We investigated the relationships between employee goal orientations, employee voice towards the supervisor, and employee influence on the supervisor in a Dutch hotel. Using data collected from 126 employee-supervisor dyads, we found that employee voice mediated the positive relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor. Furthermore, employee performance orientation operated as a second-stage moderator in this mediated relationship such that the indirect relationship was significant and positive when employee performance orientation was high, but not significant when employee performance orientation was low. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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INTRODUCTION

Work environments are becoming increasingly complex, dynamic, and interdependent, leaving supervisors unable to detect, interpret, and handle challenges alone (Gao, Janssen, & Shi, 2011). In response, supervisors must rely more on voice input – expressed concerns, opinions, and suggestions about work-related matters – of their subordinates that can facilitate their adaptation to the demands and requirements of the dynamic work environment (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Whiting, Podsakoff, & Pierce, 2008). As such, employee voice has been recognized as a driving force behind the early detection of serious problems and the creation of opportunities for improvement and innovation in the workplace (e.g., Detert & Burris, 2007; Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010). Many different types of voice exist, in the current study, we focus on employees' upward *challenging-promotive voice behavior*, defined as employees’ discretionary, extra-role communication to supervisors about work-related challenges or problems with the intent to improve the organization (Detert & Burris, 2007; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Morrison, 2011; 2014). Because the motive behind such voice is prosocial and constructive (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003), it differs from constructs like acquiescent voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003), supportive voice (Burris, 2012), and defensive voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003). It also differs from related constructs such as issue-selling, internal whistleblowing, and dissent because these forms of communications do not imply prosocial motives or improvement (Morrison, 2014).

Given the value of employee voice behavior, scholars and researchers have become interested in examining its personal and situational antecedents. Scholars agree that work attitudes such as satisfaction (e.g., Rusbult et al., 1988; Withey & Cooper, 1989) and work context such as supervisor support (e.g., Detert & Burris,
2007; Edmondson, 2003; Gao et al., 2011) influence subsequent voice behavior. Despite these advances, several major issues remain. One issue is that voice behavior requires significant cognitive and interpersonal effort from employees. Developing suggestions about work-related issues requires the motivation to invest time, energy, and expertise in detecting problems, generating solutions, and communicating this information. Therefore, a logical and important question is what internal motivational forces drive individual employees to engage in such challenging-promotive voice behaviors. A handful of prior studies has investigated personality factors underlying employee voice, but this work has primarily focused on broad traits such as proactive personality (Crant, Kim, & Wang, 2011) and extraversion, conscientiousness, and agreeableness from the Five-Factor model (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). In the present study, we seek to examine the role that individuals' dispositional differences in achievement motivation may play in voice behavior. Using a goal orientation perspective (e.g., DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Dweck, 1999; Elliot, 1999; Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007; VandeWalle, 1997; Yeo, Loft, Xiao, & Kiewitz, 2009), we argue that differences in employees' approached-focused goal orientations influence employees' voice behavior.

Specifically, we argue that a mastery orientation -- defined as the desire to develop competence through gaining knowledge, skills, and abilities (Dweck, 1999) -- may motivate employees to engage in challenging-promotive voice towards the supervisor for two main reasons. First, employees with a high mastery-approach orientation are more able to identify work-related issues and develop the suggestions that form the content of voice behaviors. Second, employees with a high mastery orientation are motivated to share, express and articulate this content to their supervisor. Hence, our first goal is to investigate whether mastery orientation is
positively related to employee voice towards the supervisor.

Employee voice behavior has substantial value for the organization and supervisors have come to rely on employee voice input to improve work unit functioning and productivity. Consequently, employees who can consistently provide voice behavior will be most likely to be perceived by the supervisors as important and influential members of the work unit. Accordingly, our second goal is to examine to what extent employees' engagement in voice is related to employee influence on the supervisor. As such, we investigate how voice serves as an explanatory mechanism for why employees with a high mastery orientation are influential to the supervisor.

Finally, based on a multiple goal orientation perspective (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011), we propose that a high performance orientation, defined as the desire to demonstrate superior competence relative to others (Dweck, 1999), enhances the influence of employee voice on the supervisor. Whereas a high mastery orientation motivates employees to engage in voice, a high performance orientation increases employee motivation to leverage voice behavior into influence on their supervisor and exploit voice as an opportunity to promote influence on the supervisor. Thus, our final goal is to test a moderated mediation model in which voice mediates the relationship between mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor, and in which performance orientation moderates the voice-influence relationship. Figure 1 presents this model.
By integrating ideas from goal orientation theory and theories of power and influence, we make three contributions to the literature. Our first contribution is that our examination of the link between mastery orientation and employee voice advances knowledge on the internal motivational forces that drive upward voice. Our second contribution is that our investigation of employee voice behavior as an explanatory mechanism through which mastery orientation relates to influence on their supervisor helps to elucidate the process that links employee characteristics to influence in the supervisor-subordinate relationship. The third contribution is that our use of the multiple goal orientation perspective will increase our knowledge of how, why, and when combinations of mastery orientation and performance orientation are linked to employee influence on supervisors. In the following sections, we first develop our hypotheses on the relationship between mastery orientation and voice (H1) and how voice is a mechanism through which employees with a high mastery orientation influence supervisors (H2 and H3). Then, we present arguments to explain that a performance orientation may heighten the effect and influence of employee voice on the supervisor (H4). Finally, we present our conceptualization of the moderated mediation model (H5).
LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Goal Orientations

Goal orientations refer to dispositional patterns of cognitions and actions for how individuals approach, interpret, and respond to achievement situations (e.g., Dweck, 1999; DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Elliot, 1999; Elliot, 2005; Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009). Two primary goal orientations were initially defined. A mastery orientation reflects an individual's desire to develop their competence and to improve their performance relative to their own past performance. A performance orientation reflects the desire to demonstrate superior competence on performance indicators relative to others (e.g., DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Dweck, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009). Both orientations relate to the fundamental human need for competence (Deci & Ryan, 2002). Individuals with a high mastery-approach orientation desire to develop competence by evaluating their performance relative to past performance--they focus on intrapersonal standards. In contrast, individuals with a high performance-approach orientation desire to demonstrate competence though displays of performance superior to socially relevant others--they focus on interpersonal standards.

Early research using a dichotomous mastery vs. performance conceptualization found that a mastery orientation was more strongly positively associated with performance than a performance orientation was (e.g., Button et al., 1996; Farr et al., 1993; Ford et al., 1998; Phillips & Gully, 1997; VanderWalle, Brown, Cron, & Slocum, 1999). However, subsequent research has shown that a performance orientation can also be positively associated with performance (e.g., Elliot & Church, 1997; Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997; Skaalvik, 1997). Scholars then conceptually bifurcated performance orientation into performance-approach (the
motivation to outperform others in order to demonstrate competence) and performance avoidance (the motivation to avoid being outperformed by others in order to prevent being viewed as incompetent) orientations (VandeWalle, 1997). Of the two, a performance-approach orientation can sometimes elicit increased effort or performance whereas a performance-avoidance orientation consistently has negative effects on effort and performance in achievement situations (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Duda, 2001; Dweck, 1999). Mastery orientations were also categorized into approach and avoidance components, where a mastery-approach orientation motivates individuals to focus on the development of competence and a mastery-avoidance orientation motivates individuals to avoid deterioration or the loss of competence and skills (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). This conceptualization implies a four-factor model of goal orientation. Most studies on goal orientations have used either the four-factor model or the two approach-focused factors of mastery and performance orientations (Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011).

In this study, we also adopt this final approach and focus on mastery-approach and performance-approach orientations. In the interest of theoretical parsimony, we focus on the approach dimensions since they have the strongest and clearest theoretical grounding with respect to approach-focused behaviors like voice. This two-factor conceptualization of mastery-approach and performance-approach orientation has a rich theoretical and empirical foundation (e.g., Anseel et al., 2011; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Poortvliet, 2013; Poortvliet, Janssen, Van Yperen, & Van de Vliert, 2009; Poortvliet, Anseel, Janssen, Yperen, & Van de Vliert, 2012; Porter, Gogus, & Race, 2010; Senko et al., 2011; Van Hooft & Noordzij, 2009) for formulating hypotheses. Consequently, we use the terms of mastery and performance orientations in this study to reflect the approach versions of these two orientations.
Employee Mastery Orientation, Upward Voice, and Employee Influence on the Supervisor

We focus on two rationales for why a mastery orientation has a positive relationship with employee voice behavior. First, we argue that employees with a high mastery orientation are more likely to detect problems and develop constructive suggestions for change that form the content of voice behaviors. A mastery orientation is associated with intrinsic task interest (Elliot & Harachiewicz, 1996; Rawsthorne & Elliot, 1999), the use of deep information-processing strategies (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Elliot, 1999; Ford et al., 1998; Pintrich, 2000; Van Yperen, 2003), and engagement in metacognitive activity (Pootvliet, 2013; Poortvliet et al., 2012). These cognitive tendencies facilitate the identification of opportunities for constructive change that improve efficiency and organizational performance.

Second, employees with a high mastery orientation have greater self-confidence and thus more likely to articulate their voice-related ideas to their supervisor. A high mastery orientation is positively related to self-confidence and task-specific self-efficacy that derive from incremental beliefs about skill development (Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996; Phillips & Gully, 1997). In a meta-analytic review, Payne and colleagues (2007) showed a strong and consistently positive relationship between task-specific self-efficacy and mastery orientation. More recently, Li (2013) showed that mastery goals\(^1\) are related to greater self-confidence and less cognitive anxiety. In turn, theoretical models of voice suggest that one of the best proximal predictors of voice is self-confidence regarding job tasks and voice behavior (Avery, 2003; Duan & Wei, 2012). In summary, due to their cognitive tendencies and high self-confidence, employees with a high mastery orientation are more likely to identify

---

\(^1\) We wish to clarify that Li’s (2013) study examined specific achievement goals whereas our study is focused on trait-based achievement goal orientations. Despite this difference, the findings for achievement goals tend to be consistent with those of goal orientations (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005).
opportunities for improvement and share them with their supervisor. Accordingly, we predict the following:

**Hypothesis 1.** Employee mastery orientation is positively related to employee voice behavior towards the supervisor.

From a supervisor's perspective, employee voice behavior has value because it can facilitate resolutions to complex problems (Detert & Burris, 2007; Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010) and is positively associated with group and unit effectiveness (Nemeth et al., 2001; MacKenzie et al., 2011). Research shows that employee voice aids supervisors in detecting and solving problems early, as well as in adapting processes, products, or services to new and changing requirements in complex organizational environments (Van Dyne, Cummings, & Parks, 1995; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Whiting et al., 2008). Consequently, supervisors often rely on employee voice input in order to meet organizational goals (Gao et al., 2011) and they value those employees who can contribute to their unit via useful, constructive voice behavior.

However, as employees differ in their capacity, willingness, and desire to engage in upward voice, the availability of this valuable resource for the supervisor tends to be limited to exchange relationships with only a small number of employees. Research consistently shows that the majority of employees prefer not to speak up regardless of whether they have valuable voice input (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Souba, Way, Lucey, Sedmak, & Notestin, 2011). As a consequence, employees who can and do engage in voice are both valuable and rare, increasing the degree to which they are likely to garner influence on their supervisor. Accordingly, we formulate our second hypothesis:
Hypothesis 2. Employee voice behavior towards the supervisor is positively related to employee influence on the supervisor.

Taken together, the above reasoning suggests that employees with a high mastery orientation are motivated to engage in voice behavior, and because of the value of their voice behavior for the work unit, the supervisor views them as valued and important team members. Thus, these employees gain the opportunity to more effectively exert influence upwards. In this sense, voice behavior links an employee's mastery orientation to influence on the supervisor. Accordingly, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3. Employee voice behavior towards the supervisor mediates the indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor.

Performance Orientation as a Moderator of the Voice-Influence Relationship

Although a mastery orientation has a clear direct relationship with employee voice behavior, the relationship between a performance orientation and voice is less clear. While some aspects of performance orientations may encourage voice, other aspects may discourage it. Employees with a high performance orientation are motivated to demonstrate superior performance and competence (Dweck, 1999). In some sense, providing constructive suggestions to one’s supervisor seems an effective way to demonstrate such competence. However, this relationship is more complex than it seems because of the unique characteristics of voice. Given their focus on demonstrating competence, employees with a high performance orientation tend to focus most of their effort on behaviors they believe have the strongest instrumental links to performance ratings and evaluations. Because employee voice is a form of discretionary, extra-role communication (Morrison, 2011, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), it is seldom a formal
component of performance management systems. Consequently, there is little reason to expect that a performance orientation will serve as an internal motivational drive towards voice behavior. In addition, the cognitive processes associated with a performance orientation have an unclear relationship to generating voice input. Individuals with a high performance orientation tend to engage in surface-level processing of task information (Elliot, McGregor, & Gable, 1999) and tend to lack intrinsic interest in performing their work tasks. These tendencies may facilitate as well as impede the generation of voice content. Finally, employees with a high performance orientation are somewhat risk-averse in relationships with others (Poortvliet & Darnon, 2010). Given the possibility that voice behaviors may challenge or upset a supervisor, employees with a high performance orientation may or may not be willing to engage in voice behaviors. Given this ambiguity, the theory and literature would not yet support a clear directional hypothesis between performance orientation and voice.

Although a performance orientation may not be a direct antecedent of voice or influence, it is still relevant because it can moderate the relationship between employee voice behavior and employees' influence on the supervisor. According to the multiple goal orientation perspective (Harackiewicz, Barron, & Elliot, 1998; Senko et al., 2011), combinations of goal orientations have the greatest impact on behavioral outcomes. Three types of combinations are possible. The two goal orientations may: (1) have a positive interactive effect to optimize an outcome (interactive model); (2) each have a positive main effect on an outcome (additive model); or (3) have unique effects on different outcomes (specialized model; Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001; Senko et al., 2011). In the present study, we adopt a variation of the interactive model in which a high mastery orientation is related to influence via voice, and a performance orientation moderates the voice-influence relationship.
We suggest that while a high mastery orientation motivates employees to both generate voice content and share it with the supervisor, a high performance orientation motivates employees to use voice input as opportunities to influence the supervisor. Because they want to demonstrate competence, employees with a high performance orientation are motivated to frame their voice input in the best possible light in order to persuade and convince the supervisor. These employees will exploit voice behaviors as opportunities to demonstrate competence and garner influence.

Moreover, when there are alternative suggestions and ideas voiced by other employees to the supervisor, performance-oriented employees are likely to more strongly promote and defend the value of their voiced ideas. Motivated by their desire to take full advantage of the voicing opportunity, performance-oriented employees will do their utmost to persuade the supervisor that their voiced suggestions are the most valuable, useful, and effective. Such efforts may enable performance-oriented employees to better leverage their voice behaviors and increase the supervisor’s perception of their influence.

In contrast, employees with a low performance orientation do not take advantage of such opportunities in the same way, weakening the relationship between voice behaviors and influence on the supervisor. Therefore, we formulate the following hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 4.** *Employee performance orientation moderates the relationship between employee voice behavior towards the supervisor and employee influence on the supervisor such that this relationship is more positive when performance orientation is higher rather than lower.*

Taken together, we use a multiple goal orientation perspective to propose that employee mastery orientation is indirectly, positively related to employee influence on the supervisor via voice behavior. This indirect relationship is conditional on the
moderating effects of employee performance orientation for the path from employee
voice to employee influence on the supervisor (see Figure 1). As such, this moderated
mediation model specifies how and when employee mastery orientation is related to
influence on the supervisor. Therefore, we formulate the following final hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 5.** The indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation
and employee influence on the supervisor through employee voice behavior is
conditional on employee performance orientation such that this indirect
relationship is more pronounced when employee performance orientation is
higher rather than lower.

**METHOD**

**Participants and Procedure**

Data were collected among employees and their direct supervisors in a four-
star hotel in the Netherlands. Participants were from all major operational departments
of the hotel (Front Office, Food and Beverage, and Housekeeping). During morning or
evening briefing meetings, questionnaires were administered to employees in order to
capture self-reports of personal and situational factors relevant to employee voice
behavior. The survey took approximately 30 minutes to complete. In addition to these
self-report data, the employees’ direct supervisors rated employee voice behavior as
well as employee influence on the supervisor. We relied on supervisor-ratings of
employee voice and influence because the supervisor was in the best position to make
this comparative evaluation. As each supervisor instructed and supervised different
employees, there were multiple exchange relationships to take into account when
evaluating and assessing the relative influence employees could leverage through their
voice behaviors. Employee and supervisor questionnaires were coded in order to match
employees’ responses with those of the supervisors. Participation was voluntary, and
confidentiality was assured.

We approached 136 employee-supervisor pairs for participation. After 10 questionnaires were excluded due to incomplete answers, 126 matches of completed questionnaires were obtained, resulting in a response rate of 92.65%. Of the employees, 61.1% were female, the average age of the sample was 20.21 years (SD = 2.22), and all were hotel management bachelor’s students in training, which explains the relatively young age of the sample. In terms of nationality, 74.6% were Dutch, 11.9% Chinese, 9.5% German, and 4% other nationalities.

**Measures**

**Employee goal orientations.** Van Yperen and Janssen’s (2002; see also Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004) goal orientations scale was used to measure employee mastery orientation and performance orientation. Sample items of the eleven-item mastery orientation scale are “I feel most successful at my job when I acquire new knowledge or master a new skill which was difficult for me in the past” and “I feel most successful at my job when I feel I am improving”. Sample items of the eight-item performance orientation scale are “I feel most successful at my job when I perform better than my colleagues” and “I feel most successful at my job when I accomplish something where others failed”. The response scale ranged from one (“strongly disagree”) to seven (“strongly agree”). The internal consistency testing revealed a Cronbach’s alpha of .92 for the mastery orientation scale, and of .93 for the performance orientation scale.

**Employee voice towards the supervisor.** We used the scale developed and validated by Liu, Zhu, and Yang (2010) to measure employees’ voice towards the supervisor. Sample items of the nine-item scale (α = .85) are “This particular employee communicates his/her opinions about work issues to me even if his/her opinion is
different, and I disagree with him/her,” and “This particular employee points out to me to eliminate redundant or unnecessary procedures.” The response scale ranged from one (“strongly disagree”) to seven (“strongly agree”).

**Employee influence on the supervisor.** We adapted the four non-reversed items of Anderson and Galinsky’s (2006) personal sense of power scale to measure employee influence on the supervisor (α = .65). We used this scale to capture employees' ability to exert influence on the supervisor as the wording of the items most closely represented upward influence ability. Sample items include “This particular employee can get me to listen to what he/she says”, “The wishes of this particular employee carry much weight with me”, and “This particular employee can get me to do what he/she asks”. These items better represent employees' ability to influence the supervisor (the ability to alter others' behavior and/or attitude [Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980]) rather than employees' personal power, or having the discretion and the means to asymmetrically enforce one's will on others (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Sturm & Antonakis, 2015).

**Control variables.** Consistent with previous research studies on employee voice (e.g., Detert & Burris, 2007; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), we included some control variables: gender, age (in years), team tenure, dyadic tenure, and team size. These were included to account for the possibility that simple demographic and organizational factors could influence employee voice towards the supervisor (e.g., LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Venkataramani & Tangirala, 2010).

**Analytical Approach**

As employees were nested in teams each led by a supervisor, the data may not be completely independent. We conducted an intraclass correlation analysis (ICC) on our study variables (i.e., mastery orientation, performance orientation, employee voice,
and employee influence). A statistically significant ICC(1) value would indicate that there is a team / supervisor effect (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). Results of this analysis showed that only the ICC(1) values for performance orientation ($ICC[1] = .19, p < .05$) and employee influence ($ICC[1] = .22, p < .05$) were statistically significant, indicating the existence of nesting effects. Therefore, we accounted for this nested multilevel structure by allowing a random intercept to control for supervisor effects on performance orientation and employee influence ratings. Specifically, we used linear mixed models in SPSS with restricted maximum likelihood estimation method to estimate our hypothesized conditional indirect relationship. This indirect effect was tested with Selig and Preacher’s (2008) Monte Carlo method, using percentile confidence intervals based on 20,000 bootstrap samples to assess mediation. Such confidence intervals take into account power problems introduced by non-normal sampling distributions of an indirect relation (Hayes, 2009; Preacher & Hayes, 2004; MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004), which other tests of mediation do not (e.g., Sobel, 1982; Baron & Kenney, 1996). To reduce potential multicollinearity when testing interaction effects, we standardized all of the predictor variables.

**RESULTS**

**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations**

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, and correlations among the study variables are presented in Table 1. Employee mastery orientation was positively related to both employee voice towards the supervisor and employee influence on the supervisor, while employee voice towards the supervisor was positively related to employee influence on the supervisor.
Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1 predicted that employee mastery orientation was positively related to employee voice behavior towards the supervisors. Following Becker’s (2005) recommendation, when testing our hypotheses using multilevel regression analysis, we only controlled for the control variables that were significantly related to the study variables. Age was found to be significantly and negatively related to influence \( (r = -0.21, p < .05, \text{see Table 1}) \) and gender was found to be significantly and positively related to voice \( (r = 0.49, p < .05, \text{see Table 1}) \). All other control variables (i.e., team tenure, dyadic tenure, team size) showed no correlation with any of the study variables (i.e., mastery orientation, performance orientation, voice, and influence). Consequently, we included age and gender in all subsequent multilevel regression analyses as controls. The results of the regression analyses showed that mastery orientation was indeed significantly and positively related to employee voice behavior towards the supervisor \( (\gamma = 0.23, p < .01, \text{see Table 2}) \), providing empirical support to Hypothesis 1.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Team size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mastery orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employee voice towards supervisor</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance orientation</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Employee influence on supervisor</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients are on the diagonal in parentheses. \( N = 126 \). Gender: 1 = male, 0 = female. * \( p < .05; \) ** \( p < .01 \)

We further predicted that employee voice behavior towards the supervisor was positively related to employee influence on the supervisor (Hypothesis 2) and that employee voice behavior mediated the positive relationship between employee
mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor (Hypothesis 3).

Following the Preacher and Hayes (2004) method, we found that employee mastery orientation was positively related to employee influence on the supervisor ($\gamma = .17, p < .05$, see Table 2). When employee voice behavior was added to the equation along with employee mastery orientation to predict employee influence on the supervisor, employee voice behavior was significantly related to influence on the supervisor ($\gamma = .27, p < .001$, see Table 2), whereas the coefficient for the direct path from employee mastery orientation to employee influence on the supervisor diminished ($\gamma = .11, ns$, see Table 2). An additional Monte Carlo simulation (Selig & Preacher, 2008) showed that the indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor through employee voice behavior towards the supervisor was significant (indirect effect = .06; CI = .02 to .12, see Table 2). These results fully supported Hypotheses 2 and 3.

Table 2.
Results of Mediation Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Voice behavior</th>
<th>Employee influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.21***</td>
<td>4.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery orientation</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 Restricted Log Likelihood 334.18 309.03 298.05

Indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor through employee voice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>95% confidence interval$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02 .12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 126$. $^a$ Based on 20,000 Monte Carlo samples; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. 
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Hypothesis 4 predicted that employee performance orientation moderated the relationship between employee voice behavior towards the supervisor and employee influence on the supervisor, such that the relationship between employee voice behavior and influence on the supervisor was more positive when employee performance-approach orientation was higher rather than lower. As results presented in Table 3 show, the interaction between employee voice behavior and performance orientation had a statistically significant relationship with employee influence on the supervisor ($\gamma = .16, p < .05$, see Table 3).

**Figure 2.** The moderating role of employee performance orientation in the relationship between employee voice towards the supervisor and employee influence on the supervisor.

To clarify this conditional effect of employee voice behavior on employee influence on the supervisor, simple slope tests were conducted. As Figure 2 illustrates, employee voice behavior had a statistically significant, positive relationship to employee influence on the supervisor ($\gamma = .42, p < .001$) when performance orientation was high (M + 1SD). When employee performance orientation was low (M − 1SD),
this relationship was not statistically significant ($\gamma = .10$, ns). This pattern of results supported Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that the indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation and influence on the supervisor through employee voice behavior was conditional on employee performance orientation. Additional Monte Carlo tests showed that the indirect relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor through employee voice behavior was significant for employees high on performance orientation (indirect effect = .10; CI = .03 to .18, see Table 3) but not for employees low on performance orientation (indirect effect = .02; CI = -.05 to .11, see Table 3). These results provided full support for Hypothesis 5.

**Table 3.**
Results of Moderated Mediation Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Employee influence on the supervisor</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>48.353</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-2.219</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee voice towards supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice $\times$ Performance orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 Restricted Log Likelihood 299.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance orientation</th>
<th>Conditional indirect effect</th>
<th>95% confidence interval $^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (M + 1 s.d.)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[.03, .18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (M – 1 s.d.)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>[.05, .11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 126. $^a$ Based on 20,000 Monte Carlo samples.*
Supplementary Analyses

We conducted supplementary analyses to assess the robustness of our results. First, we assessed whether performance orientation may have had alternative functions in our model. When regressing employee voice towards the supervisor on mastery orientation, performance orientation, and their interaction, we found no evidence for a main effect ($\gamma = .03, ns$) or interaction effect ($\gamma = .05, ns$) for performance orientation, whereas mastery orientation in itself remained to be positively and significantly associated with employee voice behavior ($\gamma = .23, p < .01$). These findings provide some additional support for our conceptualization that performance orientation serves an enhancer role in the voice-influence relationship and does not directly contribute to voice.

Second, given prior research findings of other relevant predictors of voice such as extraversion (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001) and leader openness to voice (Detert & Trevino, 2010), we conducted additional analyses to see to what extent such variables may impact mastery orientation's effect on voice behavior. In terms of zero-order correlations, employee extraversion was found to be significantly and positively related to performance orientation ($r = .33, p < .01$) while employee rated supervisor openness to voice was significantly and positively related to mastery orientation ($r = .28, p < .05$). However, neither extraversion nor leader openness to voice had statistically significant correlations with employee voice or employee influence. In addition, we regressed voice on extraversion and supervisor openness to voice separately and together with all other control variables and mastery orientation. We found that neither extraversion nor supervisor openness to voice was a significant predictor of voice while mastery orientation remained a positive and significant predictor of voice. These supplementary findings suggest that mastery orientation's
effect on voice behavior is independent of the effects of employee extraversion and leader openness to voice.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we aimed to advance understanding of the role of goal orientations in employee voice and employee influence on the supervisor. The results of our study showed that employee mastery orientation was positively related to employee engagement in voice behavior towards the supervisor. Employee voice was further found to link employee mastery orientation to employee influence on the supervisor. In addition, we found employee performance orientation to operate as a second-stage moderator in this relationship such that the relationship between employee mastery orientation and employee influence via voice was more positive when performance orientation was higher rather than lower.

Theoretical Implications

Our study has several theoretical implications. The present results support our proposition that goal orientations are related to employee voice and influence. Specifically, we found mastery orientation to be positively related to employees' engagement in voice behavior. Employees with a high mastery orientation are motivated to identify work-related issues, formulate improvement recommendations, and voice their ideas and suggestions to their supervisor. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that a mastery orientation promotes proactive, approach-oriented work behaviors that benefit individual, team, and organizational performance (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Elliot & Church, 1997; Ford et al., 1998; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Payne et al., 2007; Yeo et al., 2009; VandeWalle et al., 1999).
In addition, we answered calls to further investigate the consequences of employee voice (Greenberg & Edwards, 2009; Morrison, 2011) by identifying a link between voice behavior and employee influence on the supervisor. Employees who offer constructive suggestions aid their supervisor in the early detection of errors and inefficiencies in the work environment and create opportunities for improvement (Whiting et al., 2008). In line with theory and research on power and influence (French & Raven, 1959; Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Sturm & Antonakis, 2015), we found that providing voice input impacts the employee-supervisor relationship. However, employee influence depends on whether the supervisor believes employees' challenging-promotive voice is constructive and valuable. In the current study, we relied on supervisors' rating of employee voice. Had we relied on employees' own report of voice, the voice-influence relationship may have been different.

Finally, in line with the multiple goal orientation perspective proposed by Harackiewicz et al. (1998) and Senko et al. (2011), our results show that having both a high mastery orientation and a high performance orientation most benefit employees. Our findings align with an interactive model of how mastery orientation and performance orientation can combine in their effects (Barron & Harackiewicz, 2001). Furthermore, our results show that rather than a direct interaction between mastery- and performance orientations, the interaction is more subtle: mastery orientation promotes voice and performance orientation moderates the effects of voice on supervisors' perception of employee influence.

**Potential Limitations and Future Research**

The strengths and findings of our study need to be considered with respect to its limitations. First, the study’s cross-sectional design limits our ability to make assertions regarding causal flow. However, previous research on both goal orientations
and voice behavior provide support for the model we proposed. The literature supports a clear direction of causation from goal orientations to different contextual and change behaviors (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz, 2000; Elliot & Church, 1997; Ford et al., 1998; Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Payne et al., 2007; VandeWalle et al., 1999; Yeo et al., 2009). The causal relationship from voice to influence is also logical and consistent with literature on the motives of prosocial challenging-promotive voice (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998) as well as the effects of such voice behaviors (Nemeth, Connell, Rogers, & Brown, 2001; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Podsakoff, 2011). Given that voice benefits organizational performance by creating positive changes, the sources of voice should become more influential in organizational units because they improve the organization's outcomes.

Although our study’s unique contexts add value to it, testing our hypotheses in a single organization limits its generalizability. The relationships among goal orientations, employee voice towards the supervisor, and employee influence on the supervisor vary depending on organizational culture, industry characteristics, or other environmental factors such as national culture. We conducted this study in the Netherlands, which has a national culture with low power distance (Hofstede, 1994). Had we conducted our study in a country with high power distance (e.g., India, Russia, China), social norms could constrain voice behavior regardless of an employee’s goal orientation. Another organizational contextual factor that matters is that the majority of staff in this hotel were young: supervisors had a mean age of 23 and employees a mean age 20. The similarity in age between supervisors and employees may have reduced constraints on voice behavior. Therefore, we caution that further empirical examination is needed to generalize our findings.
Although our measurement model was generally strong, the sample reliability for employee influence exhibited a Cronbach's alpha value of .65, limiting our study. The conceptual ambiguity concerning the measurement of power versus influence (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Sturm & Antonakis, 2014) may have been a confounding factor which contributed to this low reliability. Future studies investigating employee influence on the supervisor may benefit from exploring and adapting scales that were specifically developed to measure interpersonal influence (e.g., Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Werner-Wilson & Arbel, 2000).

In addition to the above mentioned methodological considerations, our study also suggests future directions for research. Our findings show that voice fully mediated the positive relationship between mastery orientation and employee influence on the supervisor. Although we found full mediation, other mechanisms may exist through which employees with a high mastery orientation influence the supervisor. For example, social power bases and influence tactics play substantial roles in how employees attain upward influence (French & Raven, 1959; Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003; Raven, 2008; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990). Future research can further explicate how such mechanisms function in concert with goal orientations in employee-supervisor relations. We also recommend that future researchers incorporate the avoidance dimensions of goal orientations in influence studies. To preserve theoretical parsimony and highlight alignment between approach orientations and challenging-promotive voice, we focused on the approach factors of goal orientations in this study. However, mastery- and performance-avoidance orientations may also be related to other types of employee voice.
Practical Implications

Our study has several practical implications. From a managerial and organizational perspective, our findings suggest that encouraging employee voice facilitates a more balanced power relationship between employees and their supervisor. Imbalanced power relations are more prone to abuse by the powerful party (Emerson, 1962; Martinez, 2012). Our finding suggests that voice may reduce incentives to abuse or misuse power in these relationships.

Second, our findings suggest that employees with both a high mastery- and a high performance orientation are most likely to have influence on their supervisor. Our results concur with prior research suggesting that achievement cognitions triggered by both mastery orientation and performance orientation would be the most adaptive (Darnon & Butera, 2007; Darnon et al., 2007; Poortvliet et al., 2009; Poortvliet et al., 2012). Consequently, we believe organizations benefit from selecting and recruiting employees who have both a high mastery- and performance orientation. A high mastery orientation motivates employees to develop voice content and share it with their supervisor, while a high performance orientation motivates employees to maximize the conversion of this voice into influence.

Conclusion

Using a multiple goal orientation perspective and theory and research on power and influence, we showed that employee mastery orientation is positively related to employee voice towards the supervisor, and that voice is a mechanism through which employees with a high mastery orientation influence their supervisor. Moreover, we provided evidence that this relationship is conditional on the moderating effect of employee performance orientation. We argued and showed that while mastery orientation motivates and enables employees to engage in voice behavior and influence
the supervisor, performance orientation influences the degree to which employees effectively leverage voice into influence.