as a hindrance (Lazarus, 1993); some consider failure accidental while others see it as inevitable (Weiner, 1985). In voice adversity, employees high in voice resilience tend to appraise voice adversity positively, believing it has potential benefits and can be overcome through effort. These positive appraisals motivate individuals to overcome adversity and engage in constructive interaction with voice adversity (Fisher et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2019).

- (2) **Regulating emotional states.** When encountering voice adversity, employees may feel deceived by leaders (de Vries et al., 2012), perceive the voice climate as unsafe (King et al., 2019), or doubt their value in the organization (Belkin & Kong, 2018), generating anxiety or anger. Employees high in voice resilience can effectively manage emotions by reappraising adversity to identify beneficial elements (Gross & John, 2003; Tebes et al., 2004) or by using humor and relaxation techniques to alleviate negative emotions and mobilize positive ones (Shin et al., 2012). Through active self-regulation, employees can maintain positive emotions despite voice adversity, enabling active thinking about voice issues and greater courage to assume voice risks (Fu et al., 2012).
- (3) **Adjusting voice behaviors.** To truly overcome voice adversity, employees must identify and solve actual problems in the voice process. Employees strong in voice resilience can reflect on reasons for voice setbacks, which may include low-quality suggestions, leaders perceiving voice as threatening, or leaders fearing that adopting individual suggestions might disrupt team stability (Han & Liu, 2021). Based on such reflection, high voice resilience employees address these problems purposefully: improving professionalism and feasibility to optimize voice content (Han & Liu, 2021); increasing promotive voice while decreasing prohibitive voice to reduce leaders' threat perception (Liang et al., 2012); or using colleague solidarity (Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990) and collective voice (Walumbwa et al., 2012) to alleviate leaders' concerns about voice harming team harmony. By identifying and solving actual problems in the voice process, high voice resilience employees ultimately achieve adaptation to voice adversity.

Based on this analysis, this study will follow standard scale development procedures, using qualitative methods to identify the internal structure of voice resilience and quantitative methods to explore and validate its factor structure, thereby developing a reliable and valid voice resilience measurement scale.

### 3.2 Study 2: Formation Mechanism of Voice Resilience from an Achievement Goal Perspective

Study 2 aims to examine how different achievement goal orientations influence employee voice resilience and how voice efficacy moderates these relationships. As previously discussed, individuals possess three achievement goal orientations: learning goal orientation, performance-prove goal orientation, and performance-avoid goal orientation (VandeWalle, 1997). This study will propose relationships between these three goal orientations and voice resilience based on the conceptualization developed in Study 1.

#### 3.2.1 Relationship Between Learning Goal Orientation and Voice Resilience

Learning goal orientation drives individuals to pursue competence improvement (Elliot et al., 2017). To continuously surpass themselves, employees high in learning goal orientation prefer difficult and challenging tasks (Colquitt & Simmering, 1998; VandeWalle & Cummings, 1997), view criticism and failure as helpful for reflecting on shortcomings, and regard difficulties and setbacks as opportunities to develop competence (Alexander & Van Knippenberg, 2014; Cianci et al., 2010; VandeWalle, 1997). These positive cognitions can buffer the impact of adversity (Cianci et al., 2010), enabling employees to minimize negative emotional interference and focus on solving current dilemmas (Porath & Bateman, 2006; Payne et al., 2007). Therefore, employees high in learning goal orientation can recognize the positive significance of voice adversity for competence development, actively regulate negative emotional experiences in voice adversity, and strive to improve voice quality and optimize voice strategies to achieve better outcomes. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 1:** Employees' learning goal orientation is positively related to voice resilience.

#### 3.2.2 Relationship Between Performance-Prove Goal Orientation and Voice Resilience

Performance-prove goal orientation drives individuals to pursue demonstrating themselves and proving superior ability compared to others (Elliot et al., 2017). To achieve achievements surpassing others, employees high in performance-prove goal orientation view demanding and difficult tasks as opportunities to stand out (Hirst et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2021) and can actively regulate emotions and effortfully solve problems even in adversity (Porath & Bateman, 2006). However, unlike learning goal orientation, performance-prove goal orientation only pursues successful outcomes, not competence improvement (VandeWalle et al., 2001). This difference in goal pursuit leads individuals high in performance-prove goal orientation to focus more on strategy than on genuinely improving their professional competence (Elliot et al., 1999; Midgley et al., 2001). Therefore, high performance-prove goal orientation employees may believe that suc-

successful voice in adversity better highlights their excellence and are willing to exert effort accordingly. In overcoming voice adversity, they may prioritize adjusting voice strategies over improving voice quality. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 2:** Employees' performance-prove goal orientation is positively related to voice resilience.

### 3.2.3 Relationship Between Performance-Avoid Goal Orientation and Voice Resilience

Performance-avoid goal orientation drives individuals to pursue hiding weaknesses and avoiding exposure of inferior ability (Elliot et al., 2017). Because they fear exposing shortcomings, individuals high in performance-avoid goal orientation tend to resist difficult tasks (Elliot et al., 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997) and are highly sensitive to work stress, generating negative cognitive appraisals of work environments when failure is possible (Ma et al., 2021). Consequently, high performance-avoid goal orientation employees are easily affected by adversity, habitually heightening self-protection in adverse situations, maintaining relatively anxious emotional states to detect risks at any moment, and stopping behaviors that may bring negative consequences (Porath & Bateman, 2006). Therefore, contrary to high learning and performance-prove goal orientation employees, high performance-avoid goal orientation employees perceive voice adversity as a serious threat and tend to remain vigilant rather than risk speaking up. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 3:** Employees' performance-avoid goal orientation is negatively related to voice resilience.

### 3.2.4 The Moderating Role of Voice Efficacy on Goal Orientation-Voice Resilience Relationships

Voice efficacy refers to employees' beliefs, formed through accumulated experience, that they can fulfill the voice role effectively and that their voice will produce positive outcomes (Duan & Wei, 2012). Voice efficacy enables employees to believe they can control the impact of unexpected events during voice and that their suggestions will ultimately be adopted by leaders (Duan & Wei, 2012). When encountering voice adversity, learning goal orientation drives individuals to overcome voice adversity to improve competence, while performance-prove goal orientation drives them to overcome voice adversity to prove competence. In these cases, employees high in voice efficacy will have greater confidence in achieving these important goals and thus more actively overcome voice adversity. Conversely, performance-avoid goal orientation drives individuals to passively endure negative effects of voice adversity to avoid failure and exposure of competence weaknesses. Here, higher voice efficacy can mitigate performance-avoid goal orientation's effects, preventing complete passivity in voice adversity. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 4:** Voice efficacy moderates the positive relationship between learning goal orientation and voice resilience, such that the relationship is stronger when voice efficacy is high.

**Hypothesis 5:** Voice efficacy moderates the positive relationship between performance-prove goal orientation and voice resilience, such that the relationship is stronger when voice efficacy is high.

**Hypothesis 6:** Voice efficacy moderates the negative relationship between performance-avoid goal orientation and voice resilience, such that the relationship is weaker when voice efficacy is high.

### 3.3 Study 3: Outcomes of Voice Resilience

Study 3 aims to examine the outcomes of voice resilience. As previously discussed, voice resilience is a dynamic process of positively appraising voice adversity, actively regulating emotional states, and effortfully adjusting voice behaviors. Integrating this conceptualization, this study analyzes voice resilience outcomes from both employee subsequent voice and leader voice endorsement perspectives to explore the significance of voice resilience for individual growth and organizational development.

#### 3.3.1 Relationship Between Voice Resilience and Employee Subsequent Voice Behavior

Subsequent voice refers to employees' continued voice behavior after perceiving voice adversity (King et al., 2019). During voice, obstacles, conflicts, or failures may discourage employees, leading them to reduce voice or become silent (Miliken et al., 2003; Chen & Tang, 2019). However, employees with high voice resilience can positively view voice adversity, linking overcoming adversity to personal growth and achievement, thereby motivating sustained voice in adverse conditions. Moreover, despite successive setbacks in voice, high voice resilience employees can self-regulate promptly, focus attention on problem-solving, and use techniques to relieve stress, maintaining active thinking and positive emotions. Finally, high voice resilience employees can learn from negative feedback, improve voice quality, and optimize voice strategies, generating positive expectations about future voice outcomes and promoting subsequent voice behavior. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 7:** Voice resilience is positively related to employees' subsequent voice behavior.

#### 3.3.2 Relationship Between Voice Resilience and Leader Voice Endorsement

Voice endorsement refers to leaders' acceptance, recognition, and support of employee voice (Zhang et al., 2020). Many factors influence leader voice endorsement. First, leaders infer employees' voice motives. Voice resilience in-

volves employees risking punishment to persist in speaking up, which may lead leaders to perceive such self-sacrificing behavior as being motivated by organizational concern. When leaders believe employees voice out of “organizational concern motivation,” they are more likely to endorse the voice (Burris et al., 2013; Grant et al., 2009). Second, leaders perceive employees’ voice attitudes. Voice resilience enables employees to overcome difficulties and persistently voice to leaders, which may impress leaders and signal employees’ confidence in their suggestions. When leaders sense employees are confident about their voice, they are more likely to endorse it (Zhang et al., 2016). Third, leaders evaluate voice quality. Voice resilience enables employees to continuously reflect on and optimize voice content, making it more aligned with leaders’ standards, and higher-quality voice is more likely to be endorsed (Zhang et al., 2016). Finally, leader voice endorsement decisions are also influenced by timing and environmental factors (Sun et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2016). Voice resilience enables employees to analyze specific situations, continuously adjust voice strategies, and choose appropriate contexts and targets for voice. Based on this analysis, we propose:

**Hypothesis 8:** Voice resilience is positively related to leader voice endorsement.

#### 4 Theoretical Contributions

Voice resilience represents both a frontier topic in organizational behavior research and a construct highly relevant to contemporary dynamic and complex organizational management changes. Focusing on this theme, this paper integrates qualitative and quantitative methods to advance theoretical and empirical understanding of employee voice in adversity. Specifically, this paper’s theoretical contributions manifest in three aspects.

First, this paper emphasizes phenomenon-driven concept development, advancing the emerging research theme of voice resilience. Existing voice research generally assumes that when organizations contain factors inhibiting voice—such as leader nonsupport or unsafe climates—employees reduce voice and tend to remain silent (Milliken et al., 2003; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Chen & Tang, 2019). Such findings cannot explain why employees persist in voice despite adversity in practice. To explore the process mechanisms underlying employees’ sustained voice in adversity and its antecedents and outcomes, this paper builds on King et al. (2019) to propose a preliminary theoretical framework for voice resilience, articulating its psychological and behavioral processes to clarify and expand its conceptual nature. Second, following standard scale development procedures and combining in-depth interviews with questionnaire surveys, we aim to develop a reliable and valid voice resilience measurement instrument. Thus, this paper adheres to the “phenomenon-driven theory development” approach in topic selection, content organization, and methodological design, advancing voice resilience research by further conceptualizing and operationalizing the phenomenon of employee voice in adversity.

Second, this paper examines the formation mechanism of voice resilience from an

achievement goal theory perspective, thereby revealing the psychological foundations of voice resilience. Research on voice resilience antecedents is still nascent, particularly regarding how employee characteristics influence voice resilience. Considering that voice is employees' purposeful proactive behavior (Liang et al., 2012; Morrison, 2011), this paper proposes that achievement goal orientation may be an important factor influencing voice resilience, with voice resilience formation representing the organizational process of achievement goal orientation on employee psychology and behavior in voice adversity. By introducing achievement goal theory, this paper analyzes relationships between the three goal orientations and voice resilience. Additionally, it examines the moderating role of voice efficacy on these relationships to identify boundary conditions. Based on this work, this paper reveals psychological mechanisms that promote voice resilience, enriches antecedent research on voice resilience, and provides theoretical guidance for employees to maintain voice resilience and for managers to cultivate it.

Third, this paper analyzes voice resilience effectiveness from both employee and leader perspectives, obtaining a more complete understanding of voice resilience outcomes. Currently, theoretical analysis and empirical testing of voice resilience effectiveness remain scarce. Through literature review and theoretical analysis, this paper proposes that analyzing voice resilience outcomes requires consideration of both employee subsequent voice and leader voice endorsement. By analyzing voice resilience's effects on employees' motivation, cognition, and emotion in voice adversity, this paper explores its promoting effect on subsequent voice behavior. Simultaneously, by analyzing voice resilience's influence on leaders' attributions of employee voice motives, perceptions of voice attitudes, and evaluations of voice quality, this paper examines its positive impact on leader voice endorsement. Based on these analyses, this paper preliminarily explores the significance of voice resilience for employee individual growth and organizational development, providing initial support for its effectiveness and practical value.

From a practical implications perspective, the value of voice resilience is particularly prominent in today's dynamic and complex business context. First, this research draws managers' attention to employee voice resilience. In dynamic environments, organizations need employee voice more than ever, while employees face more challenges than before. This paper can enhance managers' understanding of employee voice resilience, increase their emphasis on it, and provide new pathways for protecting employees' ownership spirit and developing their "intellectual resources." Second, this paper provides guidance for managers to cultivate and stimulate employee voice resilience. By introducing achievement goal theory to reveal voice resilience formation mechanisms, this research may offer theoretical guidance and methodological direction for employee identification, selection, and training. Third, this paper encourages employees to persist in voice despite adversity. By examining the positive effects of voice resilience on subsequent voice behavior and leader voice endorsement, this research helps employees understand the important value of voice resilience for personal growth

and organizational development, thereby reducing their psychological burden when voicing in adversity and enhancing their voice willingness and motivation.

## References

- Chen, L. J., & Tang, N. Y. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee silence: Review and prospects. *Human Resources Development of China*, 36(12), 84-104.
- de Vries, G., Jehn, K. A., & Terwel, B. W. (2012). When employees stop talking and start fighting: The detrimental effects of pseudo voice in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(2), 221-230.
- Duan, J. Y., Wei, Q. J. (2012). The structure of voice efficacy and its role in the occurrence of employee voice behavior. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 44(7), 972-985.
- Duan, J. Y., Zhang, C., & Xu, Y. (2016). A meta-analysis of demographic characteristics of employee voice behavior. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 24(10), 1568-1582.
- Fu, Q., Duan, J. Y., & Tian, X. M. (2012). The emotional mechanism of employee voice behavior: A new exploratory perspective. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 20(2), 274-282.
- Han, Y., & Liu, G. (2021). Why is the voice channel difficult to open? Exploring the dimensions and formation mechanism of leader voice rejection. *Human Resources Development of China*, 38(4), 111-124.
- Li, F. J., Zheng, F. F., Yang, Q. Y., & Wang, S. M. (2018). Outcomes of employee voice behavior and their moderating mechanisms. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 26(4), 710-718.
- Lu, H. X., Duan, J. Y., & Liu, Y. B. (2020). Theoretical mechanisms and future research prospects of voice behavior. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 43(5), 1235-1242.
- Sun, L. Y., Chen, L., & Duan, J. Y. (2017). Advice taking in decision-making: Strategies, influences, and future prospects. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 25(1), 169-179.
- Zhang, G. L., Shi, W. T., & Liu, W. X. (2016). A review and prospect of voice endorsement behavior research. *Human Resources Development of China*, (19), 29-37.
- Zhang, K., Shi, J. J., & Luo, W. H. (2020). How voice endorsement promotes employee voice: An integrated mechanism based on goal self-organization perspective. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 52(2), 211-225.
- Zhu, Y. H., Zhao, Y. L., Zhou, Y. Y., & Wu, J. (2019). Resilience in organizations: Constructing protective resources through psychological and systemic pathways. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 27(2), 357-369.

- Alexander, L., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2014). Teams in pursuit of radical innovation: A goal orientation perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 423-438.
- Bashshur, M. R., & Oc, B. (2015). When voice matters: A multilevel review of the impact of voice in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1530-1554.
- Belkin, L. Y., & Kong, D. T. (2018). Implications of advice rejection in repeated exchanges: Advisor responses and advisee gratitude expression as a buffer. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 78, 181-194.
- Britt, T. W., Shen, W., Sinclair, R. R., Grossman, M. R., & Klieger, D. M. (2016). How much do we really know about employee resilience? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 378-404.
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Romney, A. C. (2013). Speaking up vs. being heard: The disagreement around and outcomes of employee voice. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 22-38.
- Cianci, A. M., Klein, H. J., & Seijts, G. H. (2010). The effect of negative feedback on tension and subsequent performance: The main and interactive effects of goal content and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 618-634.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Simmering, M. J. (1998). Conscientiousness, goal orientation, and motivation to learn during the learning process: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 654-665.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M. A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(1), 218-232.
- Elliot, A. J., Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2017). *Handbook of Competence and Motivation: Theory and Applications* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Elliot, A. J., McGregor, H. A., & Gable, S. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies, and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(3), 549-563.
- Fisher, D. M., Ragsdale, J. M., & Fisher, E. C. (2019). The importance of definitional and temporal issues in the study of resilience. *Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 583-620.
- Folkman, S., Lazarus, R. S., Dunkel-Schetter, C., DeLongis, A., & Gruen, R. J. (1986). Dynamics of a stressful encounter: Cognitive appraisal, coping, and encounter outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 992-1003.

- Grant, A. M., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behavior: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology*, 62(1), 31-55.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362.
- Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Resilience in the workplace: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 913-959.
- Hirst, G., Van Knippenberg, D., Chen, C. H., & Sacramento, C. A. (2011). How does bureaucracy impact individual creativity? A cross-level investigation of team contextual influences on goal orientation-creativity relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 624-641.
- King, D. D., Ryan, A. M., & Van Dyne, L. (2019). Voice resilience: Fostering future voice after non-endorsement of suggestions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 92(3), 535-565.
- Kinicki, A. J., Prussia, G. E., & McKee-Ryan, F. M. (2000). A panel study of coping with involuntary job loss. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1), 90-100.
- Kossek, E. E., & Perrigino, M. B. (2016). Resilience: A review using a grounded integrated occupational approach. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 1-69.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44(1), 1-22.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 326-336.
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71-92.
- Ma, J., Peng, Y., & Wu, B. (2021). Challenging or hindering? The roles of goal orientation and cognitive appraisal in stressor-performance relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(3), 388-406.
- McLarnon, M. J., & Rothstein, M. G. (2013). Development and initial validation of the workplace resilience inventory. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(2), 63-73.

- Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., & Middleton, M. (2001). Performance-approach goals: Good for what, for whom, under what circumstances, and at what cost? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 77-86.
- Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 373-412.
- Payne, S. C., Youngcourt, S. S., & Beaubien, J. M. (2007). A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 128-150.
- Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 331-369). New York, NY: JAI Press.
- Porath, C. L., & Bateman, T. S. (2006). Self-regulation: From goal orientation to job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 185-192.
- Rabenu, E., & Tziner, A. (2016). Employee resilience: A faceted analytical approach. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 480-485.
- Rhee, Y. W., & Choi, J. N. (2017). Knowledge management behavior and individual creativity: Goal orientations as antecedents and in-group social status as moderating contingency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 813-832.
- Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(3), 246-257.
- Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 727-748.
- Tebes, J. K., Irish, J. T., Puglisi Vasquez, M. J., & Perkins, D. V. (2004). Cognitive transformation as a marker of resilience. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 39(5), 769-788.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359-1392.
- VandeWalle, D. (1997). Development and validation of a work domain goal orientation instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(6), 995-1015.

VandeWalle, D., & Cummings, L. L. (1997). A test of the influence of goal orientation on the feedback-seeking process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), 390-400.

VandeWalle, D., Cron, W. L., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (2001). The role of goal orientation following performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 629-640.

VandeWalle, D., Ganesan, S., Challagalla, G. N., & Brown, S. P. (2000). An integrated model of feedback-seeking behavior: Disposition, context, and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 996-1003.

VandeWalle, D., Nerstad, C. G., & Dysvik, A. (2019). Goal orientation: A review of the miles traveled and the miles to go. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 6, 115-144.

Walumbwa, F. O., Morrison, E. W., & Christensen, A. L. (2012). Ethical leadership and group in-role performance: The mediating roles of group conscientiousness and group voice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 953-964.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548-573.

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.*