Empowering Leadership and Voice Behavior: Mediation Role of Job Autonomy and Proactive Personality

Anida Chairunnisa[1], Debora Elfina Purba[3]
[1,2]Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia
anida.chairunnisa@ui.ac.id

Abstract

Previous research has proven a weak relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior indicating the existence of a psychological mechanism between the two variables. Using trait activation theory, this research aims to explore the role of work autonomy and proactive personality as serial mediators in the relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior.The data collection method was carried out using convenience sampling by distributing online questionnaires to respondents who work in biopharmaceutical technology and health-based companies (N = 155). Data analysis was carried out with SPSS version 25 software using Hayes' PROCESS Macro model 6. The results of the study showed the mediating role of work autonomy and proactive personality significantly and sequentially in the relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior. The implication of this research is the effectiveness of using Trait Activation Theory in explaining the psychological mechanisms of employee Voice behavior. The practical implications of this research are that organizations can provide training to managers to be able to implement empowering leadership so as to give employees the freedom to determine the way they work and activate personality traits that support Voice behavior in employees.

I. Introduction

Employees are the parties who play a role in implementing the company's strategy so that the company encourages its employees to be able to contribute in the form of ideas, suggestions and feedback for the progress of the organization (Hsiung, 2012; Fuller et al., 2007). The results of a survey conducted by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2022) show that employee voice is an indicator of the quality of a job. For organizations, suggestions given by employees can support the organization's sustainability in a competitive environment by improving existing processes(Parker et al., 2010). This is supported by several previous studies which show that employee Voice behavior improves organizational performance, opening up opportunities for reform, innovation, and also crisis prevention(Frazier & Bowler, 2012; Liang et al., 2012; Rasheed et al., 2017). Seeing the important role of employees in the process of conveying ideas and suggestions, employee voice behavior is one of the behaviors needed in the organization. Voice behavior is defined as voluntary behavior in communicating ideas, suggestions and concerns about work-related matters for the sustainability of the organization.(Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

The positive impact of Voice behavior has led researchers and practitioners to explore factors that can encourage or facilitate employees to engage in Voice behavior(Chamberlin et al., 2016; Frazier & Bowler, 2012; H. Hsiung & Tsai, 2017; Liang

et al., 2012; Son, 2018).Detert and Treviño (2010)states that 93% of employees associate leader behavior as a basic decision to express an opinion. Leaders are considered to have autonomy, influence and control over employees (Magee & Galinsky, 2008;Xu et al., 2019). Based on these considerations, many behavioral researchers argue that leaders are an antecedent factor(Duan et al., 2016; A. Gao & Jiang, 2019; Makwetta et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022). Several leader factors such as openness, manager consultation behavior, and coaching have been proven to show a positive relationship with employee Voice behavior (Edmondson, 2003; Detert & Burris, 2007; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2010). However, a shift in research trends in Voice behavior has begun to look at leadership style specifically as an antecedent factor such as transformational leadership, ethical leadership, and empowering leadership.(Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018, 2019; Svendsen et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2022).

Some Voice behavior research states that Empowering Leadership or empowering leadership is an important leader behavior in facilitating Voice behavior(Biemann et al., 2015; Chiang & Chen, 2020; Gao et al., 2011; Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018; Raub & Robert, 2014). Empowering leadership is the behavior of leaders who empower their employees by sharing their power and providing support for development(Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014).Gao et al. (2011a)states that an empowering leadership style has a greater influence on Voice behavior among other leaders. Empowering leadership is considered to create an open environment and is accepted as a signal for employees to express themselves freely, including expressing opinions(Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018). However, from the literature review conducted by researchers, the relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior tends to show a low to moderate correlation coefficient (α = 0.16 - 0.40). This value indicates the role of the mediator in explaining these two variables(Gao & Jiang, 2019; Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018). Several studies have tried to explore individual aspects to explain the mechanism of the relationship between these two variables, such as psychological safety, psychological empowerment and harmonious passion(Gao & Jiang, 2019; Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018; Raub & Robert, 2014)However, there are still few who explore the external aspects or interactions between the two. This research makes a contribution by looking at individual and external aspects simultaneously in exploring the psychological mechanisms of empowering leadership and Voice behavior.

CharacteristicsEmpowering leaders encourage independence in employees to carry out their work independently by providing full authority and support in carrying out their responsibilities (Ahearne et al., 2009; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). Empowerment and support provided by empowering leaders is valued by employees as an opportunity to carry out work independently or what is referred to as job autonomy or work autonomy (Foss et al., 2009). Work autonomy is the level of freedom in scheduling, implementing and making decisions regarding the work you have(Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006).Chiang and Chen (2020)in his research, he found that work autonomy was proven to mediate the relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior. Employees are given the freedom to determine the way they want to work so that they feel they have control and are encouraged to provide opinions related to work.

Another factor that plays a role in determining employee Voice behavior is proactive personality(Crant et al., 2011; Elsaied, 2018; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Proactive personality is defined as the tendency or trait to take initiative or constructive change in the workplace (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Individuals with this personality can identify opportunities and take action to make meaningful changes so they tend to provide suggestions and opinions(Fuller & Marler, 2009; Seibert et al., 1999). However, the impact

of a proactive personality alone is unlikely to emerge in situations isolated from the social environment(Wijaya, 2019). In this research, work autonomy is believed to be able to activate an individual's proactive personality which will encourage the emergence of Voice behavior. This research uses the trait activation theory framework (Tett & Burnett, 2003) which states that certain events, situations or interventions can encourage a personality to emerge or become active. Work is considered to provide opportunities and be a resource that supports proactivity(Li et al., 2014). Behaviors that occur continuously in a job, as well as consequences that reinforce these behaviors, support personality activation(Woods et al., 2020). The perceived experience of freedom to carry out work stimulates the active proactive personality of employees to take responsibility and make proactive steps by voicing their opinions.

This research aims to look at the mechanism of the indirect relationship between empowering leadership and Voice behavior by considering the variables of work autonomy and employee proactive personality as mediators. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to the literature on empowering leadership and Voice behavior by proving the potential dynamic relationship between environment and personality. It is hoped that this research can be used as a reference for future research development related to this topic. Apart from that, testing mechanisms by considering environmental variables in stimulating the emergence of Voice behavior is expected to provide practical benefits for organizations to create a scope that supports the emergence of employee Voice behavior in the workplace.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 Voice Behavior
a. Definition of Voice behavior

Voice behavior is behavior in voicing ideas, suggestions, opinions and concerns related to work carried out voluntarily with the aim of improving organizational and unit functioning (Detert & Burris, 2007; Detert & Treviño, 2010; Dyne et al., 2003; Morrison, 2011; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). The conceptualization of Voice behavior was initially defined as an effort to bring about change in an organization (Hirschman, 1970). However, this concept is considered too broad which still classifies acts of protest and complaint into this behavior (Bashshur & Oc, 2014; Hirschman, 1970). Van Dyne and LePine (1998) then refined the concept of Voice behavior as the behavior of voicing opinions to challenge the status quo with the intention of improving the existing situation, which was then referred to as challenging-promotive behavior. Over time, several researchers began to develop conceptualizations of Voice behavior based on the messages conveyed. Liang et al. (2012) divides the concept of Voice behavior into promotive voice behavior which is an expression put forward by members of the organization to improve existing work procedures and prohibitive voice behavior as an expression of concern about work implementation that could endanger the organization.

Morrison (2011) states that the characteristics of Voice behavior are that it is expressed verbally, is discretionary and constructive. Voice behavior is conveyed in the form of a message from the sender to the recipient of the message which is voluntary or the individual has the freedom to do so or not. Voice behavior also has a constructive nature or the expression conveyed is not just a complaint but aims to bring about positive change.

Seeing the development of existing conceptualizations in behavioral research has made researchers look again at the need for research being carried out. The differences between the constructs developed by Liang et al. (2012) is on individual intentions in conveying their opinions, while the unitary construct focuses on the Voice behavior that emerges from employees (Dedahanov et al., 2019). Adopting the concept developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998), this thesis uses a unitary construct to look at the behavior that appears in employees, how employees communicate and convey their opinions.

b. Factors and Impact of Voice behavior

Several previous studies have explored factors that can influence an individual's decision to engage in Voice behavior, one of which is dispositional factors. Disposition factors explain the characteristics that a person specifically possesses and differentiates him from other individuals so that some individuals have a higher tendency to voice their voices than others. This disposition factor consists of personality factors such as conscientiousness, extraversion and proactive personality which have a positive relationship to Voice behavior (Crant et al., 2011; Naus et al., 2007; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Individuals with conscientiousness personalities are more open to being involved in conversations aimed at bringing about change and on the other hand individuals who have extraversion personalities feel more comfortable speaking up (Morrison, 2014). There are other individual factors that have been proven to be antecedents of Voice behavior, including openness to change or opportunities, a sense of enthusiasm and a good mood (Chamberlin et al., 2016; LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Liang & Gong, 2013; Maynes & Podsakoff , 2014; Tenhiälä & Lount, 2013). Other factors such as positive feelings that employees have towards their work, job autonomy and the ability to apply it have also been proven to play a positive role in Voice behavior (Burris, 2012; Lam & Mayer, 2014; Liu et al., 2014; Morrison, 2011).

On the other hand, there are contextual factors or external factors that relate to an individual's assessment of opinion, such as stressors, social environment and work climate (Chamberlin et al., 2016; GL Lee et al., 2014; Y. Zhang et al., 2014) . Contextual factors are considered to provide clues for individuals to find out whether their work environment is conducive enough to voice their opinions (Morrison, 2011). However, among several existing contextual factors, leader factors and leader behavior have the most influence on employee Voice behavior (Chamberlin et al., 2016; Detert & Burris, 2007; Detert & Treviño, 2010; HH Hsiung, 2012; Y. Li & Sun, 2015; Svendsen et al., 2018). Several studies show that leaders who are open to employee opinions and show consultation behavior make employees more courageous in voicing their opinions (Detert & Burris, 2007; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2010). Apart from that, leadership styles such as transformational leadership, ethical leadership and empowering leadership have also been proven to have a positive relationship with Voice behavior (Chiang & Chen, 2020; Raub & Robert, 2014; Svendsen et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2022).

On the other hand, a number of literatures prove that Voice behavior has a positive relationship to performance and is seen as a form of loyalty to the organization (Detert & Treviño, 2010; Detert et al., 2013; MacKenzie et al., 2011; Nemeth et al., 2001) Voice behavior also has a relationship to the level of employee involvement, job satisfaction, and reduces employees' desire to quit their jobs (I. Hassan et al., 2016; Koyuncu et al., 2013; McClean et al., 2013; Nemeth et al., 2001). However, Burris (2012) shows the negative impact of Voice behavior. In his research, Voice behavior, especially individuals who engage in challenging voice behavior, receive low support and work evaluations. Apart from that, Voice behavior is also positively related to group performance such as

productivity, performance appraisal, and creativity (Frazier & Bowler, 2012; I. Hassan et al., 2016; AN Li et al., 2017; Rees et al., 2013).

c. Measuring Voice behavior

In a literature review conducted by researchers, Voice behavior was first introduced by Hirschman (1970) in the EVLN (Exit, Voice, Loyalty and Neglect) framework. In this research, Hirschman (1970) stated that Voice behavior is a response to job dissatisfaction felt by employees. Farrell (1983) describes these 4 behaviors into several dimensions through expert judgment using multidimensional scaling (MDS). However, as time went by, research began to focus only on Voice behavior and there were several measurements of Voice behavior that researchers found. The concept and tools for measuring Voice behavior were formulated by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) which are unidimensional with 6 items. In research, Chiang and Chen (2020) reported that this measuring instrument had a good reliability value of 0.94. Then Van Dyne et al. (2003) developed a conceptualization of Voice behavior based on intention or motivation, and divided it into 3 types, namely ProSocial Voice, Defensive Voice, and Acquiescent Voice. Liang et al. (2012) tested this previously developed conceptualization and developed a new scale called the Employee Voice Behavior Scale. Different from before, Liang et al. (2012) focuses on only 2 dimensions, namely promotive and prohibitive voice which are represented through 11 items. However, most research still uses the Voice behavior measuring tool developed by Van Dyne and LePine (1998) as well as this thesis which uses this measuring tool with the consideration of seeing the Voice behavior carried out by employees as a consequence that arises from the empowerment carried out by the leader. .

2.2 Empowering Leadership
a. Definition of Empowering Leadership

Empowering leadership is defined as efforts made by leaders to motivate and encourage the ability of employees to work independently in achieving organizational goals and strategies through providing autonomy, support and development (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). There are two different perspectives in conceptualizing the construct of an empowering leader. In the socio-structure approach, researchers see empowering leadership as a managerial practice that focuses on empowering behavior carried out by leaders (Arnold et al., 2000; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Manz & Sims Jr., 1990; Strauss, 1964) whereas Other approaches see it as a reaction to the psychological state of employee perceptions (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). In developing the concept of empowering leaders, several researchers conceptualized empowering leadership behavior with several dimensions. According to Arnold et al. (2000) there are five dimensions of empowering leadership, including leading by example, participation in decision making, training, providing information and attention given to employees. show concern). In contrast to Ahearne et al. (2005) which states that the freedom given by leaders to their members to carry out tasks independently fosters motivation through a sense of meaningful work, participation in decision making, expression of self-confidence in high performance among employees and freedom from existing bureaucratic obstacles. However, Amundsen and Martinsen (2014) review that providing autonomy alone is not enough, there needs to be motivation which is also accompanied by support for employees to work independently as well as providing training in the use of this authority. They then develop new dimensions of empowering leadership behavior that include autonomy support and development.

b. Factors and Impact of Empowering Leadership

As far as researchers can see, research on the antecedents of empowering leadership is still relatively limited (Tang et al., 2020). Researchers divide the factors underlying empowering leadership into two, namely internal factors and external factors. Leaders' character and values are one of the factors that can predict their motivation to participate in EL. These internal factors consist of leader humility, leader conscientiousness, leader global and organizational self-esteem, and leader power distance orientation (Hakimi et al., 2010; Ou et al., 2014; Srivastava & Vyas, 2015; Tang et al., 2020; van Knippenberg et al., 2021). On the other hand, external factors can be further divided into factors originating from organizational members such as level of readiness, proactive behavior of members, team performance and affective conditions within the team (Han et al., 2019; Smallfield et al., 2020; Srivastava & Vyas, 2015). Apart from these factors, there are also organizational factors such as organizational culture and task characteristics which are considered to have a relationship with empowering leadership (Srivastava & Vyas, 2015).

On the other hand, much empowering leadership research focuses on proving the positive impact it produces. At the group level, empowering leaders have a positive relationship with the level of efficacy, psychological empowerment, creativity, innovation, knowledge sharing, and team proactive behavior (Srivastava et al., 2006; Lorinkova et al., 2013; Martin et al., 2013; Oedzes et al., 2019; Tang et al., 2020). At the individual level, empowering leadership has also been proven to improve work performance, creativity, OCB behavior and employee opinions (Cheong et al., 2016; S. Lee et al., 2017; N. Li et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2017; ., 2018; Zhang & Zhou, 2014). Employees who feel empowerment from their leaders believe that they are carrying out meaningful work and have an impact on those around them, so they tend to have a desire to work independently and show adaptive behavior, namely by doing things outside of their duties, which then underlies employees to be involved in OCB behavior (Kim et al., 2018; Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Martin, Liao, & Campbell, 2013; Spreitzer, 2008a).

c. Measurement of Empowering Leadership

To differentiate empowering leaders from other types of leadership, in the process of developing this construct researchers developed and validated a measuring tool for empowering leadership. Cheong et al., (2018) in a meta-analysis research categorized this measuring tool based on its use as Leadership Empowerment Behavior (LEB) (Ahearne et al., 2005), Empowerment Leadership Scale (ELS) (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014), and Leader The Empowering Behavior Questionnaire (LEBQ) is a measuring tool that can be used to measure empowering leadership at the individual level, while the External Leader Behaviors developed by Kirkman & Rosen (1997) are used at the group level. However, the most frequently used measuring tool that can be used to analyze empowering leadership at the individual and group level is the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) (Arnold et al., 2000). Cheong et al., (2018) stated that the appropriate measurement of leadership empowerment if it corresponds to the level of analysis described in theories, models and hypotheses. With these considerations in mind, this thesis uses the Empowerment Leadership Scale (ELS) (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014) to measure the level of empowerment carried out by leaders towards employees.

2.3 Work Autonomy (Job Autonomy)
a. Definition of Job Autonomy

Job Autonomy or work autonomy was originally defined as the level of freedom an individual has in carrying out their duties (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). However, over

time, this concept developed and is defined as the extent to which a job provides freedom and flexibility to the individual in scheduling work, making decisions and determining procedures in its implementation (Gao & Jiang, 2019; Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006; Robbins & Judge, 2013). Job autonomy is one of the dimensions in the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Motivation research often uses a job design approach - one of which is job autonomy - to see how elements of work can increase or decrease a person's effort (Robbins & Judge, 2017). With a high level of work autonomy, employees have self-efficacy and confidence in controlling results (Grant & Ashford, 2008; Peng et al., 2021). On the other hand, a low level of autonomy makes employees reluctant to engage in risky behavior (Wang & Cheng , 2010).

b. Factors and Impact of Work Autonomy

A number of literatures prove that work autonomy has several positive consequences. Individuals with a high level of autonomy feel more motivated to carry out their duties because they feel responsible and involved in their work (Dedahanov et al., 2019; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). This is proven in Hassan's (2014) research that work autonomy has a positive relationship with job involvement. Work autonomy also has a relationship with Voice behavior, creativity and engagement (Chiang & Chen, 2020; Svendsen et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2017). However, on the other hand, Ng and Feldman (2014) stated that individuals with a high level of autonomy do not always have a positive work attitude, good level of well-being and positive performance. This is supported by Langfred et al. (2004) which proves a negative relationship between the level of autonomy and performance.

On the other hand, for antecedents, leaders are considered to be an influencing factor because they have the authority to regulate existing work methods. Several studies show that transformational leadership and ethical leadership are factors of work autonomy (Hammond et al., 2015; Jain & Duggal, 2018; Piccolo et al., 2010). Apart from that, empowering leadership is considered to be able to provide employees with work autonomy (Chiang & Chen, 2020; Hassi et al., 2021). The characteristics of empowering leaders who give authority to their employees and support motivation for developing the ability to work independently and take initiative can increase employee work autonomy (Amundsen & Martinsen, 2014). Autonomy can be strengthened by giving followers the opportunity to lead themselves, as well as inspiring them to learn and develop in the workplace (Manz & Sims, 2001).

III. Research Method

This research was conducted at the individual level with the population used being employees who work in technology and health-based industries (biopharmaceuticals) with a minimum work period of 3 months. This sample selection followed the suggestions of Liu et al. (2013) that the most appropriate context to demonstrate the positive potential of empowering leadership is in an environment based on science and professionalism. Employees in high-tech industries are required to continuously make changes, while the health and biopharmaceutical industries are organizational contexts with high risks, so speaking up is needed.(Weiss et al., 2016, 2017; Zhu et al., 2022). Choosing a work period of 3 months is considered sufficient time for employees to get to know the job and superiors (Mayfield & Mayfield, 1998). Convenience sampling technique was used in this research as a sampling method based on the ease of researchers in obtaining samples that meet the criteria for inclusion in the research. (Cozby & Bates, 2018).

IV. Result and Discussion

4.1 Demographics of Research Respondents

The total number of respondents to this study was 155 people out of a total of 239 respondents who participated (response rate 65%). Respondents who did not meet the participant criteria and respondents who answered distractor questions incorrectly and did not fill out the questionnaire completely were not included in data processing.

The demographic description of respondents in this research will explain the characteristics of respondents consisting of gender, age, education level, length of service, and industry where they work. The conclusion about the demographic picture of respondents can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

Participant Characteristics	Total Sample	
	n	%
Gender		
Woman	70	45
Man	85	55
Level of education		
SMA / SMK / MA	3	1.9
Diploma	2	1.3
S1	115	74.2
S2	34	21.9
S3	1	0.6
Length of work		
3-11 months	38	24.5
1-5 years	59	38.1
6-10 years	25	16.1
11-15 years	14	9
16-20 years old	12	7.7
21-25 years old	4	2.6
>25 years	3	1.9
Industry		
Technology Based	62	40
Health/Biopharmaceuticals	93	60

From the table above, it can be seen that the research respondents were male, namely 85 people (55%) while the number of female respondents was 70 people (45%). Apart from that, the majority of respondents also indicated that they were at the Bachelor's level (74.2%) followed by the Master's level (21.9%). The total number of respondents from the health/biopharmaceutical industry was 93 people and 62 people came from technology-based industries.

Correlation analysis was carried out to see the relationship between research variables. The results of the correlation test can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation between Variables

	Mean	elementary school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	37.8	12.58							
2. Gender	-	-	,035						
3. Education a	-	-	.126	,035					
4. Work Period	2.84	1.71	.77**	,00	,057				
5. Empowering Leadership	4.84	,599	**,199***	,067	-.131	.127			
6. Job Autonomy	5.05	,655	**.26***	-.010	-.007	.135	**.59***		
7. Voice Behavior	5.07	,653	**.29***	-114.	-.150	**.24***	**.44***	**.47***	
8. Proactive Personality	4.77	,610	**.28***	-0.58	,001	.128	**.44***	**.47***	**.52***

*p < .05. **p < .01. a Education dummy code: 1 = SMA/ MA/ MK; 2 = Diploma; 3 = Bachelor's degree; 4 = Master; 5 = Doctorate

From the results of the correlation test, it can be seen that empowering leadership has a positive correlation with work autonomy (r = .59, p < .01); Voice behavior (r = .44, p < .01) and proactive personality (r = .44, p < .01). This indicates that the level of leader empowerment influences other research variables. The results of the analysis also show that research respondents have high scores on all research variables, one of which is Voice behavior (M = 5.07; SD = 6.53). However, if you look at the respondents' work period, the average time span is 2.84 years (SD = 1.71), which shows slightly different results from research conducted byTangirala and Ramanujam (2008). This indicates that employees in technology and health/biopharmaceutical-based industries still have the opportunity to voice their opinions even though they have not had a long tenure. On the other hand, demographic factors, age and years of service have a significant relationship to the research variables. This supports researchers to control these two variables.

Research hypothesis testing was carried out using*Hayes' PROCESS Macros*model 6 on the SPSS version 25 tool to see the serial mediation relationship. The results showed that empowering leadership predicted employee Voice behavior (total effect = 0.06, p = .47, 95%CI; [.007, .1193]). Hypothesis 1 which states that empowering leadership predicts employee empowerment behavior positively and significantly is accepted in this research and is supported by the data. In testing Hypothesis 2, researchers controlled demographic factors in the form of age, length of service and gender. This study examines the mediating role of work autonomy and proactive personality. The results of serial mediation testing support this hypothesis with total effect = 0.17, 95%CI; [.005, .35]. The research results and relationships between variables can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of serial mediation hypothesis tests

	β	se	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
Direct Relationships						
EL→JA	.3047	.0362	8,428	,000	.2333	.3762
EL→PP	.1455	.0482	3,019	,003	.0503	.2407
JA→PP	.2716	.0897	3,029	,003	.0944	.4488
EL→VB	.0600	.0300	1.9996	.0474	,007	.1193
JA→VB	.1298	,559	4,224	.0215	.0194	.2402

39

PP→VB	.2092	.0495	1,403	,000	.1113	.3071
Total Effect	.0600	.0300	1.9996	.0474	,007	.1193
Indirect Relationships						
EL→JA→VB	.0396	.0191			.0016	.0774
EL→PP→VB	.0304	.0127			.0090	.0598
EL→JA→PP→VB	.0173	.0076			.0049	.0348

EL = Empowering leadership (Empowerment leader); JA = Job Autonomy (work autonomy); VB = Voice behavior (Voice behavior); PP = Proactive Personality;LLCI=lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence

4.2 Discussion

This research aims to answer the question of whether empowering leaders have a direct impact on Voice behavior. This research proves that there is a significant positive relationship between empowering leaders and Voice behavior. These results show the same results as previous research that empowering leaders is one of the leader behaviors that can encourage employees to give their opinions.(Chiang & Chen, 2020; Jada & Mukhopadhyay, 2018, 2019; Li et al., 2018). Empowerment leaders share their authority with employees, thereby motivating employees to offer their suggestions. However, the direct relationship effect shown indicates a weak effect on these two variables, thus supporting the researcher's assumption to carry out further review of the mediating role that arises. This research tries to prove that there is a psychological mechanism that employees feel so they are moved to voice their opinions when leaders show an empowering attitude.

The theoretical framework of Trait Activation Theory (TAT) is used to explain that context can encourage individuals to activate basic traits as a relevant way of responding to the situation.(Tett & Burnett, 2003). This research proposes empowering leadership behavior as an external factor that focuses on developing employees' self-leadership so that they take responsibility for what they do. Providing training in the use of authority as a dimension of empowering leadership provides experience for employees in managing work independently. The results of this study support previous research which shows a positive relationship between empowering leaders and work autonomy(Hassi et al., 2021; Kim & Beehr, 2018). This indicates the role of leaders in determining how employees work.

Second, from the research resultsshows that the freedom of work experienced by employees is considered a relevant context for the basic nature of proactive personality so that it will be activated. Individuals with a proactive personality will carry out their work with a proactive approach such as identifying opportunities and bringing about meaningful change(Li et al., 2014;Seibert et al., 1999).Employees will be more active in voicing their opinions and providing ideas related to work as shown by the positive relationship shown by a proactive personality and Voice behavior(Elsaied, 2018; Xie et al., 2014).

This research contributes to research on empowering leaders, especially in their role in determining employee Voice behavior. The research results show that there is a role for work autonomy and proactive personality in explaining this relationship. Most research on the mediation of empowering leaders and Voice behavior focuses on only one factor.Jada & Mukhopadhyay (2019)is the only study that attempts to explore serial mediation between empowering leaders and Voice behavior from the leader's perspective. This research strengthens the existence of a series of external factors, namely leadership and task characteristics which activate an individual's personality so that Voice behavior is formed. Apart from that, this research also contributes to the use of Trait Activation Theory in explaining how environmental aspects can activate individual traits and behavior.

On the other hand, this research provides practical contributions that can be used as suggestions for organizations or leaders in encouraging certain behavior. The results of this research prove that leaders implementing empowerment behavior can encourage employees to voice their opinions, especially for technology and health/biopharmaceutical based industries. Organizations can implement training and education programs for leaders and management so that empowering behavior can be implemented by every organizational leader. This is supported by experimental studies conducted byCougot et al. (2022)in the health industry that the implementation of empowerment leadership will be more effective if it is applied at every layer of the organization, especially the management because this leadership style will influence the practices of other leaders. Seeing the large role of management in influencing leadership practices, providing coaching and mentoring programs can also be implemented by organizations so that a leadership relay can occur. Apart from that, the results of this research can also be used as suggestions for organizational selection programs. This research proves the positive impact of individuals with proactive personalities. Organizations need to consider proactive personality aspects as criteria in the candidate selection process which is supported by the results of meta-analysis in previous research which shows proactive personality to be a valid predictor of several indicators of work performance and career success compared to the Big Five Factors.(Fuller & Marler, 2009; Thomas et al., 2010; Tornau & Frese, 2013).

IV. Conclusion

This research explains the stages in explaining the mechanism for forming Voice behavior in an organizational context. The use of Trait Activation Theory explains that there are environmental factors that can activate latent traits possessed by individuals, thereby encouraging the emergence of certain behaviors.Although this research provides theoretical and practical contributions, there are several limitations so that it can be used as a development suggestion for similar research in the future. This research only describes the mechanisms that occur in the relationship between leaders, job characteristics and subordinates. Future research can develop the research model by exploring other variables at the group or organizational level such as organizational culture and organizational climate. Apart from that, in research methods, multisource techniques for Voice behavior variables can be carried out so that the assessment will be more objective. The use of longitudinal studies can also be carried out to capture the dynamics of personality and behavior that emerge over time as well as temporal separation can be used in self-reports to reduce bias resulting from respondents in remembering questions and the tendency to use the same answers.(Podsakoff et al., 2003).

References

Abhishek Srivastava, Kathryn M Bartol, & Edwin a Locke. (2006). Epowering Leadership in Management Teams: Effects on Knowledge Sharing, Efficacy, and Performance. Academy of Management Journal, 49(6), 1239.

Ahearne, M., Mathieu, J., & Rapp, A. (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? An empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90(5), 945–955. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.945

Amundsen, S., & Martinsen, Ø. L. (2014). Empowering leadership: Construct clarification, conceptualization, and validation of a new scale. Leadership Quarterly, 25(3), 487–

511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.009

Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., Rhoades, J. A., & Drasgow, F. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21(3), 249–269. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(200005)21:3<249::aid-job10>3.0.co;2-%23

Askim, K., Czajkowski, N. O., & Knardahl, S. (2022). Exploring dynamic relationships between employees' personalities and psychosocial work factors. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 31(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1912016

Bashshur, M.R., & Oc, B. (2014). When Voice Matters: A Multilevel Review of the Impact of Voice in Organizations. Journal of Management, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314558302

Burris, E.R. (2012). The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice. Academy of Management Journal, 55(4), 851–875. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0562

Campion, M. A., & Thayer, P. W. (1985). Development and Field Evaluation of an Interdisciplinary Measure of Job Design. Journal of Applied Psychology, 70(1), 29–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.70.1.29

Chamberlin, M., Newton, D. W., & LePine, J. A. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Voice and its Promotive and Prohibitive Forms: Identification of Key Associations, Distinctions and Future Research Directions. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12185.

Detert, J.R., & Burris, E.R. (2007). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voucher: Is the Door Really Open? Academy of Management Journal, 50(4), 869–884.

Detert, J.R., & Treviño, L.K. (2010). Speaking up to higher-ups: How supervisors and skip-level leaders influence employee voice. Organization Science, 21(1), 249–270. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0405

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, Voice, Negkct Job Loyalty, as Responses Dissatisfaction: Multidimensional Scaling. The Academy of Management Journal, 26(4), 596–607. http://www.jstor.org/stable/255909

Field, A., Miles, J., & Field, Z. (2012). Discovering statistics using R. In Sage. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.50-2114

Gao, L., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011a). Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviors. The Leadership Quarterly, 22, 787–798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.015

Gao, L., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011b). Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviors. Leadership Quarterly, 22(4), 787–798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.05.015

Hakimi, N., van Knippenberg, D., & Giessner, S. (2010). Leader empowering behavior: The leader's perspective. British Journal of Management, 21(3), 701–716. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00703.x

Hammond, M., Cleveland, J. N., O'Neill, J. W., Stawski, R. S., & Tate, A. J. (2015). Mediators of transformational leadership and the work-family relationship. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30(4), 454–469. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-10-2011-0090

Jain, P., & Duggal, T. (2018). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, emotional intelligence and job autonomy: Empirical analysis on the moderating and mediating variables. Management Research Review, 41(9), 1033–1046. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-01-2018-0029

Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). Can Empowering Leaders Affect Subordinates' Well-

Being and Careers Because They Encourage Subordinates' Job Crafting Behaviors? Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 25(2), 184–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817727702

Koyuncu, M., Burke, R., Fixenbaum, L., & Tekin, Y. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee voice behavior among front-line employees in Turkish hotels. Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research, 24(3), 427–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2013.804425

Lam, C.F., & Mayer, D.M. (2014). When do employees speak up for their customers? A model of voice in a customer service context. Personnel Psychology, 67(3), 637–666. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12050

Li, N., Chiaburu, D.S., & Kirkman, B.L. (2017). Cross-Level Influences of Empowering Leadership on Citizenship Behavior: Organizational Support Climate as a Double-Edged Sword. Journal of Management, 43(4), 1076–1102. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314546193

Makwetta, J. J., Deli, Y., Sarpong, F. A., Sekei, V. S., Khan, K. Z., & Meena, M. E. (2021). Effects of Empowering Leadership on Employee Voice Behavior: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment. Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, 10(4), 125–133. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.pbs.20211004.11

Morrison, E. W. (2011). The Academy of Management Annals 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

Nemeth, C. J., Connell, J. B., Rogers, J. D., & Brown, K. S. (2001). Improving decision making by means of dissent. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31(1), 48–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02481.x

Oedzes, J.J., Rink, F.A., Walter, F., & Van Der Vegt, G.S. (2019). Informal Hierarchy and Team Creativity: The Moderating Role of Empowering Leadership. Applied Psychology, 68(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12155

Ou, AY, Tsui, A.S., Kinicki, A.J., Waldman, D.A., Xiao, Z., & Song, L.J. (2014). Humble Chief Executive Officers' Connections to Top Management Team Integration and Middle Managers' Responses. Administrative Science Quarterly, 59(1), 34–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213520131

Parker, S.K., Bindl, U.K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. Journal of Management, 36(4), 827–856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310363732

Peng, Q., Zhong, X., Liu, S., Zhou, H., & Ke, N. (2021). Job autonomy and knowledge hiding: the moderating roles of leader reward omission and person–supervisor fit. Personnel Review, 51(9), 2371–2387. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2020-0133

Rees, C., Alfes, K., & Gatenby, M. (2013). The International Journal of Human Employee voice and engagement : connections and consequences. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24(14), 2780–2789. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.763843

Rezwan, R.B., & Takahashi, Y. (2022). Retention intention: does having a proactive personality matter? Personnel Review, 51(2), 528–542. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2020-0073

Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 84(3), 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-04-2014-0139

Smallfield, J., Hoobler, J.M., & Kluemper, D.H. (2020). How team helping influences abusive and empowering leadership: The roles of team affective tone and

performance. In Journal of Organizational Behavior (Vol. 41, Issue 8). https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2450

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Exploring Nonlinearity in Employee Voice: The Effects of Personal Control and Organizational Identification. Academy of Management Journal, 51(6), 1189–1203.

Tangirala, S., Kamdar, D., Venkataramani, V., & Parke, M.R. (2013). Doing right versus getting ahead: The effects of duty and achievement orientations on employees' voice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 98(6), 1040–1050. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033855

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41(1), 108–119. https://doi.org/10.2307/256902

van Knippenberg, D., Giessner, S.R., Sleebos, E., & van Ginkel, W.P. (2021). A motivated information processing perspective on the antecedents of empowering leadership. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 51(2), 79–89. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12718

Woods, S. A., Wille, B., Wu, C. huei, Lievens, F., & De Fruyt, F. (2019). The influence of work on personality trait development: The demands-affordances Transactional (DATA) model, an integrative review, and research agenda. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 110, 258–271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.11.010

Woods, S.A., Edmonds, G.W., Hampson, S.E., & Lievens, F. (2020). How our work influences who we are: Testing a theory of vocational and personality development over fifty years. Journal of Research in Personality, 85, 103930. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103930

Xie, J., Chu, X., Zhang, J., & Huang, J. (2014). Proactive personality and voice behavior: The influence of voice self-efficacy and delegation. Social Behavior and Personality, 42(7), 1191–1200. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.7.1191

Xle, J., Chu, X., Zhang, J., & Huang, J. (2014). Proactive personality and voice behavior: The influence of voice self-efficacy and delegation. Social Behavior and Personality, 42(7), 1191–1200. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.7.1191

Zhang, X., & Zhou, J. (2014). Empowering leadership, uncertainty avoidance, trust, and employee creativity: Interaction effects and a mediating mechanism. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 124(2), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.02.002

Zhang, Y., Lepine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair⋯ or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor-job performance relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 57(3), 675–697. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.1110