This is a repository copy of *Coaching as a route to voice: a framework for change*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/220560/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

This is a pre-publication version of the following article: Brooks, S. (2024) Coaching as a route to voice: a framework for change. The Coaching Psychologist, 20 (1). pp. 50-62.

Title: Coaching as a Route to Voice: A Framework for Change

Dr Sarah Brooks * (Corresponding Author)

Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour

Sheffield University Management School

Conduit Road, Sheffield, S10 1FL, UK

Email: s.brooks@sheffield.ac.uk

Tel: 0114 222 3218

Orcid: 0000-0003-4132-6587

Abstract

A common problem brought to coaching is one where the coaching client is unable to voice problems and concerns to someone more senior in the workplace. This paper introduces a coaching framework which supports coaches to help coaching clients think systematically about ways in which they can formulate and articulate needs and wants which address those problems and concerns. Drawing on the voice and silence literature, the Coaching as a Route to Voice framework brings to the fore power differentials between employees and managers in the workplace which act as both enablers and barriers to voice. The framework centres around three questions which guide the coaching client through a goal-articulation process which provides clarity around who is most likely to be able to support the coaching client, when best to approach them and how best to present the information in order to have the most impact.

Introduction

Many problems that coaching clients bring to coaching are underpinned by an inability to effect change in a particular area. One way to achieve change is through a concept known as voice. Voice can be defined as "opportunities for employees to have a say and potentially influence organizational affairs relating to issues that affect their work and the interests of managers and owners" (Wilkinson, Dundon, Donaghey, & Freeman, 2014 p.5). However, many employees find it very difficult to speak out about problems and concerns in the workplace, a phenomenon known as silence. Silence can be defined as the "purposeful withholding of ideas, questions, concerns, information or opinions by employees about issues relating to their jobs and organisation in which they work" (Nechanska, Hughes & Dundon, 2020 p.3). Silence is mainly considered to be detrimental within organisations (Morrison, 2011) because it has been shown to lead to a host of problems for both individuals and organisations. These include burnout and stress (Sherf, Parke, & Isaakyan, 2021) turnover and absenteeism (McClean, Burris, & Detert, 2013) total organisational collapse such as at Enron (Tourish & Vatcha, 2005), organisational scandals such as the Volkswagen emissions scandal (Rhodes, 2016), operational failures leading to loss of life such as at those at the NHS (Currie, Richmond, Faulconbridge, Gabbioneta, & Muzio, 2019; Francis, 2013) and sexual misconduct such as that at the BBC (Greer & McLaughlin, 2013).

There are a whole range of influences which are known to lead to silence ranging from individual-level variables all the way through to cultural and economic variables. For example, the relationship with the manager (Duan, Zhou, & Yu, 2022); fear of losing a job or damaging relationships with others (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003); tall hierarchical organisations (Morrison & Milliken, 2000), industrial relations processes (Kaufman, 2015) and turbulent economic contexts (Prouska & Psychogios, 2018). However, despite knowing a great deal about the reasons why people don't voice, the voice and silence literature contains very little evidence to show how to design practical voice attempts which overcome silence-inducing variables and enhance overall levels of voice.

The purpose of this article is to introduce coaches to a coaching framework which helps them support coaching clients to articulate problems and concerns in their workplace. The framework recognises that coaching clients can be managers or employees within an organisation, both of whom may be required to voice. Regardless of whether the coaching client is an employee or a manager, this coaching framework addresses a very specific and fundamental need, that of helping employees and managers to understand the variables in organisations that shape voice and silence and how they can be navigated to achieve successful goals and outcomes. The framework is suitable for both individuals and groups where speaking out is an available option to achieve change.

The Coaching as a Route to Voice framework acts as a valuable tool to support voice in three ways. Firstly, it draws on knowledge of the voice and silence literature to help coaches better support coaching clients to voice in the most impactful way possible. It can also be used to help coaching clients understand the reasons why they may be finding it difficult to voice or why voice attempts may be unsuccessful. It draws on theoretical and empirical knowledge to help contextualise the way that individuals, managers and the organisation contribute to levels of voice and silence, making it possible to voice more effectively. Secondly, van Zyl and colleagues (van Zyl, Roll, Stander, & Richter, 2020) identified that helping coaching clients feel powerful in ways that supported their goal achievement was an important phase in the coaching process. This aligns well with findings in the voice and silence literature which have identified power as a key variable shaping voice and silence. Thirdly, the Coaching as a Route to Voice framework recommends three questions around which to develop the voice offering to ensure it is as impactful as possible: What do you want to say? Who needs to hear it? When is the best time to tell them? In summary, this coaching framework brings to the fore the different forms of power that might be available to coaching clients in any given situation to build feelings of empowerment and strength which subsequently encourage motivation for voice.

The paper is structured as follows. Firstly, a theoretical overview of voice and silence is presented in relation to what we know about the influences over voice between employees and managers. In particular, the role of power is identified as a key variable. Secondly, the role of coaching and how this can best support voice will be considered. Finally, the three questions will be presented and guidance will be provided on considerations when trying to answer them.

Influences over voice and silence

Organisations exist to make a profit or provide a service which benefits society and therefore, organisations need to ensure they are effective and efficient at doing these things (Morrison, 2011). From an organisational perspective, voice is important because it gives managers access to information which helps them make decisions in order to ensure the smooth running of organisations (Tourish & Robson, 2003). From an individual perspective, it allows employees to express their desires, needs, and opinions in order to create working environments which motivate them to work hard (Brooks & Wilkinson, 2021).

Scholars have highlighted numerous variables which lead to silence including lack of available voice mechanisms (Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington, & Ackers, 2004), feelings of futility (Harlos, 2001), poor economic climate (Kaufman, 2015), lack of trust in managers (Hao, Han & Wu, 2021) and fear (Kish-Gephart, Detert, Treviño, & Edmondson, 2009). Fear is thought to be the greatest variable underpinning silence which includes reasons such as fear of upsetting or damaging relationships with others, being scared of what will happen afterwards (i.e. losing a job or not getting promoted) or concerns about being retaliated against for breaking confidences and telling tales about others (Knoll et al., 2021). In fact, studies have shown that between 68% and 85% of employees have withheld information at some point from a manager for these reasons (Brinsfield, 2013; Milliken et al., 2003). The nature of the content of voice has also been found to be an important variable. For example, information which is positive in nature, such as the achievement of targets or sharing customer praise easily passes through organisations and reaches destinations very quickly (Davies,

1953). However, negative information, or that which does not deliver good news, such as customer complaints, poorly performing employees or sexual misconduct moves much more slowly, if at all (Rosen & Tesser, 1970). As can be seen from organisational scandals which are the result of silence about wrongdoing over time, voicing early about problems is of utmost importance but it is precisely voice about problems which finds its way to managers least often (Brooks, Richmond & Blenkinsopp, 2023).

When considering the ways in which individuals can be encouraged to voice, Sherf and colleagues identified that it is first important to increase feelings of psychological safety (2020). Psychological safety can be defined as "employees' perceptions about the level of risks or potential negative interpersonal outcomes from acting" (Sherf et al., 2020 p.117). Psychological safety is a concept which is known to be related to interpersonal trust. In other words, it is a construct that is created where one individual feels confident to take risks in relation to changes. When psychological safety is present, individuals feel less need for self-protection and therefore are more likely to express themselves (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). However, Sherf et al., (2020) found that increasing psychological safety does not directly increase voice. In fact, it was found to reduce silence rather than increase voice. Instead, what they found was that to increase voice, once psychological safety is present, it is also important to build perceived impact amongst voicers (Sherf et al., 2020). Perceived impact can be defined as "perceptions regarding the potential of making a difference or change to the environment from acting" (Sherf et al., 2020 p.115). In other words, when there is confidence that the voice attempt will make a difference and psychological safety is present, only then is voice is more likely. One variable associated with perceived impact is the nature of the relationship between manager and employee. Owing to the interpersonal trust between these two people which is required for voice to take place it can be considered to be at the core of all voice attempts (Mowbray, Wilkinson & Tse, 2014). We have just considered the influences that shape the voices of employees, Therefore, we will now reflect on the role of managers in shaping voice.

How do managers influence voice and silence?

The reason the relationship with the manager is likely to be a highly influential variable is because for voice to be effective, it has to be enacted with someone more senior in the organisation who has an opportunity to make relevant changes (Hirschman, 1970). In hierarchical organisations, the direct line manager is most usually the person to whom the employee would be expected to voice. As a result, many voice mechanisms in organisations rely on trust between the employee and their manager for their effectiveness (Mowbray et al., 2014). Voice mechanisms are considered to be either face to face, verbal, written or mediated (Morrison, 2014; Klaas et al., 2012). Example voice mechanisms include grievance procedure, email, 1-2-1 meetings, video conferencing and telephone. Therkelsen and Fiebich (2003) argue that the manager is capable of engendering organisational commitment and employee loyalty amongst their employees, both of which are trust-related constructs which have been found to be important for voice. Frequent interactions, face to face communication and informal conversations have all been found to build trust required for voice (Mowbray et al., 2014; Brooks, 2018). When considering the role of psychological safety, another important variable for voice, it is recognised that managers have the power to administer rewards in terms of promotion and pay rises as well as punish, making the supervisor one of the most important sources of psychological safety for an employee (Morrison, 2011). Whether managers appear open and willing to listen to voice is an important indicator as to whether someone voices or not (Detert & Burris, 2007) and how frequently (Milliken et al, 2003). Managers with whom employees have a good relationship are more likely to elicit voice (Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008) and direct line managers who have a good relationship with their employees are considered to be a better target for voice because voice is more likely to be acted upon (Liu, Tangirala, & Ramanujam, 2013). Leaders who display ethical, authentic or transformational leadership styles are considered more approachable (Avey, Wernsing, & Palanski, 2012; Detert & Burris, 2007; Wu Liu, Zhu, & Yang, 2010; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009) and research has also shown that voice is more common where both employee and manager share a tendency for proactive behaviour (Xu, Qin, Dust, &

DiRenzo, 2019). On the other hand, managers who lack openness and honesty are considered less desirable as targets of voice because they can react defensively or in a hostile manner (Detert & Burris, 2007).

Attempts to understand how managers shape voice has predominantly focused on the quality of the relationship with their employees. This has frequently been measured using Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX). LMX theory describes the quality of the relationship between manager and employee based on three key principles: mutual trust, respect and liking (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Voice has been consistently positively correlated with LMX across numerous studies (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009; Duan, Lapointe, Xu, & Brooks, 2019; Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005). However, Botero and Van Dyne (2009) found that there appeared to be a ceiling effect for LMX where Power Distance was high. In other words, the quality of the relationship ceases to be influential over a certain point in cultures where management is respected because of their more senior position. It is therefore important to consider the role of power inherent in hierarchical organisations and how it shapes voice and silence.

Power

Within hierarchical organisations, power differences have been identified as a strong influence over voice behaviour (Morrison & Rothman, 2009). In fact, Detert and Burris (2007) made the role of power explicit in the voice process in their definition: "Verbal behavior that is improvement oriented and directed to a specific target who holds power inside the organization in question (p. 870)". There are two ways in which power can be represented in relation to voice and silence: power distance and perceptions of power.

Power Distance

Power distance can be considered at both the individual and the organisation levels. At the organisational level it can be defined as "the extent to which the people accept that power is

distributed unequally in society" (Liu & Liao, 2013 p.1750) and at the individual level it can be defined as "the extent to which an individual accepts the unequal distribution of power in institutions and organizations" (Liu & Liao, 2013 p.1750). Power distance has been shown to be consistently and negatively related to voice (Botero & Van Dyne, 2009, Liu & Liao, 2013)**.** However**,** Botero and Van Dyne (2009) found that a high quality relationship between the employee and the manager did appear to override some of the effects of power differentials between them in a high power distance culture.

Feeling Powerful

Some scholars have looked at the effect of feelings of power on voice. For example, Tost, Gino, and Larrick (2013) explored the effects of formal (hierarchical) power on leader behaviour. In particular, the link between feelings of power amongst leaders and the extent to which they verbally dominated their teams. They defined power as "an individual's relative ability to control others' outcomes, experiences, or behaviors" (p.1466). They were particularly interested in the effects of hierarchy and its ability to allow subordinates to feel power (either powerful or powerless) and the effects that this had on voice. The outcome of the studies showed that teams who voiced less had reduced team performance. Leaders who verbally dominated were also considered to be less open and to provide less opportunities for communication. Therefore, it could be said that leaders who feel powerful are more likely to verbally dominate their teams, leading to poorer performance. More conceptually, one way in which to understand how feelings of powerfulness can shape voice is to explore the different bases of power that exist within hierarchical organisations. Figure 1 outlines six forms of power which are available to individuals within the workplace to varying degrees. Against each type of power, there is a description which explains what having that power means to the holder.

_____

Insert Figure 1 about here

9

_____

Within organisations, managers are more powerful because of the formal processes and procedures

which provide them with legitimate position power (French & Raven, 1959). The power differences

result in those less senior being disadvantaged in certain situations through an inability to influence

outcomes (Stinchcombe, 2001).   The importance of reward and coercive power can be seen when

considering that "power exists only in relation to others whereby low-power parties depend on high-

power parties to obtain rewards and avoid punishments" (Anderson & Brion, 2014 p.69). Within a

hierarchical organisation, this means that managers are able to use their power to promise rewards

or threaten punishments, making them an influential figure over voice and silence. Referent power

describes a situation where an individual has developed an ability to influence others because of

their personality (Raven, Schwarzwald & Koslowsky, 1998). Expert power describes some individuals

who may have access to a form of power because they have expertise or experience in a particular

area which gives them insights which are valuable or more knowledge than others. In fact, Duan and

colleagues found that managers were more likely to listen to employees who they considered to be

experts (Duan et al.,2022). Finally, some individuals might have access to information which can act

as a form of power. For example, evidence (anecdotal or otherwise) that wrongdoing is taking place

in an organisation is sufficient to constitute a form of informational power. Figure 2 demonstrates

the different forms of power available to subordinates. The right-hand column explains how this

power has the potential to shape voice.

_____

Insert Figure 2 about here

_____

Managers have access to three forms of power that subordinates do not, only because of their more

senior position in the hierarchy: legitimate power, reward power and coercive power. However, the

other three power bases are available to every organisational employee regardless of position in the hierarchy: referent power, expert power, and informational power. Therefore, it is possible for subordinates to feel more powerful than their managers by thinking about the power sources available to them. Understanding the different sources of power that are available to employees could enhance likelihood for voice as it increases their feelings of powerfulness.

One of the reasons feeling more powerful has been linked to increased likelihood for voice is because it engenders feelings of efficacy (Tost et al., 2013). Efficacy can be defined as "the employee's perception about whether engaging in voice will be effective in bringing about the desired result" (Morrison, 2014 p.180). This must not be confused with self-efficacy which refers to "the self-assurance that individuals have in their personal ability to orchestrate or complete an activity" (Yan, Tangirala, Vadera, & Ekkirala, 2021 p.651). In other words, efficacy is a situation-dependent variable because the confidence comes from weighing up self-belief as well as other variables in their environment which also need to be considered if something is to be successful. Some of the earliest voice and silence literature highlighted the importance of power for being able to craft arguments to encourage managers to address issues and problems in the workplace (Dutton & Ashford, 1993). In order to support individuals to recognise and build on the power that is available to them, next we will consider the role of coaching which has been found to enhance feelings of self-efficacy (Bozer & Jones, 2018), an important variable underpinning feelings of efficacy in relation to voice.

The role of coaching

Although a single definition of coaching is not yet available, it is defined here as "an intervention that can help people to achieve their goals or improve performance through structured conversations" (Gormley & van Nieuwerburgh, 2014). Coaching is a tool recognised to improve self-efficacy (Bozer & Jones, 2018), which as indicated above, has been shown to be important for voice behaviour, in particular where there is a manager who is encouraging of voice (Morrison, 2022).

When attempting to understand how best coaching can be used to support voice, a systematic literature review by van Zyl et al., (2020) advocates adopting a positive psychology approach which results in coaching clients becoming aware of their strengths and using them to achieve their dreams for the future. Their approach advocates realistic goal setting as an early stage in the coaching process, followed by work to create feelings of power within the coaching client and the generation of an ideal vision towards which the coaching client can work. The ideal vision engages the coaching client sufficiently so that they "give voice to her/his desired future" and affirm their dreams (van Zyl et al., 2020 p.10). The role of the coach primarily is to help the coaching client find the motivation to generate commitment to their dreams so that working towards goals helps them see and feel progress is being made (Van Zyl et al., 2020). The feelings of power help to develop self-efficacy which propels them towards sustainable change and high performance. It is suggested here that only when the coaching client has a clear idea of where they are going that they can voice confidently and articulately to create the conditions in which they perform at their best. However, to consider voice as the goal in itself is unlikely to be helpful because voice is a way of highlighting a need for change, not the change per se. It is the goal to be achieved through the voice which is likely to be the valued prize towards which the coaching client is motivated to work.

Goal Identification

Although identifying a goal is recognised as an important first step in the coaching process, in order to achieve that goal, the client also needs to feel motivated to achieve that goal. Pink (2018) differentiates the goal from the motivation to achieve that goal and highlights the importance of self-determination as a form of power which gives the client the ability to choose what to do, when to do it and how to go about achieving the goal. Whereas others may consider that identifying the goal is, in itself sufficient to motivate someone to achieve it (see Pink 2018 for a philosophical discussion about this point), Deci and Ryan (2010) propose three sources of motivation which are helpful for generating feelings of self-determination and subsequent action to achieve the goal.

Firstly, autonomy which is a recognition of the ability to choose, make decisions that serve oneself and the sense of plotting one's own path towards desired outcomes. Secondly, competence which is the desire to master a skill, recognise and develop personal strengths and develop a reputation for such. And finally, relatedness, which is the desire to build stronger relationships and feelings of connection with others. When utilising the theory of self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2010) in conjunction with the power bases set out by French and Raven (1964), it is possible to conceptualise relatedness as a way of generating referent power and competence as a way of generating expert power. By contrast, informational power can underpin all three: autonomy (by providing data to support decisions), competence (through the ability to talk knowledgeably about a topic) and relatedness (by providing a convincing argument worthy of further conversation). In building on these three sources of motivation, it is possible to generate a sense of personal power subsequently resulting in voice. In this way, the role of coaching will not only help individuals identify a goal, but it will also help them to recognise the power available to them and give them a way to consider how it can be most useful for them in achieving their goal.

As described previously, one of the most important stages within the coaching process is goal identification. However, the process of goal identification can be iterative resulting in altered goal descriptions once the practicalities of goal achievement are considered. For example, there are usually multiple solutions for any problem or concern in the workplace, so working out what type of change is most appropriate might depend on a realistic acknowledgement of what's possible. Following goal identification, it is then important to consider individual motivations underpinning the desire to voice and start a process of change within the organisation. In doing so, personal sources of power are evaluated and the coaching client has a recognition of their perception of self-efficacy as well as considered other variables which are likely to impact the outcome of the voice.

The three questions

The next stage involves identifying a manager who is interested and likely to use their influence to bring about the desired change. Many managers are not interested in listening to employees because they do not believe that they have information that is more important than that which they already have (Detert & Edmondson, 2011), they believe that employees are self-interested and incapable of putting the organisation's needs first (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) and they believe that organisations do not have adequate processes and policies for supporting voice (Peirce, Smolinski, & Rosen, 1998). Furthermore, finding the right time to voice is likely to be important for ensuring impactful voice (Brooks, Richmond & Blenkinsopp, 2023). Therefore, in order to help coaching clients identify how voice can be enacted, we will now consider the three questions which can be used to guide the coaching sessions.

1) What do you want to say?

Being able to articulate what needs to be the focus of voice requires the goal to be identified beforehand. Voicing can be considered as drawing attention to something that needs to change in order to help the coaching client achieve their goal. An example goal could be "To alert a manager to a breach of procedure in order to ensure it doesn't happen again". Therefore, the coaching client is likely to want to share the details of the breach of procedure with a manager who needs to know or who is most likely to make sure it doesn't happen again. This question requires the coaching client to think through exactly what it is that needs to be said and what exactly it is that they would want to see done differently as a result of them bringing this to managerial attention.

2) Who needs to hear it?

There are three key considerations which are required to answer this question: working out who is the most appropriate person; knowing if the most appropriate person is interested in hearing about the voice and if not, who else might be; and identifying how the chosen manager prefers to receive information. The voice mechanism used is also an important consideration here and exploring how powerful or powerless a particular mechanism makes the individual feel can yield important insights

(Brooks, 2018). Overwhelmingly, the literature shows that when employees voice, they want to know that the manager to whom they are voicing will firstly, take them seriously and secondly, not reprimand them in any way (Morrison, 2014). Employees have a lot to lose from voicing in organisations where promotion and ongoing career success relies on being on good terms with managers (Milliken et al., 2003). Unfortunately, voice can sometimes be considered problematic by managers especially if they are only just finding out about problems that they were not aware of previously. Therefore, some managers may not take favourably to voice about such problems without being prepared in advance which can result in damage to the relationship between employee and manager (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). Furthermore, when going to the trouble of voicing, employees want to know that the manager is going to act on the information they have shared with them, rather than brush it under the carpet (Harlos, 2001). In fact, a recent study found that managers who can be trusted to act on voice were more likely to engender voice than managers with whom employees had a good relationship (Hao et al., 2021).

Detert and Edmondson (2011) found that managers want to see facts and figures when being given information on which they are being asked to take action. Facts and figures constitute one form of information and it is important to consider the informational power to which the voicer may have access. Managers do prefer evidence supported by factual information because it is much easier to convince their senior leaders of the need to take action with such evidence. However, it may be important to garner support from a manager in order to gather information in the first place. It is important to explore the type of information that the coaching client has, an appraisal of the robustness of it, and an exploration of opportunities to collect more information to provide a more compelling case. If information is lacking, it could be that the aim of voicing may be to alert the manager to a potential problem and ask for support to gather more information to identify the extent of it.

3) When is the best time to tell them?

Managerial time is often limited and so being clear on what needs to be said is really important to ensure the message is as impactful as possible. It's important to voice when the manager is able to give their full attention to the problem, especially if hearing the voice is likely to be difficult for them to manage. For example, reporting sexual harassment or violent conduct. Booking a meeting is preferable rather than just mentioning something in a corridor. In fact, booking meetings with someone has been shown to signal formality, and should give the indication to managers that something important is about to be discussed (Brooks, 2018). Sharing something with a manager in a private meeting has certain advantages, not least that it's possible to have an open and honest conversation about the subject without others sharing their views on the situation. It has also been found that where there is a poor relationship between the employee and the manager, sharing information in a public meeting can be seen as highly threatening to the manager (Isaakyan, Sherf, Tangirala, & Guenter, 2020). Therefore, information shared with managers in meetings with others present without due warning can be considered highly risky for both employee and manager and may not be the most appropriate route (Detert & Edmondson, 2011).

Conclusion

It is entirely possible, that as a result of coaching around voice, the individual will consider that voicing is not possible or appropriate for any number of reasons. These could include lack of information, overwhelming fear of reprisal or ostracism from the manager based on prior experience, thoughts by the employee that voicing will not make a difference or lack of opportunity to voice to a manager in a way that is most impactful. Ultimately, it is the role of the coach to help the coaching client explore if voicing is the right option for them and if so, how best to go about it. The Coaching as a Route to Voice framework will guide the coach through this process. Given the idiosyncratic nature of voice between employee and manager, there are no specific rules, processes, procedures, policies or voice mechanisms which can be put into place to "fix" the problem of voice. It is a wicked problem requiring innovative and creative solutions (Rittel & Webber, 1973). Coaching

provides an opportunity to explore in depth the relationship between the employee and manager.

For example, the idiosyncratic nature of voice suggests that only the two people involved in the

voice interaction can find a way that works for them. Trust is a key feature of interpersonal

relationships and knowing that a manager will act on information has been shown to be more likely

to encourage voice, more so in fact than disclosure of personal information (Hao et al., 2021).

Therefore, coaching is recommended as a route to voice as a starting point to help coaching clients

work out what their approach to voice might be. The most basic starting point are the three simple

questions: What do you want to say? Who needs to hear it? When is the best time to tell them?

From this, coaching clients can be coached to explore their thoughts, identify a goal, understand

their sources of personal power and work out answers to these questions. Coaching could improve

the number of individuals choosing to speak up by helping them think through different options,

weigh up the advantages and disadvantages in a more considered manner, and help them gain the

confidence to take control of the situation in a way that feels right for them.

References

Anderson, C., & Brion, S. (2014). Perspectives on Power in Organizations. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 67–97. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091259

Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Palanski, M. E. (2012). Exploring the Process of Ethical Leadership: The Mediating Role of Employee Voice and Psychological Ownership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *107*(1), 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1298-2

Botero, I. C., & Van Dyne, L. (2009). Employee voice behavior: Interactive effects of LMX and power distance in the United States and Colombia. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *23*(1), 84–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909335415

Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *27*(3), 342–361. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1446946

Brinsfield, C. T. (2013). Employee Silence Motives : Investigation of Dimensionality and Development of Measures. *Journal of Organization Behavior*, *34*, 671–697. https://doi.org/10.1002/job

Brooks, S. (2018). How Does Perceived Formality Shape Unheard Challenging Voices? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*(5), 995–1014. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1405359

Brooks, S., & Wilkinson, A. (2021). Employee Voice as a Route to Wellbeing. In *Handbook on Management and Employment Practices* (pp. 1–18). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24936-6_16-1

Brooks, S., Richmond, J., & Blenkinsopp, J. (2023). Applying a lens of temporality to better understand voice about unethical behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05505-x

Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: the mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 912–922. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.912

Currie, G., Richmond, J., Faulconbridge, J., Gabbioneta, C., & Muzio, D. (2019). Professional Misconduct in Healthcare: Setting Out a Research Agenda for Work Sociology. *Work, Employment and Society*, *33*(1), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018793352

Davies, K. (1953). Management Communication and the Grapevine. *Harvard Business Review*, 43–49.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). Self-determination. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 1-2.

Detert, J. ., & Burris, E. . (2007). Leadership Behaviour and Employee Voice: Is The Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(4), 869–884.

Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit Voice Theories: Taken-for-Granted Rules of Self-Censorship at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(3), 461–488. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2011.61967925

Duan, J., Lapointe, É., Xu, Y., & Brooks, S. (2019). Why do employees speak up? Examining the roles of LMX, perceived risk and perceived leader power in predicting voice behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *34*(8), 560–572. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2018-0534

Duan, J., Zhou, A. J., & Yu, L. (2022). A dual-process model of voice endorsement. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *33*(18), 3765–3787. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1949624

Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). The Meanings and Purpose of Employee Voice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *15*(6), 1149–1170. https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519041000016773359

Dutton, J. E., & Ashford, S. J. (1993). Selling Issues to Top Management. *The Academy of Management Review*, *18*(3), 397. https://doi.org/10.2307/258903

Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological Safety: The History, Renaissance, and Future of an Interpersonal Construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091305

Francis, R. (2013). *Report of the Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust Public Inquiry*. https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.20044

French, J. R., & Raven, B. (1959). The Bases of Social Power. In D. Cartwight & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group Dynamics* (pp. 150–167). New York: Harper & Row.

Gormley, H., & van Nieuwerburgh, C. (2014). Developing coaching cultures: a review of the literature. *Coaching*, *7*(2), 90–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/17521882.2014.915863

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-Based Approach To Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership Over 25 Years: Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, *6*(2), 219–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-

9843(95)90036-5

Greer, C., & McLaughlin, E. (2013). The Sir Jimmy Savile scandal: Child sexual abuse and institutional denial at the BBC. *Crime, Media, Culture*, *9*, 243–263. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659013513782

Hao, S., Han, P., & Wu, C. (2021). The relationship between two dimensions of felt trust and promotive voice behaviour: The motivational mechanisms. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 36*(8), 592-605.

Harlos, K. P. (2001). When Organizational Voice Systems Fail: More on the Deaf-Ear Syndrome and Frustration Effects. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *37*(3), 324–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886301373005

Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Huang, X., Vliert, E. Van De, & Vegt, G. Van Der. (2005). Breaking the Silence Culture: Stimulation of Participation and Employee Opinion Withholding Cross-nationally. *Management and Organization Review*, *1*(3), 459–482. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2005.00023.x

Isaakyan, S., Sherf, E. ., Tangirala, S., & Guenter, H. (2020). Keeping It Between Us : Managerial Endorsement of Public Versus Private Voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *106*(7), 1049–1066.

Kaufman, B. E. (2015). Theorising Determinants of Employee Voice: An Integrative Model Across Disciplines and Levels of Analysis. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *25*(1), 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12056

Kish-Gephart, J. J., Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., & Edmondson, A. C. (2009). Silenced by Fear:The Nature, Sources, and Consequences of Fear at Work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *29*, 163–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2009.07.002

Knoll, M., Götz, M., Adriasola, E., Al-Atwi, A. A., Arenas, A., Atitsogbe, K. A., … Zacher, H. (2021). International differences in employee silence motives: Scale validation, prevalence, and relationships with culture characteristics across 33 countries. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *42*(5), 619–648. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2512

Liu, S., & Liao, J. (2013). Transformational Leadership and Speaking Up: Power Distance and Structural Distance as Moderators. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *41*(10), 1747–1756. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2013.41.10.1747

Liu, W, Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2013). The Relational Antecedents of Voice Targeted at Different Leaders. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(5), 841–851. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032913

Liu, Wu, Zhu, R., & Yang, Y. (2010). I Warn You Because I Like You: Voice Behavior, Employee Identifications, and Transformational Leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(1), 189–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.014

McClean, E. J., Burris, E. R., & Detert, J. R. (2013). When Does Voice Lead to Exit? It Depends on Leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(2), 525–548. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0041

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. . (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.

The Academy of Management Annals, *5*(1), 373–412.
https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.574506

Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee Voice and Silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 173–197. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091328

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. *Academy of Management Journal*, *25*(4), 706–725.

Morrison, E. W., & Rothman, N. B. (2009). Silence and the Dynamics of Power. In J. Greenberg & M. S. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and Silence in Organizations* (pp. 111–134). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.

Mowbray, P. K., Wilkinson, A., & Tse, H. H. (2015). An integrative review of employee voice: Identifying a common conceptualization and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 17*(3), 382-400.

Nechanska, E., Hughes, E., & Dundon, T. (2020). Towards an integration of employee voice and silence. *Human Resource Management Review, 30*(1), 100674.

Peirce, E., Smolinski, C. A., & Rosen, B. (1998). Why Sexual Harrassment Complaints Fall on Deaf Ears. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *12*(3), 41–54.

Pink, T. (2020). Agents, objects, and their powers in Suarez and Hobbes. In *Philosophy of Action from Suarez to Anscombe* (pp. 9-30). Routledge.

Prouska, R., & Psychogios, A. (2018). Do not say a word! Conceptualizing employee silence in a long-term crisis context. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*(5), 885–914. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1212913

Raven, B. H., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *28*(4), 307–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1998.tb01708.x

Rhodes, C. (2016). Democratic Business Ethics: Volkswagen's Emissions Scandal and the Disruption of Corporate Sovereignty. *Organization Studies*, *37*(10), 1501–1518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840616641984

Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730

Rosen, S., & Tesser, A. (1970). On Reluctance to Communicate Undesirable Information : The MUM Effect. *Sociometry*, *33*(3), 253–263.

Sherf, E. N., Parke, M. R., & Isaakyan, S. (2021). Distinguishing voice and silence at work: Unique relationships with perceived impact, psychological safety, and burnout. *Academy of Management Journal*, *64*(1), 114–148. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2018.1428

Stinchcombe, A. L. (2001). *When Formality Works : Authority and Abstraction in Law and Organizations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Therkelsen, D. J., & Fiebich, C. L. (2003). The supervisor: The linchpin of employee relations. *Journal of Communication Management*, *8*(2), 120–129. https://doi.org/10.1108/13632540410807592

Tost, L. P., Gino, F., & Larrick, R. P. (2013). When Power Makes Others Speechless : The Negative Impact of Leader Power on Team Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(5), 1465–1486.

Tourish, D., & Robson, P. (2003). Critical Upward Feedback in Organisations: Processes, Problems and Implications for Communication Management. *Journal of Communication Management*, *8*(2), 150–167. https://doi.org/10.1108/13632540410807628

Tourish, D., & Vatcha, N. (2005). Charismatic Leadership and Corporate Cultism at Enron: The Elimination of Dissent, the Promotion of Conformity and Organizational Collapse. *Leadership*, *1*(4), 455–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715005057671

van Zyl, L. E., Roll, L. C., Stander, M. W., & Richter, S. (2020). Positive psychological coaching definitions and models: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(May), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00793

Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader Personality Traits and Employee Voice Behavior: Mediating Roles of Ethical Leadership and Work Group Psychological Safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(5), 1275–1286. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015848

Wilkinson, A., Dundon, T., Donaghey, J., & Freeman, R. B. (2014). Employee voice: Charting new terrain. In A. Wilkinson, T. Dundon, J. Donaghey, & R. . Freeman (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Employee Voice* (pp. 3–16). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Xu, M., Qin, X., Dust, S. ., & DiRenzo, M. . (2019). Supervisor-subordinate proactive personality congruence and psychological safety: A signaling theory approach to employee voice behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(4), 440–453.

Yan, T. T., Tangirala, S., Vadera, A. K., & Ekkirala, S. (2021). How Employees Learn to Speak Up From Their Leaders: Gender Congruity Effects in the Development of Voice Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *107*(4), 650–667. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000892

Type of Power	Description
Legitimate Power	Authority to issue orders that should be accepted
Reward Power	Access to valued rewards which will be dispensed in return for compliance
Coercive Power	Access to penalties or sanctions that are considered unwelcome
Referent Power	'Charisma'; a person has desirable abilities and personality traits that can and should be copied
Expert Power	A person has superior knowledge relevant to the situation and task at hand
Informational Power	A person who has access to valuable or important information

Figure 1: French and Raven's five bases of power (1959) further updated to include informational power.

Type of Power	What it means in relation to voice
Legitimate Power	Not available
Reward Power	Not available
Coercive Power	Not available
Referent Power	The ability to convince more senior others of your argument
Expert Power	Being recognised as knowing more about a particular subject
Informational Power	Having more/different information to support your arguments

Figure 2: Bases of power available to a subordinate