Research Purpose

- To examine the impact of cultural differences on employees’ voice behavior as a response to dissatisfactory situation at work.

- If culture makes a difference in the application of existing voice related model in the non-western cultural setting to elaborate the characteristics of employees’ response to their dissatisfactory situation at work?
Background

- How employees respond to their dissatisfaction at work?
- Employee voice literature since Hirschman (1980)’s exit-voice model
- Very little studies in voice literature examining how culture affects employees’ responses to dissatisfaction
- Lee and Jablin (1992), Price, et. al. (2001), and Botero and Van Dyne (2009)

Limitations
- Lack of theoretical rationale
- Student samples
- Simply relying on Hofestede’s culture dimension score
Boundary Conditions

- Only with some culture example: Confucianism, especially in Korea
- Natives grown and working in their original culture
- Focused on country-level culture: not organizational or industrial level culture
- Voice as response to dissatisfactory situation at work: not voice as a type of OCB
Theoretical Framework

- Kozan (1997)’s the three culture models of conflict management
- Why from Conflict MGT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflict MGT</th>
<th>Response to dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>About how people cognate and behave at work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: Especially to what <strong>unfavorable or negative situation</strong> that they want to improve or change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td>Sharing three inherent characteristics of voice behaviors (Liu et. al, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: discretionary, challenge-oriented, and potential risky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>Toward individual, group, or org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In reality</strong></td>
<td>Can be overlapped in real work situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>: ex) supervisor’s unfair treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td>By individual, group, or org</td>
<td>By individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Kozan (1997)’s three models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harmony model</th>
<th>Confrontational model</th>
<th>Regulative model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td>Interdependence and harmony</td>
<td>Fair play, mutual concessions, problem-solving approach</td>
<td>Universalistic principles and rules with bureaucratic arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotions</strong></td>
<td>Suppression of negative emotions</td>
<td>Expression of negative emotions</td>
<td>Expression of negative emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>Avoidance and accommodation</td>
<td>Confrontation and compromise</td>
<td>Avoidance or forcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome criteria</strong></td>
<td>Face-saving concern</td>
<td>Due process concerns</td>
<td>Due process concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third parties</strong></td>
<td>Frequent, intrusive, informal</td>
<td>Infrequent, planned, non-intrusive</td>
<td>Formal appeal systems, adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third-party emphasis</strong></td>
<td>Harmony, shame</td>
<td>Reason, fairness (equity)</td>
<td>Reason, general principles (equality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example</strong></td>
<td>Asian countries</td>
<td>Individualistic, English-speaking countries</td>
<td>Continental European countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretical Framework

- Confucianism

  Originally a philosophy of human nature that regards "proper" human relationships as the basis of society

  Urges to adapt the collectivity, to control their own emotions, to avoid confusion, competition and conflict, and to maintain inner harmony (Kirkbride et. al., 1991)

- Which values in Confucian culture?

  Transformed into work place setting (Kirkbride et. al., 1991, Friedman et. al., 2006, Moore, 1967, Tse, et. al., 1988)

  Harmony and collectivism, Conflict-avoiding, Face-saving
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Propositions

- Proposition 1: As a response to dissatisfaction at work, employees in the Confucian culture will be more likely to show harmony style of response, which is characterized as **high value of harmony**, suppression of negative emotions, conflict avoiding and accommodating behaviors, emphasizing face-saving concern.

- Proposition 2: In the Confucian culture, some predictors of employees’ response to dissatisfaction will not have as significant relationship with their choice, was supported in the previous empirical study with the sample of the Western, mostly U.S. sample: for instance, despite of high job dissatisfaction will not lead high voice behaviors that are supported in the previous empirical study with the sample of the Western.
Propositions

Proposition 3: As far as voice behavior is concerned, employees in the Confucian culture will have different likelihood of certain type of voice behaviors to that in the U.S.: for instance, compared to the U.S. employees, Korean employees will be less likely to voice directly to supervisors which was shown most likely in the U.S. sample.