



H A R V A R D | B U S I N E S S | S C H O O L

**Rising Scholars Conference
Voice and Identity Student Research Presentations**

Tianna Barnes

barnest@wharton.upenn.edu

University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Tianna Barnes is a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Pennsylvania in the Wharton School. Her research interests sit at the intersection of identity and stigma. Here, she primarily studies the concept of identity reconstruction or how an individual's self-concept will adapt, refine, and redefine itself as a reaction to both social and work experiences.

ABSTRACT:

When Moral Identity Lapses: Extending Prosocial Behaviors Through a Social Moral Identity

Moral motivations inform both the direction and strength of our altruism. Much of the *why* and *how* around helping behaviors is determined by our moral motivations. The amalgam of these motivational networks is reflected in our moral identities. Defined as a type of social identity, a moral identity represents a valued set of moral traits (Blasi, 1984). Our valued morals, and ultimately moral motivations, may reflect a larger collective group (e.g., religious affiliation), or some abstract importance (e.g., Golden Rule), among many other sources (Reed & Aquino, 2003). Current moral identity literature acknowledges moral source ambiguity yet does not lean into the potential consequences of moral source salience and specification. Varying moral sources are likely to impact individual moral motivations in significantly different ways, ultimately influencing moral behaviors. Herein lies the primary realization for this research.

This work seeks to answer the question of what effect moral identity has on individual moral motivations and subsequent expressions of prosocial behavior given distinct moral sources. Using a social-cognitive model and a situation-trait relevant theory, this research considers the different moral motivations, contingencies, and outcomes that result from variations in moral source salience and specification. This work considers two types of moral sources—a specific ingroup source unique to an individual (i.e., social moral identity; SMI) as compared to an abstract source (i.e., abstract moral identity;AMI).

Methods and Results

Four experimental studies were conducted to examine these distinct moral identity sources. Study 1 assessed main and moderating effects of each moral identity source on prosocial behaviors. The second study explored similar relationships but with the inclusion of qualitative measures and moral motivations as an outcome. Study 3 tested the mediating influence of identity representation, or the participant's belief that they are a positive model or "representative" of their unique ingroup source. A fourth analysis was run with SMI as a construct to determine discriminant validity. Study results support that SMI source salience and specification is a more significant and positive predictor of prosocial motivations and expressions, as compared to an AMI source. This effect is most notable when a participant perceives that their organization and/or team members align with their ingroup. The results also support that identity representation is a significant mediator for the relationship between an SMI and prosocial motivations and behaviors. Lastly, we find that an SMI is also significantly different from a general social identity.

Implications

Theoretically, we develop a dual moral motivational process model to illustrate differences across specific versus abstract moral sources. Our theoretical model aids in mapping the direction and strength of prosocial expressions via different moral motivations. This helps to clarify the predictive differences between an SMI and an AMI. Moreover, our research captures the idiosyncratic moral traits within each individual SMI and AMI, providing a richer comparative analysis between the two types of sources. As a practical implication, organizations can better grasp the use of worker morals and ethics as a motivational tool. SMI was found to be predictive of a range of prosocial expressions (e.g., positive affirmations towards others, donating resources, volunteering, etc.) that can be useful for both coworker and organization relationships.

Overall, this research contributes to management scholarship by illuminating the ways in which the salience of and specification around our moral sources can better inform and adjust our prosocial motivations and expressions. This is of benefit to the continued development of identity research and the viability of moral identity as a practical tool for organizational use. Clarifying the differences between an SMI and an AMI demonstrates that there are meaningful

distinctions for people between abstract concepts like "care" or "honesty" and socially meaningful groups that represent the value of care and honesty to an individual.

Yaminette Diaz-Linhart
ydiazlinhart@brandeis.edu

Brandeis University

Yaminette Diaz-Linhart is a doctoral candidate in Social Policy and Management at the Heller School at Brandeis University. Her research focuses on multi-level factors of well-being at work by bridging management and social policy research.

ABSTRACT:

VOICE+WELL-BEING

Does having a say over one's working conditions impact well-being for workers? The concept of "voice" captures how employees attempt to influence the conditions of their work to meet both individual and collective interests. Compared to other medical professionals, voice may be even more important for frontline workers providing services to patients in health care and social services since they may not have a designated professional status (or association) to support them and their work. Although there are strong research foundations for the separate concepts of employee voice, professionalization, and worker well-being, there are no studies linking these concepts for an emerging profession like community health workers, who are employed to coordinate care and address social determinants of health for improved patient health outcomes.

Research Design and Methods

This dissertation employs a mixed-methods research design to understand employee voice as a predictor of well-being for community health workers. In particular, this dissertation seeks to answer the following questions: 1) What organizational conditions and voice systems predict well-being for workers? 2) Is professionalization and certification experienced as a form of voice? and 3) What voice behaviors predict Drawing from Hirschman's insights concerning exit, voice, and loyalty based in economic well-being? theory, Karasek's job-demands resources model, and economic and sociological theories of professionalization, this study aims to 1) quantitatively test the relationship between employee voice and well-being for community health workers at both the organizational and individual levels and 2) qualitatively explore how community health workers voice in their day-to-day work and experience professionalization and certification of their occupation.

Preliminary Results

Currently, I have collected 137 survey responses; the survey will close at the end of August 2021 with a goal of 150 responses. Data will be cleaned and analyzed while qualitative interviews will be completed in September 2021. Preliminary descriptive results show that workers on the whole have no say over their salary, benefits, opportunities for promotion and how technology impacts their work. On the other hand, workers have a lot of say over how they schedule their work, how they choose to do their job, how they access training opportunities and, in their ability, to perform their jobs safely. This highlights some strengths in how organizations are promoting autonomy and control for workers. Over half of workers reported that with "talking with their supervisor" was one of the *most effective ways* to resolve a workplace issue, highlighting the importance of the supervisory relationship. "Protesting, joining a union or striking" were seen as having *little to no effectiveness* in addressing workplace issues. (Of note, 85% of respondents are not represented by a union.) In terms of well-being outcomes, workers reported an average of about 9 days of poor mental health in the last 30 days, higher than average for residents in the same state as reported on nationally representative surveys. Twenty-six percent of workers find their work always or often stressful, 56% find their work sometimes stressful, while 18% hardly ever or never find their work stressful. Finally, 55% of workers are "somewhat satisfied" with their job while 14% of workers are "not too satisfied" and 31% are "not at all satisfied" with their jobs. Final data will be analyzed for bundles of organizational and individual-level voice variables and hypotheses will be tested to understand the relationship between voice and well-being.

Contribution to knowledge and Policy Implications

Well-being of workers is crucial to sustainably delivering high quality services. The demands for doing so have only been heightened with the ongoing challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic. By understanding and testing voice and well-being, this dissertation advances how organizations structure work environments to promote employee voice and to support workers and their well-being. Finally, this research may help change how organizations develop formal and informal structures that promote employee voice. Ultimately, I hope my dissertation research will change the conversation around well-being for often overlooked essential workers across different service industries who do not have a professional status or designation to rely on.

Kalan Norris is a fourth-year doctoral candidate in the Organization and Human Resources Department at the University at Buffalo, State University of New York. His research and teaching specializes in organizational behavior, power and influence, leadership, diversity and inclusion, within-group differences, and research methods. He is a Ph.D. Project/Baruch College Research Fellow, a William H. Hastie Research Fellow, and a recipient of UB's School of Management Rising Star Award.

ABSTRACT:

Inclusion for African-American Employees: Are Uniqueness and Belongingness Enough?

Inclusion results from proactive attempts to ensure all workers can contribute fully and effectively in the workplace (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998; Roberson, 2006). In a recent review of the inclusion literature, Shore et al. (2018) contend extant scholarship reflects two general themes--belongingness and uniqueness. Belongingness entails feeling like an insider, contributing to decision-making processes, and having access to information. At the same time, the uniqueness theme reflects respecting all cultural perspectives and acknowledging different ways of doing one's job. In sum, However, one unanswered question of Shore et al. (2018)'s recent summary of the inclusion literature is whether uniqueness and belongingness capture the full extent to which employees from socially marginalized groups (e.g., African-Americans, hereafter Black employees) perceive inclusion. As an illustration, Neckerman et al. (1999) suggest although blue-collar and white-collar Black employees may understand each other's situation in general, each group encounters distinct problems as it pertains to discrimination and race. The glass-ceiling effect is intelligible for white-collar Black employees, whereas blue-collar workers are concerned with joblessness or low wages (Neckerman et al., 1999). Further, there (i.e., one's is growing evidence that not all Black employees hold similar racial identities and attitudes attitudes and beliefs concerning how Blacks should act, think, and behave), which can serve as risk or protective factors toward true inclusion for Black employees (Sellers et al., 1998; Wong et al., 2003). This evidence suggests that different Black employees might have different needs in order to perceive full inclusion.

There is evidence of generational identities emerging in the workplace based on collective memories of shared events that dictate future actions and behaviors, impose boundary conditions on self-expression, and influence personality (i.e., individual differences that influence emotions, cognitions, and behavior; Costa & McCrae, 2008). Further, the strength of one's generational identity may vary by age, race, and education (Joshi et al., 2010; Schuman & Scott, 1989). It follows, then that Black employees from different generational cohorts may view inclusion differently based on their values, beliefs, and the nature of race relations experienced in their historical context (e.g., baby boomers and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Lyons & Kuron, 2013). Take, for an example, a Black employee who subscribes to the tenants of critical race theory, which contends that racism is a normal and everyday feature of life that is embedded within systems and institutions (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2016). For these employees, acknowledgment of structural inequalities by leadership may serve as a necessary catalyst toward inclusion. However, I contend that not all Black employees' subscribe to the tenants of critical race theory and may deny the existence of structural racism in favor of a colorblind approach (Ryan et al., 2007). After all, some Black employees endorse an assimilationist (i.e., beliefs embracing integration into majority group culture) belief system (Sellers et al., 1998). In sum, the implications of these previous statements suggest that the construal of situational (or organizational) factors one needs to feel inclusion can be shaped by generational (e.g., education, birth cohort) differences and belief systems, which necessitates examining within-group differences among Black employees in the United States.

This research aims to extend existing theory on inclusion by examining if there are meaningful within-race differences concerning how Black employees experience inclusion (or exclusion) above and beyond uniqueness and belongingness. Based on the theories and evidence above, I seek to determine whether generational (e.g., education, birth cohort) differences account for meaningful within-race differences concerning how Black employees' experience inclusion distinct from the uniqueness and belongingness dimensions, and what additional inclusion dimensions must be considered. Table 1 summarizes how I plan to answer these research questions.

References

Joshi, A., Dencker, J. C., Franz, G., & Martocchio, J. J. (2010). Unpacking Generational Identities in Organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 392-414. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25682421>

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2016). Toward a critical race theory of education. In *Critical race theory in education* (pp. 10-31). Routledge.

Lyons, S., & Kuron, L. (2014). Generational differences in the workplace: A review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(S1), S139-S157.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1913>

McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (2008). The five-factor theory of personality. In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and research*, 3rd ed. (pp. 159-181). The Guilford Press.

Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M.-K., Hsiao, H.-Y., & Brimhall, K. C. (2016, 2016/08/07). The Promise of Diversity Management for Climate of Inclusion: A State-of-the-Art Review and Meta-Analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 40(4), 305-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2016.1138915>

Neckerman, K. M., Carter, P., & Lee, J. (1999). Segmented assimilation and minority cultures of mobility. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(6), 945-965.

Roberson, Q. M. (2006). Disentangling the Meanings of Diversity and Inclusion in Organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(2), 212-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601104273064>

Ryan, C. S., Hunt, J. S., Weible, J. A., Peterson, C. R., & Casas, J. F. (2007). Multicultural and colorblind ideology, stereotypes, and ethnocentrism among Black and White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10(4), 617-637.

Schuman, H., & Scott, J. (1989). Generations and collective memories. *American Sociological Review*, 54(3), 359-381. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095611>

Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A. J., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity: A Reconceptualization of African American Racial Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(1), 18-39. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0201_2

Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2018, 2018/06/01/). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 176-189. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.003>

Wong, C. A., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. (2003, Dec). The influence of ethnic discrimination and ethnic identification on African American adolescents' school and socioemotional adjustment. *J Pers*, 71(6), 1197-1232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.7106012>

Table 1
Dissertation Studies Overview

	<i>Aims</i>	<i>Methodology/Citations</i>	<i>Sample</i>
Study 1:	Using an inductive research design, I will conduct qualitative interviews to examine whether there are meaningful within-race differences concerning how Black employees perceive inclusion above and beyond the uniqueness and belongingness dimensions.	I will interview 20 participants from each generational cohort (Eisenhardt, 1989). Ten of these individuals will be college graduates, and the remaining ten will be high school graduates. To analyze the data, I will code data based on the participant' responses (1 st order), and my identified themes and categories (2 nd order). Next, I will combine the 1 st and 2 nd order themes into a data structure, formulate relationships among 2 nd order themes, and finally transform data into a grounded theory model.	The sample will contain 80 African-American employees employed in the United States. The plan is to interview 20 workers from the four largest generation cohorts in the U.S. workforce. Those cohorts are the baby boomers (1946-1964), generation-X (1965-1980), millennials (1981-1996), and generation-Z (1997-2012).
Study 2:	This study will empirically test the existence of inclusion needs identified through my literature review and the results of Study 1.	To gather evidence of empirical support, I will use a field panel of working minorities to test and verify the model identified by theory and the results of Study 1.	I will use a Qualtrics panel consisting of 400 Black employees employed in the United States. Following the initial segmentation strategy from Study 1, 200 will be college graduates, and 200 will be high-school graduates.
Study 3:	After analyzing the data from Studies 1 & 2, I will generate a testable model with hypotheses. The purpose of this study is to demonstrate that the inclusion structures identified in the previous Studies offer enhanced explanatory power on outcomes than preexisting measures of inclusion.	I will conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to confirm factor structure, and assess convergent- and discriminant- validity. Further, I will use hierarchical regression to test how much exploratory power is added by considering my additional inclusion dimensions.	Planned field study working with Black employees employed in the United States.

Note. This table briefly summarizes Studies 1-3 of my proposed dissertation.

McKenzie Preston
mpresto@wharton.upenn.edu

University of Pennsylvania

McKenzie Preston is a PhD Candidate at The Wharton School and a Presidential Fellow for the University of Pennsylvania. His research focuses on cultivating more diverse, equitable, and inclusive workplaces.

ABSTRACT:

When Voice Solicitation Yields Silence: An Examination of Leader Voice Solicitation and Empathic Expressions on Employees' Silence for DEI Issues

Recently, diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) has become a more prevalent discussion topic in organizations. Although encouraging conversation and employee voice on DEI issues is generally well-intentioned, a pertinent issue that remains unclear is how leaders' attempts to enhance employee voice on DEI issues might affect employee silence. In the present research, we draw from research on the behavioral inhibition system (BIS) to examine when and why leaders' attempts to solicit employee voice on DEI issues has its intended effect of reducing silence or unexpectedly backfires by increasing employee silence. We suggest that empathic leadership behaviors, which aim to validate employees' thoughts and emotions, will influence how employees respond to voice solicitation. Specifically, we expect that leaders' attempts to solicit employee voice will reduce employee silence when the leader engages in empathic leadership behaviors because employees will be less concerned with social retaliation. Alternatively, leaders' attempt to solicit employee voice will increase employee silence when the leader fails to display empathic leadership behaviors because employees will fear the social consequences of speaking up. We further integrate BIS research with research on status characteristics theory to argue that racial minorities—compared to White employees—will be more affected by the empathic behaviors of leaders. Compared to White employees, racial minorities will be less compelled to remain silent when their leader displays empathic behaviors, and alternatively, racial minorities will be more compelled to remain silent when their leader fails to display empathic behaviors. We test and find support for our predictions in a pilot field survey using 299 full-time, U.S.-based working respondents.

The present research offers several contributions to the voice and diversity literatures. First, we advance theory on the behavioral inhibition and silence by suggesting leadership behaviors can activate the BIS system. In doing so, we unpack how an underexplored leadership behavior—empathetic leadership behaviors—is related to when employees are more concerned about the social repercussions of speaking out. Next, we extend research on voice solicitation. Whereas prior research suggests that formal and informal feedback channels promote employee voice (Morrison & Milliken, 2000), we suggest that voice solicitation can also backfire by increasing employee silence. By linking research on voice solicitation with the behavioral inhibition system, we argue that what matters is not simply asking employees to speak up, but how employees expect their leaders will respond when employees speak up. Further, we contribute to research that speaks to the intersection of voice and race by providing an additional explanation for why racial minorities may avoid advocating for other racial minorities. Whereas prior research has suggested that racial minorities avoid advocating for and contributing to the advancement of other racial minorities because of perceptions of in-group threat ("crab mentality," Mendoza, 2002: 57), we suggest that racial minorities may resist advocating for other minorities because they view speaking out as personally costly.