Ideas endorsed, credit claimed: Managerial credit claiming weakens the benefits of voice endorsement on future voice behavior through respect and work group identification

Supplement A

Study 2: Scenario and manipulations for the 2 x 2 endorsement x credit-claiming experiment

Scenario

In this section, you will read a scenario about a company called TravelAir and respond to a few questions about your reactions to your manager's responses when you share your ideas and suggestions. Please put yourself in the role of working for your manager, Jamie, at TravelAir.

TravelAir is a small commuter airline that serves the Pacific Northwest, California, Nevada, and Arizona. TravelAir has served this market for the past 15 years. You have been working as the maintenance chief for your area in California at TravelAir for about 2 years now where you are in charge of the maintenance of all equipment necessary for ensuring the functionality of the airport, such as visual aids, airport electrical systems, luggage systems, security systems, pavement, drainage, and maintenance of unpaved areas. Promotions are often made within TravelAir. You are ambitious and would like to be promoted quickly in order to achieve higher leadership positions at TravelAir. One attribute that TravelAir seeks in their leaders is the ability to speak up, express ideas, and share concerns for how to continuously improve the company's procedures. Therefore, you make a great effort to share your ideas with the hope that others will know that you speak up effectively on a regular basis.

You will now read about how your manager, Jamie, typically responds to you when you share your ideas or suggestions with him.

Endorsement manipulation

Endorsement

In discussions with you, Jamie often agrees with your suggestions, considers them valuable, and thinks your suggestions should be implemented.

Non-endorsement

In discussions with you, Jamie does not agree with your suggestions, does not consider them valuable, and does not think your suggestions should be implemented.

Credit claiming manipulation

High credit claiming

When Jamie meets his superior and talks among your peers, Jamie does not acknowledge that you came up with your ideas. In other words, he claims your ideas as his own and takes credit for your ideas.

Low credit claiming

When Jamie meets with his superior and talks among your peers, Jamie acknowledges that you came up with your ideas. In other words, he does not claim your ideas as his own and does not take credit for your ideas.

Supplement B

Voice Recall Study

Participants and procedures

We initially recruited 249 full-time U.S. and U.K. employees via Prolific. One participant was excluded for not passing the one attention check item. This resulted in a final sample of 248 full-time employees (40.3% male; average age of 33.90 years [*SD* = 10.47]; 73.3% had a college degree or above; average organizational tenure of 9.90 years [*SD* = 11.27]). We rewarded participants with £1 for taking part in our survey.

The study design included a recall writing task (Fong, 2006; Tiedens & Linton, 2001) which has been used widely in the management literature (e.g., Casciaro et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2021). After reading a definition of voice behavior based on Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) voice items, the participants wrote about a time when they had spoken up to a manager. They then completed the scales of endorsement, credit claiming, respect, and anger.

Measures

Participants rated all items on a scale from one (*strongly disagree*) to seven (*strongly agree*). The question stem for the endorsement, credit claiming, and respect items was "After I spoke up with what I just described to my supervisor …," followed by the same endorsement, respect, and credit claiming items used in Study 1, except that the items were adapted to refer to the voice incident they had just recalled (e.g., for endorsement, "…my supervisor agreed with my comment").

We also asked participants if their supervisor had claimed credit for their idea, with only "yes" or "no" as responses. Participants who responded "yes" then answered the following open-ended question: "Please describe how your supervisor took credit for your idea, and how you found out about it." The results for this qualitative portion of this study are not reported below

but are incorporated in our theory development for hypothesis 2 in the manuscript; they can be made available to the readers upon request.

Results

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that voice incidents of low endorsement and high credit claiming indeed exist. If endorsement is a prerequisite of credit claiming, then we should have observed no or very few cases of low voice endorsement and high credit claiming. We coded endorsement as low (average endorsement score <4) or high (average endorsement score >4) and then ran a one-way ANOVA with credit claiming as the dependent variable and found no significant difference in credit claiming for incidents that were lower (M = 1.96, SD = 1.39) versus higher in endorsement (M = 1.98, SD = 1.18; F[1, 239] = .01, p = .92). Finally, the correlation between endorsement and credit claiming was nonsignificant (r = -.02, p = .76), suggesting that the two dimensions are empirically distinct.

Study summary

On the basis of the voice incidents the participants recalled, we found that voice incidents with low endorsement and high credit claiming exist.

Supplement C

2x2 Voice Recall Study

Participants and procedures

We initially recruited 401 full-time U.S. and U.K. employees via Prolific. A total of 84 participants were excluded for not passing the attention check items (8 participants) or not writing the correct content for their manipulated condition (76 additional participants). This resulted in a final sample of 317 full-time employees (36.3% male; average age of 34.35 years [*SD* = 10.21]; 85.5% had a college degree or above; average organizational tenure of 5.30 years [*SD* = 5.62]). We rewarded participants with £1 for taking part in our survey.

We manipulated endorsement and credit claiming using a recall writing experiment (Fong, 2006; Tiedens & Linton, 2001) which has been used widely in the management literature (e.g., Casciaro et al., 2014; Hill et al., 2021). We adopted a 2 (endorsement versus non-endorsement) × 2 (high claim credit versus low claim credit) between-subjects design in which participants were randomly assigned to write about a time when they spoke up to a manager and received one of four responses from their manager (endorsement + high claim credit, endorsement + low claim credit, non-endorsement + high claim credit, or non-endorsement + low claim credit). We first defined voice behavior on the basis of Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) voice items and described potential endorsement and credit claiming responses from supervisors:

> *"At work, people develop and make recommendations concerning issues that affect their work group, speak up and encourage others in the work group to get involved in issues that affect the work group, communicate their opinions about work issues to others in the work group even if their opinions are different and others in the work group disagree with them, and speak up in the work group with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures.*
>
> *After people have spoken up with their ideas/suggestions, their supervisors may agree with, support, and implement people's ideas/suggestions. Or supervisors may disagree with, not support, and not implement people's ideas/suggestions.*

Additionally, regardless of whether their supervisors endorse their ideas/suggestions, supervisors may take credit for people's ideas/suggestions and claim the ideas/suggestions as their own without acknowledging that others came up with the ideas/suggestions. Or supervisors may not take credit for people's ideas/suggestions and not claim the ideas/suggestions as their own without acknowledging that others came up with the ideas/suggestions."

Next, in the high [low] endorsement condition, participants were given the following writing instruction:

"In the space below, describe a time when you spoke up to your supervisor and your supervisor agreed [disagreed] with, supported [did not support], and implemented [did not implement] your idea/suggestion…"

Finally, in the high [low] credit claiming condition, participants were given the following writing instruction:

"…and also took credit [did not take credit] for your idea/suggestion without acknowledging that you came up with the idea/suggestion."

They then completed the scales regarding recall clarity, social desirability, and the endorsement and credit claiming manipulation check items. This qualitative portion of this study are not reported below; they are available from the first author upon request.

Measures

Participants rated all items on a scale from one (*strongly disagree*) to seven (*strongly agree*). The question stem for the endorsement and credit claiming manipulation check items was "After I spoke up with what I just described to my supervisor …," followed by the items used to measure endorsement ($\alpha = .92$) and credit claiming ($\alpha = .99$) in Study A.

Results

Table A summarizes the means and standard deviations of endorsement, credit claiming, and recall clarity across conditions. We checked whether the endorsement manipulation (non-endorsement = -1; endorsement = 1) was effective using a 2 (endorsement versus non-

endorsement) × 2 (high versus low claim credit) between-subjects ANOVA in which endorsement was the dependent variable. Participants in the endorsement condition indicated higher levels of endorsement (M = 5.63, SD = 1.10) than those in the non-endorsement condition (M = 3.02, SD = 1.44; F[1, 313] = 355.09, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .53$). Next, we checked whether the manipulation of credit claiming (low claim credit = -1; high claim credit = 1) was effective using another 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA with credit claiming as the dependent variable. Participants in the high claim credit condition indicated higher levels of credit claiming (M = 6.00, SD = 1.10) than participants in the low claim credit condition (M = 1.63, SD = 0.98; F[1, 313] = 1,380.83, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .82$). Thus, our manipulations were effective.

We were interested in whether participants were able to recall their assigned condition and how difficult it was for them to recall it. If voice endorsement is a prerequisite of credit claiming, then we would expect participants in the low voice endorsement and high credit claiming condition to have a higher level of difficulty recalling the experience compared with participants in the other conditions. Our specific interest was whether the participants in the low voice endorsement and high credit claiming condition had more difficulty recalling the experience compared with participants in the other conditions, so we conducted a 2 x 2 between-subjects ANOVA with recall ability as the dependent variable and examined the pairwise comparisons. There was no significant difference in recall ability between those in the low endorsement and high credit claiming condition (M = 5.81, SD = 1.17) and those in the low endorsement and low credit claiming condition (M = 5.95, SD = 1.06; F[1, 313] = 0.70, p = .41) or those in the high endorsement and high credit claiming condition (M = 5.81, SD = 1.11; F[1, 313] = 0.00, p = .98).

Study summary

This study provided support for the existence of voice incidents in which endorsement is low and credit claiming is high. We found that it was no more difficult to recall a voice incident in which managers did not endorse the idea but claimed credit for the idea than it was to recall voice incidents in which managers did not endorse or claim credit for the idea, or endorsed the idea and claimed credit for the idea.

Table A
Means and standard deviations for conditions

Condition	*N*	Endorsement	Credit Claiming	Recall Clarity
Non-endorsement + High Claim Credit	67	3.79 (1.38)	6.00 (1.08)	5.81 (1.17)
Non-endorsement + Low Claim Credit	95	2.48 (1.23)	1.58 (0.95)	5.95 (1.06)
Endorsement + High Claim Credit	78	5.22 (1.28)	6.00 (1.12)	5.99 (1.01)
Endorsement + Low Claim Credit	77	6.04 (0.66)	1.69 (1.02)	6.16 (0.91)