Discussion Papers In Economics And Business

A Social Cognitive Framework of Newcomers' Extra-Role Behaviors

Jie Li and Tomoki Sekiguchi

Discussion Paper 14-18

A Social Cognitive Framework of Newcomers' Extra-Role Behaviors

Jie Li and Tomoki Sekiguchi

Discussion Paper 14-18

April 2014

A Social Cognitive Framework of Newcomers' Extra-Role Behaviors

Jie Li[†]   Tomoki Sekiguchi[‡]

Abstract

Although much research has been conducted on employees' extra-role behaviors (ERBs), the topic of how newcomers to an organization engage in ERBs remains relatively underexplored. Following social cognitive theory, we develop a dynamic model of newcomers' helping and voice as two types of ERBs. The core idea of our model is that although newcomers may eventually come to engage in both types of ERBs, there will be a time lag between the emergence and increase of helping and those of voice. Our model shows that a social cognitive mechanism, including cyclical positive feedback loops and transfer of domain-specific self-efficacy, mediates the behavioral-level spillover from helping to voice. Our model also identifies several moderating factors that influence the process in which newcomers' helping and voice behaviors develop over time.

JEL Classifications: M10, M12, M54

Keywords: newcomers, helping, voice, domain-specific self-efficacy, social cognitive theory

[†] Graduate School of Economics, Osaka University, 1-7 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043 Japan. E-mail: lijiesjtu@gmail.com
[‡] Graduate School of Economics, Osaka University, 1-7 Machikaneyama, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043 Japan. E-mail: tomoki@econ.osaka-u.ac.jp

To develop and maintain competitive advantage, organizations need to respond rapidly to an ever-changing environment. Accordingly, managers expect their employees to work in a nonroutine manner and to act beyond formal job requirements (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995). The dynamic nature of the work environment has led scholars to pay increasing attention to employees' extra-role behaviors (ERBs), a term that refers to employees' discretionary behaviors intended to benefit their organizations and to exceed delineated role expectations, such as taking initiatives, making valuable suggestions, or collaborating (e.g., Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Researchers have also conceptualized similar constructs which have significant overlaps with ERBs such as organizational citizenship behaviors, proactive behaviors, and contextual performance (Bergeron, 2007). Organizations often benefit from employees' ERBs, especially in the nonroutine aspects of work (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Owing to the importance of ERBs, research on this topic has blossomed over the past two decades.

Although the number of studies on this topic is increasing, most focus on experienced employees, including their ERBs toward each other or toward newcomers (e.g., LePine & Van Dyne, 1998). Traditional research largely relegates newcomers to the role of passive recipients of organizational socialization (Morrison, 2002). However, according to the interactionist perspective, not only do newcomers accept the organization's socialization tactics, but also they proactively redefine their roles within the new organization (Ashford & Black, 1996). Accordingly, newcomers may engage in ERBs to develop self-control and to improve their adjustment to organizations (Ashford & Black, 1996; Hurst, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Livingston, 2012; Morrison, 2002). Nevertheless, how they come to engage in different types of ERBs is relatively underexplored. Among the few studies that focus on newcomers' performance during organizational entry, most investigate newcomers' in-role behaviors (IRBs) rather than ERBs (Li, Harris, Boswell, & Xie, 2011). This research

gap is noteworthy because newcomers can bring entirely fresh knowledge and skills, creative ideas, and new energy through ERBs, which may benefit the organizations greatly.

We address this research gap by theorizing the relationship between two distinct types of newcomers' ERBs: helping and voice. Helping refers to "voluntarily helping others with, or preventing the occurrence of work related problems" (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000: 516). Voice is defined as the discretionary verbal expression of suggestions, ideas, or concerns about workplace issues with the intent to bring about organizational improvement (Burris, Detert, & Chiaburu, 2008; Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). We focus on helping and voice because these two ERBs are the most representative forms of affiliative and challenging ERBs, respectively (Grant & Mayer, 2009). Although we focus on helping and voice in theoretical development, our aim is to develop a model that is generalizable to newcomers' affiliative and challenging ERBs in general.

In developing our model, we take a social cognitive approach as a theoretical basis. Our model proposes that although newcomers may eventually come to engage in both types of ERBs, there will be a time lag between helping behavior and voice behavior in their emergence and increase. To adjust themselves to new organizations, newcomers engage in helping behavior first. Influenced by the success of their attempts to help, their voice behavior subsequently emerges. In particular, to explain how newcomers' helping and voice behaviors develop over time, our model uses interpersonal positive feedback loops and transfer of domain-specific self-efficacy as a linking mechanism for observable behavioral changes. Understanding this mechanism also enables us to identify several factors that influence the changing pattern of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors.

This article makes several major contributions to the literature. First, our model describes how newcomers' helping and voice behaviors develop over time. In particular, our

model predicts a time lag between helping and voice behaviors in their emergence and increase. Almost no research has explored newcomers' ERBs from this angle. Second, we integrate the social cognitive mechanism (i.e., interpersonal feedback loops and transfer of domain-specific self-efficacy) into the relationship between helping and voice at the behavioral level. We propose that an intra-individual, social cognitive process mediates the behavioral-level spillover from helping to voice. In this way, our model enables us to identify several moderators—interpersonal, individual, and situational factors—that influence the development of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors over time. Third, our model has the potential to extend the theory of ERBs in general by proposing that one form of ERBs can influence another through the social cognitive mechanism. Past researchers investigated different types of ERBs separately and only pointed out their correlational relationships (e.g., Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). However, they overlooked the possible causal relationships between different types of ERBs.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. First, we review the literature on ERBs and describe the similarities and differences between helping and voice behaviors. Next, based on social cognitive theory, we introduce domain-specific self-efficacy as a key concept in our model. We then present an integrative social cognitive model of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors and offer several testable propositions derived from the model. Finally, we discuss the implications for theory, practice, and future research directions.

HELPING AND VOICE AS EXTRA-ROLE BEHAVIORS

The definitions of helping and voice derive from the framework of ERBs (Van Dyne et al., 1995). Distinct from IRBs, or job-specific behaviors within the assigned roles, ERBs are not formally required or expected for any particular job, lying outside prescribed work boundaries (Bergeron, 2007). Examples of ERBs include voluntarily assuming more

responsibilities, helping other colleagues, and generating innovative suggestions for organizations (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). It has been suggested that ERBs facilitate organizational performance and effectiveness, including team learning (Edmondson, 1996), organizational functioning improvement (Van Dyne et al., 1995), and error correction (Morrison, 2011).

Because they represent two forms of ERBs, helping and voice have several distinctive characteristics. First, helping is noncontroversial, whereas voice involves the greater risk of expressing one's opinions, which may upset interpersonal relationships and the environment (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003; Van Dyne et al., 1995). In other words, helping is an affiliative ERB that is harmonious and cooperative, whereas voice is a challenging ERB that may even damage interpersonal relationships (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Second, helping is intended to maintain the status quo and to promote existing work procedures and relationships (Grant & Mayer, 2009; McAllister, Kamdar, Morrison, & Turban, 2007), whereas voice is change oriented and intended to achieve positive change. Third, helping is primarily directed toward colleagues, so the immediate beneficiaries are individuals. On the other hand, employees speak up with the intention of benefiting individuals and the whole organization (Van Dyne et al., 1995; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2009).

At the same time, helping and voice have several similarities. First, both are intended to have the constructive improvement (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). In this sense, both helping and voice are promotive rather than prohibitive ERBs (Van Dyne et al., 1995). Second, researchers have often assumed that these behaviors are proactive in nature and are driven by prosocial motives (Grant & Mayer, 2009). Third, both forms of behavior normally exceed formal job duties. Employees are not rewarded formally, nor do they receive punitive outcomes. Finally, from the organizational perspective, helping and voice can both benefit

organizations or work groups. Therefore, newcomers can adapt to their environments by engaging in these two ERBs.

Research has revealed several common antecedents for helping and voice, including prosocial motives (Grant & Mayer, 2009), organizational justice (Zhang, LePine, Buckman, & Wei, 2013), group cohesiveness (Ng & Van Dyne, 2005), and low alienation (Van Dyne et al., 1995). Moreover, prior studies have reported high correlation coefficients between helping and voice (e.g., LePine & Van Dyne, 2001; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), which are displayed in Table 1. All previous studies report a significant positive correlation between these two ERBs. However, we know little about how and why these two ERBs are interrelated. In this regard, we posit that in the case of newcomers' ERBs, helping behavior will impact on voice behavior will impact on voice behavior through a social cognitive process.

Insert Table 1 about here

DOMAIN-SPECIFIC SELF-EFFICACY

As stated above, we take a within-individual and social cognitive approach to explain the way in which newcomers develop helping and voice behaviors over time. Domain-specific self-efficacy is a key construct in our model as a linking mechanism between the emergence and increase of newcomers' helping and the emergence and increase of voice behavior. Generally, self-efficacy refers to "beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands" (Wood & Bandura, 1989: 408). Individuals usually form self-efficacy based on an in-depth assessment of task requirements, situational resources, and constraints (Bandura, 1977; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Self-efficacy can be instilled and shaped in four primary ways: (1) enactive mastery, (2) vicarious experiences, (3) social persuasion, and (4) physiological

states (Bandura, 1991; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Collectively, these experiences influence people's cognitive appraisal and self-regulation, which in turn determine their self-efficacy (Bandura, 2009).

Researchers have differentiated self-efficacy into general self-efficacy, task-specific self-efficacy, and domain-specific self-efficacy (Bandura, 2009; Woodruff & Cashman, 1993). Among these, domain-specific self-efficacy refers to individuals' perceived capabilities to participate successfully in activities in a particular context (Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Janssen & Gao, 2013). Unlike task-specific self-efficacy, which focuses on task performance, domain-specific self-efficacy reflects perceived competence in broader situational activities (Woodruff & Cashman, 1993). In addition, researchers assume that domain-specific self-efficacy is less stable than general self-efficacy (Woodruff & Cashman, 1993). Domain-specific self-efficacy is considered to be malleable, depending on an individual's prior experience in the domain, which provides direct information on personal accomplishment (Bandura, 1997).

Domain-specific self-efficacy may change over time through continuous learning and skill development procedures (Bandura, 2009). As individuals gain experience in a specific domain, they use interpersonal feedback, which provides direct information about discrepancies between their personal attainments and expectations, as an external cue to adjust their perceived competence in that domain (Bandura, 1991; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Enhanced self-efficacy motivates people to exercise their acquired skills and knowledge further, resulting in ongoing success in that domain. Such iterative relationships make them engage in the activity more routinely, forming an upward cyclical loop (Bandura, 1977; Lindsley, Brass, & Thomas, 1995).

After a series of accomplishments in one domain, individuals could develop more

generalizable self-efficacy and transfer it to another domain (Schunk, 1991; Woodruff & Cashman, 1993). Researchers suggest that domain-specific self-efficacy may transfer across domains based on the similarity between the skills and knowledge required (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977). Efficacy beliefs can even transfer to a dissimilar domain to the extent that people believe there is overlap in skills and knowledge (Schunk, 1991). For instance, people who excel at writing academic articles may feel competent in consulting projects because both need analytical ability. We employ this mechanism to explain the spillover effect from self-efficacy for helping to that for voice.

AN INTEGRATED SOCIAL COGNITIVE MODEL

Figure 1 illustrates our integrative model of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors. As stated above, we use social cognitive theory as a theoretical basis and focus on the role of cyclical feedback loops and transfer of domain-specific self-efficacy as a linking mechanism in the process of behavioral change over time.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Our model shows that newcomers do not engage in helping and voice behaviors synchronously. Instead, they are initially inclined to engage in helping behavior, which is a stepping-stone to voice behavior. Then they may gradually become "good soldiers," who not only are cooperative with colleagues but also make constructive suggestions for change. Specifically, newcomers' successive helping experiences will induce voice behavior through the social cognitive process, which includes positive cyclical feedback loops and the transfer of self-efficacy across domains (i.e., helping and voice). Through this dynamic, a cyclical process involving helping and voice behaviors, newcomers constantly plan and adjust themselves to their organizations (Ashforth, Sluss, & Saks, 2007).

Our model uses interpersonal feedback from co-workers (i.e., positive/negative) as a moderator that influences the cyclical feedback process. We also provide several individual difference and situational moderators that influence the transfer of specific self-efficacy across helping and voice domains. Individual difference moderators include newcomers' organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), which reflects an employee's perceived value to an organization (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989), and their interpersonal skill. Situational moderators include group voice behavior, the extent to which a work group overall speaks up on work-related issues (Frazier & Bowler, 2012), and supervisor support, which reflects the ongoing social exchange with one's supervisor (Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009). The rationale for choosing these moderators is that, based on the relational view, interaction with other members in a new workplace is critical for newcomers to adapt to the environment (Li et al., 2011). OBSE and interpersonal skill reflect newcomers' attitudes and skills with respect to the social interaction with other staff members in the workplace. Group voice behavior and supervisory support are related to the view that newcomers' social cognitive processes will be influenced by other members' behaviors and support from their supervisors through social interactions.

In all, our model consists of the following major components: a spiral of helping, transfer of self-efficacy across domains, a spiral of voice, and moderators influencing the process. Below, we explain each component in detail.

Spiral of Helping

The initial step of our integrative model is called the "spiral of helping," meaning that the newcomers' helping behavior increases through a cyclical positive feedback loop involving helping and helping efficacy. According to uncertainty reduction theory (Berger & Calabrese, 1975), newcomers' primary goal is to reduce uncertainty in initial interactions

after they enter organizations. Although they can adjust themselves by engaging in ERBs, they evaluate the potential risks underlying these behaviors. Because helping can enhance their image and organizational connectedness, newcomers tend to contribute to their colleagues by engaging in helping first, which is less risky than voice (Flynn, 2003; Grant & Gino, 2010).

In this process, favor exchange occurs between newcomers as helpers and their co-workers as help seekers (Flynn, 2003). Newcomers' self-efficacy for helping is enhanced because they perceive themselves as "creditors" rather than "debtors" in this asymmetrical favor exchange, meaning that they provide help rather than seek assistance from co-workers (Blau, 1964; Flynn, 2003; Flynn, Reagans, Amanatullah, & Ames, 2006). Therefore, newcomers' initial helping attempts serve as prior mastery experiences to regulate their self-efficacy for helping. Specifically, they feel that their co-workers can perform more effectively with their assistance (Sonnentag & Grant, 2012). In addition, acts of helping boost newcomers' positive mood and self-evaluations (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005; Williamson & Clark, 1989). An aroused positive mood can also elevate the self-efficacy for helping of newcomers (Bandura, 1997).

After newcomers provide help, they obtain information about the consequences and utilize this to adjust the level of their self-efficacy for helping (Maurer, 2001). Self-efficacy for helping influences newcomers' self-regulation in motivation and actions through goal systems, which in turn determines their subsequent helping behavior (Gist & Mitchell, 1992; Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984). Newcomers adjust self-efficacy for helping through further helping experiences, and their helping behavior increases, motivated by enhanced helping efficacy. That is, helping affects self-efficacy for helping, which in turn, affects their subsequent help (Lindsley et al., 1995). Therefore, we predict that the feedback control system produces such a cyclical loop.

Proposition 1: A cyclical positive feedback loop exists where giving help is related to newcomers' self-efficacy for further helping, which results in increased helping behaviors over time.

Moderating Role of Peer Feedback

In the abovementioned spiral of helping, feedback from co-workers through social interactions provides information cues. Generally, once newcomers engage in helping, they care about the consequences because they want to be integrated into the organization (Ashford & Black, 1996). However, it is difficult and inaccurate to evaluate the effectiveness of their helping without external cues. In this sense, interpersonal feedback from co-workers enables newcomers to view themselves accurately in social interactions (Grant & Gino, 2010; Isen, 1970). Specifically, positive feedback from co-workers (e.g., gratitude expressions) can reduce newcomers' feelings of uncertainty and increase their self-efficacy for helping because it serves as persuasion from colleagues (Maurer, 2001). Furthermore, newcomers become more willing to invest time and effort in helping because their attempts lead to success (Grant & Gino, 2010). On the other hand, when newcomers receive negative feedback from co-workers (e.g., expressions of dissatisfaction or complaints), they perceive themselves as incompetent in helping others effectively in the workplace. Thus, they gain no satisfaction or positive self-evaluations from their prior helping experiences (Bandura, 1986; Maurer, 2001), lose confidence in the value of their assistance, and are less willing to engage in subsequent helping behavior.

Proposition 2: Peer feedback on newcomers' help moderates the spiral of helping such that the spiral is strengthened by positive feedback and weakened by negative feedback.

Transfer Mechanism of Self-Efficacy across Domains

In the spiral of helping, newcomers experience social exchanges in which they provide help and receive interpersonal feedback from their co-workers. Our model shows that when newcomers accumulate self-efficacy for helping after consistent prior success, they gradually begin to speak up through an increase in self-efficacy for voice, which is similar to the "spillover effect." The objective of voice is similar to that of helping, because employees who speak up intend to assist their co-workers, work groups, or organizations (Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Whiting et al., 2009). Based on self-consistency motives (Korman, 1970), newcomers may want to "help" their organization further. That is, after their feelings of uncertainty are reduced, newcomers with positive self-image may gradually be motivated to speak up. The argument so far suggests that the observable behavioral change from helping to voice behavior is mediated by a social cognitive mechanism: self-efficacy for helping is transferred to self-efficacy for voice.

Before engaging in voice as a new activity, newcomers evaluate whether they possess the necessary skills to exercise effective control over voice behavior. Self-efficacy for voice is an avenue by which newcomers develop necessary cognitive skills to overcome fear and anxiety before speaking up (Kish-Gephart, Detert, Treviño, & Edmondson, 2009). After repeated success in helping, newcomers feel that they are valuable to an organization, and their social status rises through social exchanges with co-workers (Flynn et al., 2006; Sonnentag & Grant, 2012). These factors contribute to their confidence as members of the new workplace and facilitate the transfer of their self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain. Moreover, they can acquire relevant knowledge and skills for effectively exercising control over job-related matters (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009). The newcomers use such new knowledge and skills for their cognitive rehearsal first, imagining themselves speaking up, which is more challenging than helping (Bandura, 1997). The cognitive rehearsal in turn

facilitates the transfer of self-efficacy transfer from the helping to the voice domain. Furthermore, positive emotional states stemming from positive self-efficacy for helping can inspire confidence in their ability to speak up (Flynn, 2003; Kish-Gephart et al., 2009). Such social cognitive processes often occur when newcomers enter an organization (Griffin, Colella, & Goparaju, 2001). Thus, we propose the following.

> *Proposition 3: When newcomers accumulate self-efficacy for helping, it will be transferred to self-efficacy for voice.*

Moderators of Self-Efficacy Transfer Mechanism

Because voice is challenge oriented, self-efficacy for voice cannot be fully developed based on simple factors. Engaging in voice behavior is risky and unfamiliar to newcomers, so they regulate behavioral decisions based on diverse sources of information, including individual factors, situational resources, and environmental constraints (Klein, 1989). In addition, newcomers and organizations interact during socialization (Reichers, 1987). Accordingly, the transfer mechanism for self-efficacy across domains is influenced by two major sets of moderators: individual dispositional factors and the workplace environment (Bandura, 1991).

First, we propose that the smooth transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain depends on the level of newcomers' OBSE, or their self-perceived value as organization members (Pierce et al., 1989). Employees with high OBSE view themselves as valuable and worthy members of their organization (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). OBSE is a critical predictor of self-efficacy because both OBSE and self-efficacy reflect individuals' self-evaluations (Gardner, Van Dyne, & Pierce, 2004). Moreover, OBSE is a relatively stable individual disposition that influences individuals' dynamic self-evaluations in a domain (Pierce & Gardner, 2004).

The transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain is smoother for those with high OBSE. Those with high OBSE tend to perceive themselves as competent to point out potential problems and to make innovative suggestions for change because they have improved their self-evaluations through the spiral of helping (Pierce & Gardner, 2004). They infer that they can engage in more challenging and difficult behaviors (i.e., voice) once they have become competent at easier and less risky behaviors (i.e., helping). In contrast, those with low OBSE will suspect their self-image, impeding their development of self-efficacy for voice, even if they have high self-efficacy for helping.

> *Proposition 4a: Newcomers' OBSE moderates the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain such that the transfer is smoother when their OBSE is high rather than low.*

Voice behaviors entail expressing ideas or feelings to other people, so effective communication is the key to increasing one's confidence to give voice (Morrison, 2011). In this regard, interpersonal skills or "soft skills" enable newcomers to interact with others effectively, whereby they can obtain more relational resources at the workplace. Moreover, they may feel less uncertainty and anxiety (Ferris, Witt, & Hochwarter, 2001; Klein, DeRouin, & Salas, 2006). Furthermore, employees with high levels of interpersonal skill are more likely to take initiatives to expand their assigned roles (Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway, & Ferris, 2006). Therefore, interpersonal skill, which is related to the fluency of social behaviors such as working with others, listening, and expressing views (Klein et al., 2006; Lievens & Sackett, 2012), influences the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain.

Suggestions for constructive changes are often accompanied by challenges to others, including supervisors or co-workers. This process requires newcomers to communicate successfully with other people (Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Therefore, those

with high levels of interpersonal skill are more likely to feel capable of coping with social interactions and persuading others in work-related matters. After experiencing repeated success in helping, those with higher levels of interpersonal skill perceive that they can take control of the potential outcomes of giving voice, and develop their self-efficacy for voice smoothly. In contrast, newcomers with less interpersonal skill fear that they may upset or embarrass others through poor communication, so they have less confidence in speaking up.

Proposition 4b: Newcomers' interpersonal skill moderates the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain such that the transfer is smoother when their level of interpersonal skill is high rather than low.

Our model shows that situational factors will also intervene in the transfer of self-efficacy across domains. The organizational context shapes employees' psychological safety and perceived competence within a domain (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008a). Thus, situational factors influence employees' perceptions of what behaviors are acceptable, especially challenge-oriented behaviors (Detert & Burris, 2007; Detert & Treviño, 2010). We propose group voice behavior and supervisor support as two relational moderators that intervene in the transfer mechanism of self-efficacy across domains.

Group voice behavior refers to the extent to which a work group as a whole makes constructive suggestions and shares new ideas (Frazier & Bowler, 2012). It is suggested that modeling and observation are most common during newcomers' socialization (Griffin et al., 2000). Generally, newcomers can learn group norms through vicarious experiences by observing co-workers in work groups (Kammeyer-Mueller, Livingston, & Liao, 2011; Maurer, 2001). By observing whether co-workers in work groups actively engage in voice behaviors, they learn whether expressing opinions is encouraged in the workplace.

In high group voice circumstances, newcomers feel that expressing their opinions is safe and worth doing (Frazier & Bowler, 2012). Observing co-workers' voice behaviors can strengthen newcomers' efficacy beliefs and facilitate cognitive modeling, which encourages them to engage in similar endeavors. In contrast, if newcomers perceive voice behaviors as futile and ineffective in a low group voice situation, this in turn impedes their self-efficacy transfer across domains (Walumbwa, Morrison, & Christensen, 2012). Therefore, we propose that a high level of group voice behavior will facilitate newcomers' self-efficacy transfer across domains, whereas a low level of group voice behavior will impede it. This argument is consistent with multilevel theorizing, which implies that group processes have a critical role in individual employees' voice efficacy (Frazier & Bowler, 2012; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011).

> *Proposition 5a: Group voice behavior moderates the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain such that the transfer is smoother when group voice behavior is high rather than low.*

Newcomers in particular may need organizational support during their socialization (Kammeyer-Mueller, Wanberg, Rubenstein, & Song, 2013). In this process, one pivotal assumption in newcomers' socialization process is that interactions with supervisors are critical channels for newcomers to adjust better to their jobs and organizations (Graen, 1976; Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009). Newcomers obtain their role information primarily from supervisors (Morrison, 1993). For example, newcomers can learn the expectations for their role from supervisors and develop their self-evaluations. Supervisor support reflects the social exchanges between newcomers and their supervisors. Just as employees evaluate their value to the organization, newcomers perceive whether they are cared about or valued based on their levels of supervisor support (Blau, 1964; Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009). Therefore, we propose that highly supportive supervisors enhance newcomers' perceived control over

work-related issues, which in turn enhances their feeling that they are capable of influencing events.

We further argue that supervisor support facilitates newcomers' social learning through persuasion. Social cognitive theory suggests that support from other people serves as social persuasion to enhance self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Especially in a challenging context (e.g., speaking up as a new member), newcomers need positive feedback and encouragement from supervisors to develop their self-confidence and progressive mastery of their work (Jokisaari & Nurmi, 2009). Therefore, given an accumulation of helping efficacy, newcomers who receive a high level of supervisor support will develop greater self-efficacy for voice. In contrast, those that perceive a low level of supervisor support will not smoothly develop their self-efficacy for voice because of a lack of persuasion.

> *Proposition 5b: Supervisor support moderates the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain such that the transfer is smoother when supervisor support is of a high rather than low level.*

Spiral of Voice

Although voice may bring about improvements to organizations, it can also embarrass or upset interpersonal relationships (Morrison, 2011). Such conflicting outcomes require newcomers to estimate the risks and benefits before breaking their silence (Detert & Burris, 2007). The emergence of newcomers' voice behavior mainly depends on their expectations of positive outcomes from receivers (Takeuchi, Chen, & Cheung, 2012). That is, unless newcomers view themselves as capable of coping with the potential outcomes, they will not attempt to express their opinions (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008b). Because those with high levels of self-efficacy for voice believe that they can express their opinions effectively (i.e., others will listen to them), they are more likely to speak up. We provide this

argument primarily for two reasons.

First, newcomers with high levels of self-efficacy for voice anticipate greater accomplishments. Specifically, self-efficacy for voice facilitates the process of striving for goals aiming at improvement (Bandura, 1977). In addition, the newcomers will be motivated to choose challenging goals and to invest time and effort because perceived competence boosts their perception of dealing with difficulties (Morrison, 2011; Parker, Bindl, & Strauss, 2010; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008b). Such a self-regulation process is important for challenging activities because individuals estimate whether they can take control of the consequences before actual engagement (Klein, 1989). Therefore, newcomers with greater voice efficacy are more likely to speak up for their organization's benefit.

Second, domain-specific self-efficacy increases persistence and willingness to overcome obstacles, especially in extra-role activities (Bandura, 1997; Parker et al., 2010). Newcomers with high levels of voice efficacy are more willing to master challenges when facing risky activities such as voice behavior (Krueger & Dickson, 1993). In contrast, those with little voice efficacy are reluctant to invest greater effort, or even give up in challenging situations (Bandura, 1997). They "pipe down" because they perceive challenges to be formidable and themselves as incapable of handling them (Janssen & Gao, 2013; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012).

After expressing their opinions, newcomers adjust their self-efficacy for voice based on the effectiveness of their ideas or suggestions (Wood & Bandura, 1989). Social cognitive theory suggests that individuals avoid activities beyond their coping capabilities but readily undertake challenges that they perceive themselves capable of managing (Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). When receiving positive feedback, newcomers elevate their self-appraisals of voice behavior, which in turn regulate their subsequent attempts in voice,

resulting in an upward spiral of voice behavior (Locke et al., 1984).

> *Proposition 6: A cyclical positive feedback loop exists where newcomers'*
>
> *self-efficacy for voice encourages their voice behavior, which in turn increases*
>
> *self-efficacy for voice, resulting in an increase in their voice behaviors over time.*

Moderating Role of Peer Feedback

As for the spiral of helping, interpersonal feedback plays an important role in the cyclical process involving voice behavior and voice efficacy. Feedback from supervisors or co-workers provides external cues regarding whether newcomers express their opinions effectively (Bandura, 1977). Therefore, it leads newcomers to adjust their self-efficacy for voice, and then they may assess the usefulness of their ideas or suggestions, which in turn influences future attempts.

When newcomers receive positive feedback (e.g., praise and managerial endorsement), they will experience positive affect, such as decreased uncertainty and stress (Bandura, 1991). In addition, positive outcomes increase their satisfaction and further build their intrinsic motivation to speak up (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). That is, voice affects self-efficacy for voice, which in turn affects subsequent voice behaviors. Indeed, success in speaking up leads newcomers to confirm their previous successes and thus encourages persistence in speaking up. Finally, continual successes result in an upward spiral of voice (Lindsley et al., 1995).

In contrast, when receiving negative feedback from co-workers (e.g., ignorance of their ideas), newcomers perceive that they have failed to improve the status quo (Bandura, 1986). Their motivation regarding voice behavior will diminish, because failures undermine their self-efficacy (Lindsley et al., 1995). Accordingly, their newly learned skills may not be used continually. In addition, the negative moods aroused make them doubt their competence

in expressing ideas, and they are more likely to remain silent.

Proposition 7: Peer feedback on newcomers' voice moderates the spiral of voice such that the spiral becomes stronger when newcomers receive positive feedback and weaker when they receive negative feedback.

Time Lag between Helping and Voice Behaviors

Thus far, we have explained the mechanism whereby newcomers' initial attempts to help others in the workplace are reinforced and related to the emergence and increase of their voice behavior. In line with Schmitz and Skinner (1993), our model illustrates a time lag between newcomers' helping and voice behaviors. That is, although newcomers may eventually come to engage in both helping and voice behaviors, their helping behavior emerges and increases first, and the emergence and increase of their voice behavior follows.

Our model shows that the "spillover effect" from newcomers' helping to voice at the behavioral level is mediated by a social cognitive process involving the transfer of self-efficacy from the helping to the voice domain. Although self-efficacy regulates human functioning, it takes time for employees to regulate their motivation for ERBs (Bandura, 1991; Spurk & Abele, 2013). Moreover, the spiral of helping does not concurrently induce newcomers to develop their voice efficacy. Instead, it takes time for their self-efficacy for helping to be manifested and transferred to self-efficacy for voice.

Proposition 8: There will be a time lag between the emergence and increase of newcomers' helping behavior and those of voice behavior: Helping behavior emerges and increases first, and voice behavior follows a similar pattern.

DISCUSSION

In this article, we develop a theoretical model to illustrate how newcomers engage in

different types of ERBs. Specifically, we develop an integrative model of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors based on social cognitive theory. Our model highlights the importance of employees' domain-specific self-efficacy, which regulates human functioning, motivation, and attainments (Bandura, 1977). After their initial attempts in helping, transfer of self-efficacy across domains is the key mechanism to understand why newcomers become confident in speaking up. In addition, we specify how interpersonal feedback, individual differences, and social context within the workplace alter employees' efficacy beliefs and behavior.

Theoretical Implications

Our integrative social cognitive model of newcomers' helping and voice behaviors has significant implications for the theory of ERBs. In particular, by focusing on newcomers' helping and voice behaviors, we could theoretically analyze the emergence and increase of these behaviors, which would contribute to a deeper understanding of the characteristics and interrelationship of these two behaviors. Moreover, our model, involving newcomer helping and voice, has potential to extend the theory of affiliative and challenging ERBs in general.

Although past research suggests that affiliative ERBs and challenging ERBs correlate (e.g., Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), and these two ERBs share similar antecedents. Our model does not predict that the emergence and increase of these ERBs occur simultaneously. Affiliative and challenging ERBs are different in terms of difficulties and potential risks. Thus, when employees are motivated to contribute to the organization by going beyond prescribed roles, they may start with affiliative ERBs, which are easier and less risky than challenging ERBs. In addition, because of the similarities of these two ERBs (e.g., volitional and driven by prosocial motives), spillover will occur from affiliative ERBs to challenging ERBs, or from easier and less risky behaviors to more difficult and riskier ones.

We believe that the conceptual integration involving the cyclical positive feedback loops and the transfer of self-efficacy across domains is helpful to explain how such a spillover at the behavioral level occurs.

The focus of our model on the intra-individual and longitudinal process extends the explanation of ERBs by including the causal relationship between different types of ERBs. In this way, our model advances our understanding of the observable correlations between different types of ERBs. That is, rather than explaining that different ERBs tend to correlate because they are similar, our model suggests that they will correlate not only because of the same antecedents but also because a spillover occurs between easy and difficult behaviors over time.

Practical Implications

This article has several implications for managers who wish to elicit and enable newcomers' ERBs. Newcomers can bring creative ideas and fresh consideration of job-related matters, which can benefit organizations (Li et al., 2011). Given the relationship between helping and voice, we suggest that managers motivate newcomers to express their ideas by substantially managing their help. In other words, supervisors can initially encourage newcomers to help others and can praise them for doing so, which serves as social persuasion (Bandura, 1977). Then newcomers can develop long-term memories of this appraisal process, resulting in higher levels of self-efficacy for helping, which can be transformed to self-efficacy for voice.

Another implication for practice is to call on managers to recognize individual differences and situational factors in the self-efficacy transfer process. For example, we demonstrate the roles of group voice behavior and supervisor support in enhancing newcomers' intrinsic motivation and fostering their self-efficacy for voice. Thus, managers

can strengthen newcomers' self-confidence in putting forward valuable ideas by encouraging group voice behavior. Such measures facilitate newcomers' social learning through modeling and then smooth their transfer of self-efficacy across domains. Identifying individual difference factors such as interpersonal skill may also be useful in selecting for the organization new members who are more likely to develop helping and voice over time.

Finally, this article reinforces the importance of supervisors in newcomers' socialization. Managers may want to encourage other group members to provide positive interpersonal feedback such as expressing gratitude and praising newcomers' voice behaviors as external cues to foster their ERBs (Burris, 2012). Organizations can motivate and train managers to recognize their proactive role in providing feedback and support for newcomers (Kammeyer-Mueller et al., 2013). Such efforts can facilitate newcomers' integration into organizations.

Directions for Future Research

Our theoretical framework poses several avenues for future research. First, researchers can empirically test our theoretical model. Field studies and experimental research can strengthen the validity and generalizability of the theoretical model. For example, researchers can use longitudinal studies to investigate the dynamic relationship between newcomers' helping and voice behaviors. Alternatively, a laboratory design could clearly reveal cognitive processing, such as the transfer of self-efficacy across domains. For most constructs (e.g., helping, voice, and domain-specific self-efficacy) in our theoretical framework, we already have reliable measurement instruments (e.g., McAlister et al., 2007; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). However, researchers need to consider the design of instruments to capture interpersonal feedback in employees' social cognitive processes.

Within the interactionist perspective of ERBs (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), future

research could extend the boundary conditions in our theoretical model. The contextual factors may include work characteristics, such as job autonomy, which are a critical predictor of employees' proactivity (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Researchers can also attempt to identify the role of some organizational-level constructs. For example, social norms in organizations may be an important predictor of newcomers' ERBs. According to the relational perspective, peer influence can facilitate or prevent newcomers' ERBs.

Furthermore, researchers can extend our conceptual model by incorporating employees' causal attributions of feedback (Harvey, Martinko, & Douglas, 2009). That is, not only prior experiences but also employees' attributions can influence their domain-specific self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). In other words, the relationship between personal attainments and efficacy judgments is not automatic. For example, after helping a teammate, a newcomer receives negative feedback (e.g., a lack of expressed gratitude or even a complaint). If the newcomer attributes such a failure to the colleague's obliviousness or other external factors, his or her self-efficacy for helping may remain stable. However, if the newcomer interprets such feedback as personal incompetence, his or her self-efficacy for helping may be decreased.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we provide an integrative model of the ways in which newcomers engage in helping and voice behaviors as two different forms of ERBs. Our theory suggests that repeated success within the helping domain motivates them to engage in voice behavior. In particular, we provide a dynamic model by proposing that this causal structure does not occur simultaneously. Instead, we introduce cyclical positive feedback loops and transfer of domain-specific self-efficacy as social cognitive mechanisms that mediate the behavioral change from helping to voice. In conclusion, this article highlights the importance of social

cognitive processes in understanding newcomers' ERBs.

REFERENCES

Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. 1996. Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 81: 199-214.

Ashforth, B. E., Sluss, D. M., & Saks, A. M. 2007. Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 70: 447-462.

Bandura, A. 1977. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review,* 84: 191-215.

Bandura, A. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. 1991. Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 50: 248-287.

Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.

Bandura, A. 2009. Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. In E.A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organization behavior (2nd Ed.):* 179-200. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. 1977. Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 35: 125-139.

Belschak, F. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. 2009. Consequences of positive and negative feedback: The impact on emotions and extra-role behaviors. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 58: 274-303.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. 1975. Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human*

Communication Research, 1: 99-112.

Bergeron, D. M. 2007. The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost? *Academy of Management Review,* 32: 1078-1095.

Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life.* New York, NY: John Wiley.

Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. 1993. Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations:* 77-98. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burris, E. R. 2012. The risks and rewards of speaking up: Managerial responses to employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal,* 55: 851-875.

Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. 2008. Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93: 912-922.

Chan, S. C. 2013. Paternalistic leadership and employee voice: Does information sharing matter? *Human Relations.* doi: 10.1177/0018726713503022

Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C., & Andersson, L. M. 2003. Doing unto others: The reciprocity of helping behavior in organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics,* 47: 101-113.

De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vianen, A. E. 2001. Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 22: 309-328.

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. 2007. Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal,* 50: 869-884.

Detert, J. R., & Treviño, L. K. 2010. Speaking up to higher ups: How supervisor and skip-level leaders influence employee voice. *Organization Science,* 21: 241-270.

Edmondson, A. 1996. Learning from mistakes is easier said than done: Group and organization influences on the detection and correction of human error. *Journal of*

Applied Behavioral Science, 32: 5-28.

Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. 2007. Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support–employee outcome relationships in China: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50: 715-729.

Ferris, G. R., Witt, L. A., & Hochwarter, W. A. 2001. Interaction of social skill and general mental ability on job performance and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86: 1075-1082.

Frazier, M. L., & Bowler, W. M. 2012. Voice climate, supervisor undermining, and work outcomes: A group-level examination. *Journal of Management.* doi: 10.1177/0149206311434533.

Flynn, F. J. 2003. How much should I give and how often? The effects of generosity and frequency of favor exchange on social status and productivity. *Academy of Management Journal,* 46: 539-553.

Flynn, F. J., Reagans, R. E., Amanatullah, E. T., & Ames, D. R. 2006. Helping one's way to the top: Self-monitors achieve status by helping others and knowing who helps whom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 91: 1123-1137.

Gardner, D. G., Van Dyne, L., & Pierce, J. L. 2004. The effects of pay level on organization-based self-esteem and performance: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 77: 307-322.

Gist, M. E. 1987. Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review,* 12: 472-485.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. 1992. Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review,* 17: 183-211.

Graen, G. B. 1976. Role-making process within complex organizations. In M. Dunnette (Ed.),

Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: 1201-1245. Chicago, IL: McNally.

Grant, A. M. 2013. Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: The role of emotion regulation in employee voice, *Academy of Management Journal,* 56: 1703-1723.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. 2008. The dynamics of proactivity at work. In B. M. Staw & A. P. Brief (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* vol. 28: 3-34. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Grant, A. M., & Gino, F. 2010. A little thanks goes a long way: Explaining why gratitude expressions motivate prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 98: 946-955.

Grant, A. M., & Mayer, D. M. 2009. Good soldiers and good actors: Prosocial and impression management motives as interactive predictors of affiliative citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 94: 900-912.

Griffin, A. E., Colella, A., & Goparaju, S. 2001. Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionist perspective. *Human Resource Management Review,* 10: 453-474.

Harvey, P., Martinko, M. J., & Douglas, S. C. 2009. Causal perceptions and the decision to speak up or pipe down. In J. Greenberg & M. Edwards (Eds.), *Voice and silence in organizations:* 63-82. Bingley, England: Emerald.

Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., Treadway, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. 2006. The interaction of social skill and organizational support on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 91: 482-489.

Hung, H. K., Yeh, R. S., & Shih, H. Y. 2012. Voice behavior and performance ratings: the role of political skill. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 31: 442-450.

Hurst, C., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Livingston, B. A. 2012. The odd one out: How

newcomers who are different become adjusted. In C. Wanberg (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of organizational socialization:* 115-138. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Isen, A. M. 1970. Success, failure, attention and reactions to others: The warm glow of success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 15: 294-301.

Janssen, O., & Gao, L. 2013. Supervisory responsiveness and employee self-perceived status and voice behavior. *Journal of Management.* doi: 10.1177/0149206312471386

Jokisaari, M., & Nurmi, J. E. 2009. Change in newcomers' supervisor support and socialization outcomes after organizational entry. *Academy of Management Journal,* 52: 527-544.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., Livingston, B. A., & Liao, H. 2011. Perceived similarity, proactive adjustment, and organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 78: 225-236.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J., Wanberg, C., Rubenstein, A., & Song, Z. 2013. Support, undermining, and newcomer socialization: Fitting in during the first 90 days. *Academy of Management Journal,* 56: 1104-1124.

Kim, Y. J., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Johnson, R. E. 2013. Why and when do motives matter? An integrative model of motives, role cognitions, and social support as predictors of OCB. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* 121: 231-245.

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. In B. M. Staw & A. P. Brief (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* vol. 29: 163-193. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Korman, A. K. 1970. Toward an hypothesis of work behavior. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 54: 31-41.

Klein, H. J. 1989. An integrated control theory model of work motivation. *Academy of Management Review,* 14: 150-172.

Klein, C., DeRouin, R. E., & Salas, E. 2006. Uncovering workplace interpersonal skills: A review, framework, and research agenda. In G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology,* vol. 21: 79-126. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

Krueger, N. F. Jr., & Dickson, P. R. 1993. Self-efficacy and perceptions of opportunities and threats. *Psychological Reports,* 72: 1235-1240.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. 1998. Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 83: 853-868.

LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. 2001. Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with big five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 86: 326-336.

Li, N., Harris, T. B., Boswell, W. R., & Xie, Z. 2011. The role of organizational insiders' developmental feedback and proactive personality on newcomers' performance: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 96: 1317-1327.

Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. 2012. The validity of interpersonal skills assessment via situational judgment tests for predicting academic success and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 97: 460-468.

Lindsley, D. H., Brass, D. J., & Thomas, J. B. 1995. Efficacy-performance spirals: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Review,* 20: 645-678.

Locke, E. A., Frederick, E., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. 1984. Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 69: 241-251.

Maurer, T. J. 2001. Career-relevant learning and development, worker age, and beliefs about
self-efficacy for development. *Journal of Management,* 27: 123-140.

McAllister, D. J., Kamdar, D., Morrison, E. W., & Turban, D. B. 2007. Disentangling role
perceptions: How perceived role breadth, discretion, instrumentality, and efficacy
relate to helping and taking charge. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 92: 1200-1211.

Morrison, E. W. 1993. Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and
outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal,* 36: 557-589.

Morrison, E. W. 2002. Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during
socialization. *Academy of Management Journal,* 45: 1149-1160.

Morrison, E. W. 2011. Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future
research. *Academy of Management Annals,* 5: 373-412.

Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and
development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review,* 25: 706-725.

Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. 1999. Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate
workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal,* 42: 403-419.

Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Kamdar, D. 2011. Speaking up in groups: A
cross-level study of group voice climate and voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*
96: 183-191.

Ng, K. Y., & Van Dyne, L. 2005. Antecedents and performance consequences of helping
behavior in work groups. *Group & Organization Management,* 30: 514-540.

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. 2010. Making things happen: A model of proactive
motivation. *Journal of Management,* 36: 827-856.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. 2005. Prosocial behavior:
Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 56: 365-392.

Pierce, J. L., & Gardner, D. G. 2004. Self-esteem within the work and organizational context:

A review of the organization-based self-esteem literature. *Journal of Management,* 30: 591-622.

Pierce, J. L., Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., & Dunham, R. B. 1989. Organization-based self-esteem: Construct definition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal,* 32: 622-648.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management,* 26: 513-563.

Reichers, A. E. 1987. An interactionist perspective on newcomer socialization rates. *Academy of Management Review,* 12: 278-287.

Schmitz, B., & Skinner, E. 1993. Perceived control, effort, and academic performance: Interindividual, intraindividual, and multivariate time-series analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 64: 1010-1028.

Schunk, D. H. 1991. Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist,* 26: 207-231.

Sonnentag, S., & Grant, A. M. 2012. Doing good at work feels good at home, but not right away: When and why perceived prosocial impact predicts positive affect. *Personnel Psychology,* 65: 495-530.

Spurk, D., & Abele, A.E. 2013. Synchronous and time-lagged effects between occupational self-efficacy and objective and subjective career success: Findings from a four-wave and 9-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior.* doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2013.12.002.

Stamper, C. L., & Van Dyne, L. 2001. Work status and organizational citizenship behavior: A field study of restaurant employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 22: 517-536.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. 2008a. Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate. *Personal Psychology,* 61: 37-68.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. 2008b. Exploring nonlinearity in employee voice: The effects of personal control and organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal,* 51: 1189-1203.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. 2012. Ask and you shall hear (but not always): An examination of the relationship between manager consultation and employee voice. *Personnel Psychology,* 65: 251-282.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. 2003. Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies,* 40: 1359-1392.

Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & McLean P. J. 1995. Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* vol. 17: 215-285. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Joireman, J. 2008. In-role perceptions buffer the negative impact of low LMX on helping and enhance the positive impact of high LMX on voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93: 1195-1207.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. 1998. Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal,* 41: 108-119.

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

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes, and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior,* vol. 18:

1-74. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Pierce, J. R. 2009. Effects of task performance, helping, voice and organizational loyalty on performance appraisal ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 93: 125-139.

Williamson, G. M., & Clark, M. S. 1989. Providing help and desired relationship type as determinants of changes in moods and self-evaluations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 56: 722-734.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. 1989. Impact of conceptions of ability on self-regulatory mechanisms and complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 56: 407-415.

Woodruff, S. L., & Cashman, J. F. 1993. Task, domain, and general efficacy: A reexamination of the self-efficacy scale. *Psychological Reports,* 72: 423-432.

Zhang, Y., LePine, J., Buckman, B., & Wei, F. 2013. It's not fair…Or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor – job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal.* doi: amj.2011.1110.

TABLE 1

Correlation Between Helping and Voice[a]

Published Study	Type of Study	Antecedents of Helping	Antecedents of Voice	Correlation
Farh, Hackett, & Liang (2007)	Field study ($N = 169$)			$r = .55$
Chan (2013)	Field study ($N = 202$)			$r = .70$
	Field study ($N = 289$)		Authoritarian leadership ($\beta = -.15$) Moral leadership ($\beta = .13$)	
Kim, Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Johnson (2013)	Field study ($N = 247$)	Prosocial values motives ($\beta = .22$) Impression management motives ($\beta = .14$)	Organizational concern motives ($\beta = .32$)	$r = .18$
	Field study ($N = 281$)	Prosocial values motives ($\beta = .20$) Impression management motives	Organizational concern motives ($\beta = .22$)	$r = .15$

[a] Studies that label "helping" as "altruism" are also included into this table.

		(β = .15)		
De Dreu & Van Vianen (2001)	Field study (Team N = 27)	Collaborating conflict response (β = -.51) Avoiding conflict response (β = .50)	Collaborating conflict response (β = -.49) Avoiding conflict response (β = .55)	r = .70
Stamper & Van Dyne (2001)	Field study (N = 257)	Work status (β = .14)		r = .67
Deckop, Cirka, & Andersson (2003)	Field study (N = 157)	OCB received from coworkers (β = .16)		r = .62
Van Dyne & LePine (1998)	Field study (N = 597)			r = .63–.81
Zhang, LePine, Buckman, & Wei (2013)	Field study (N = 339)	Organizational justice (β = .32)	Organizational justice (β = .30)	r = .72
Grant (2013)	Field study (N = 100)	Emotion regulation knowledge (β = .03) Deep acting (β = .29) Surface acting (β = .19)		r = .43
Hung, Yeh, & Shih (2012)	Field study (N = 258)			r = .40

Van Dyne, Kamdar, & Joireman (2008)	Field study ($N = 211$)	LMX ($\beta = .36$)	LMX ($\beta = .32$)	$r = .31$
		In-role perceptions ($\beta = .38$)	In-role perceptions ($\beta = .43$)	
	Field study ($N = 234$)	LMX ($\beta = .17$)	LMX ($\beta = .17–.19$)	$r = .21–.23$
		In-role perceptions ($\beta = .41–.46$)	In-role perceptions ($\beta = .32–.35$)	

FIGURE 1

Theoretical Framework of Newcomers' Extra-Role Behaviors

Individual Differences
-OBSE
-Interpersonal skill

Situational Factors
-Group voice behavior
-Supervisor support

Spiral for Helping

Spiral for Voice

Helping

Helping Efficacy

Voice Efficacy

Voice

Cognitive Mediation

Feedback
-Positive/Negative

Feedback
-Positive/Negative

39