The Role of Safety Voice in Improving Organizational Information Security

Kent Marett
Mississippi State University
kmarett@business.msstate.edu

Emily Marett
Mississippi State University
emarett@business.msstate.edu

Abstract

Organizational information security programs are typically thought to be driven from the top-down, but allowing employees to offer input is thought to be part of a comprehensive security climate. In this study, we investigate the role of employee safety voice in improving a company's information security program. The results of an experiment comparing four types of safety voice suggest that the manner in which input is offered could be important, but the source of the input may be even more important. Male employees appear to be more effective at influencing managerial intentions to improve security than female employees. The implications and future directions of this research are discussed.

Keywords: information security, safety voice, sex differences, grassroots influence

1. Introduction

In the interest of protecting themselves against revenue loss, civil liabilities, and reduced credibility, organizations continually look for effective ways in which to improve their information security. Certainly, the best practices and recommendations offered by experts and peers are among the top sources of security input (Cavusoglu et al., 2015), but important insights could be available from within the organization itself. Its employees, the actual end users themselves, could be valuable toward crafting more effective security policies and procedures. Employees serve at the "street level" of the security program through their interaction with the tools and rules invested in and developed by upper management. They are often the most knowledgeable personnel of the strengths and weaknesses of a security program, and their compliance may ultimately lead to its success or failure (Flowerday & Tuyikeze, 2016). Employee consultation on security matters should be considered a vital part of security program development (Paananen et al., 2020).

This type of grassroots input is commonly referred to in the organizational behavior literature as "employee voice" (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001), and when the input is aimed at improving safety within the workplace, it is classified as a subset known as "safety voice" (Bazzoli & Curcuruto, 2021). We consider issues revolving around organizational information security as being one aspect of workplace safety. As Chan and colleagues (2005) point out, information security shares commonalities with workplace safety initiatives. These include the need for compliance by all parties involved, the goal of potential loss reduction through the prevention of accidents, and the use of guidelines that often create inconveniences and lost efficiencies. In order to create an overall safer climate, commitment to secure practices and procedures must include both employees and management.

This study takes a first step toward understanding where employee safety voice fits into improving an organization's information security program. Specifically, we investigate four types of safety voice that have been identified and tested in the employee voice literature in what appears to be the information security context for the first time. Using an experimental research design, we found that safety voice featuring a future-looking orientation was somewhat more effective at encouraging change than present-oriented safety voice. We also found that the sex of the employee offering security suggestions matters, with male employees being significantly more influential than female employees.

2. Theory and Literature Review

Information security policies are typically thought to be developed and instituted by management in a "top-down" approach, often by mimicking the best practices of competitors or following professional recommendations. In the same vein as the belief that an organization's budget indicates its priorities and goals, a set of security policies developed by management can also define organizational leaders' values (von Solms & von Solms, 2004). However, "bottom-up" policies originating with employees can better reflect actual

URI: https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109583
978-0-9981331-8-8

work processes and the idiosyncrasies of specific organizations and, thus, should not be discouraged (Niemimaa & Niemimaa, 2019). It is also thought that employee participation will lead to better security outcomes, including social acceptance and compliance with new policies (Siponen, 2005). In truth, both approaches are likely to be necessary for developing a holistic security program that is appropriate for each particular work setting.

Employee-led security initiatives are only possible in organizations with a culture of openness and a willingness by management to receive employee input. Management may believe that bottom-up suggestions are reactive in nature, possibly because employees tend to be present for incidents occurring at the perimeter of the organization and not for those striking strategic areas (Johnston & Hale, 2009). Supervisory support is crucial for establishing an environment that encourages proactive behavior by employees (Xu et al., 2023).

2.1 Employee Voice and Information Security

Employee voice is defined by LePine and Van Dyne (2001) as "constructive change-oriented communication intended to improve the situation" (p. 326). Because this study focuses on the role that employees play in helping shape organizational security programs, we use a subset of this behavior known as "safety voice." Employees engage in safety voice when they make proactive suggestions meant to prevent future injury and damages by alerting organizational members who have the capability to enact change (Bazzoli & Curcuruto, 2021).

Safety voice can be classified as one of four types depending on whether it is meant to reinforce current policies or to challenge the status quo (Bazzoli & Curcuruto, 2021). *Promotive voice* and *preventive voice* are both future-oriented, meaning that they center on anticipating and adapting to possible future threats. Promotive voice is devoted to making changes, so suggestions usually are of a constructive tone and express a need to depart from what the organization currently does. Preventive voice, on the other hand, offers advice on how to sustain current practices while defending against future losses.

The other two types are *prohibitive voice* and *hostile voice*, which are both present-oriented and, rather than predicting the future, are instead highly reactive to current conditions and events. Prohibitive voice deems the status quo as being sufficient for safety purposes, but recommendations deal with the factors that seem to undermine current policies and practices. Whistleblowing is thought to be a form of prohibitive voice (Chen & Trevino, 2022). Hostile voice is comparatively more focused on making changes based on criticism of current policies (Le Poire et al., 1992), often appearing as a form of "Monday-morning quarterbacking."

We predict that, because they are future-oriented and less reactive in nature, future-oriented promotive and preventive safety voice from employees will be more effective in terms of encouraging managers to consider information security suggestions than the present-oriented prohibitive and hostile safety voices. The basis for this prediction is grounded in construal- level theory, otherwise known as CLT (Trope & Liberman, 2010). CLT explains that there are differences in psychological distance between events that occur in the present and speculative possibilities that may occur in the future. By psychological distance, CLT describes one's self as a central reference point from which to craft subjective opinions of events that vary by temporality. People tend to examine temporally-distant future events by focusing on its benefits and desirability, while temporally- closer present events are appraised by their feasibility and their influence on highly-specific others (Nakashima et al., 2017). Simply put, future events are often considered in a nebulous "big picture" fashion and present events involve thinking about the concrete information associated with it. Of course, recommended changes must be performed at some point in time if they are to be adopted. Voice messaging that matches the temporal level (or urgency) of the situation is more likely to be digested by decision makers (Scheurs et al., 2020).

3. Hypotheses

Following construal-level theory, future-oriented suggestions voiced by employees should be more compelling to decision-makers due to the factors required to perform the change are still distant and less obligatory. Committing resources toward a future procedural change is not as urgent and can still allow reallocation should the need arise later on. Present- oriented safety voice, especially where information security is concerned, does not afford that luxury. The threats to security are occurring now; they cannot be as easily punted down the road by managers. All things being equal (such as the skills, resources, and scalability needed to successfully adopt a security change), we believe that the future-oriented promotive and preventive safety voices will be more likely to inspire change, whether or not the change actually transpires. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1: Future-oriented safety voice (promotive and preventive) will be associated with higher security change intentions than present-oriented safety voice (prohibitive and hostile).

The second hypothesis explores whether sex differences play a factor in how safety voice is perceived by managers. Expectation states theory (EST) has often been enlisted to help explain the differing effects of workplace voice put forth by males and females. EST proposes that status characteristic differences exist between different subsets of employees. Depending on their demographic differences (e.g. sex, age, race, computer experience, etc.), employees may stand to benefit or suffer from the subconscious perceptions of others, which are often perpetuated by stereotyping (Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004). These status differences may manifest when employees offer recommendations to their managers. For example, McClain and colleagues (2022) have found that female voice is more effective when it utilizes characteristics that are counter to typical female gender stereotypes. When female employees speak assertively and confidently instead of politely and humbly, they were perceived as more competent and were more likely to have their ideas endorsed by management (McClain et al., 2022). For men, there was no difference in perception of their competence whether they spoke assertively or adopted a more counter-stereotypical polite and humble tone (McClain et al. 2022).

In other studies exploring sex differences, findings have been mixed. In some studies, female voice is more heard than male voice (in predominantly female environments: Howell et al., 2015; in majority male groups: Farh et al., 2020) and the ideas proposed by female employees are perceived as higher quality than those proposed by their male counterparts (Bain et al., 2021). However, male speakers generally enjoy higher perceived role status than female speakers (McClean et al., 2018). We believe that these perceived status differences could apply to suggestions made about information security improvements.

Prior research has noted that women seem to be more receptive to safety information in the workplace, but whether this applies to recommended improvements to information security made by male employees remains open to conjecture. Within the information systems field, perhaps the most pertinent research to the intersection of voice receptivity and sex differences lies in the technology adoption area, in which females have been identified as being more swayed by social influence than males (Gefen & Straub, 1997; Venkatesh & Morris, 2000).

Several factors lead us to believe that male safety voice will be more influential than female safety voice: the preponderance of previous research indicating that male speakers enjoy higher perceived status than female speakers and findings that male voice is perceived favorably regardless of whether it reinforces or counters gender stereotypes (McClain et al., 2022). Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2: Male employees will be more influential with safety voice proposing information security changes than female employees.

4. Method

To test the hypotheses developed above, we employed an experimental research design featuring two fixed factors. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the four types of safety voice. Then, participants were presented a comic strip-styled vignette that matched the two characters with the participant's self-reported sexual identification. Female participants were exposed to one of the following vignettes: female manager and a male employee or a female manager and a female employee. Male participants were exposed to one of the following vignettes: male manager and a male employee or a male manager and a female employee. Figures 1A and 1B below provide examples.

Figure 1A: Sample panel from preventive voice vignette presented to male participants.

Figure 1B: Sample panel from hostile voice vignette presented to female participants.

Visual vignettes like those used in this study are thought to offer added benefit to the traditional text-based vignette. Both types of vignette allow researchers the opportunity to ask about sensitive topics due to depersonalization and distancing effects, thus reducing social desirability bias (Khanolainen & Semenova, 2020). However, visual vignettes provide a richer, more complex depiction of dialogue and events, leaving behind the one-dimensional characters found in text (Kinicki et al., 1995). Visual vignettes also tend to elicit quicker responses than text due to less required thought and interpretation of the narrative (Hughes & Huby, 2004), reducing the likelihood of delayed responses and decay effects of the treatment embedded within.

The vignettes used stock photos of two employees engaged in a workplace conversation. The dialogue was developed through the use of generative AI software that was provided the definitions for the four types of safety voice and instructed to write a short discussion between a manager and an employee recommending a change to the company's security procedures. For the proposed security improvement, we used the potential adoption of two-factor authentication (2FA) as this has been identified as a security procedure that employees have recognized as being a worthwhile addition while simultaneously considered to be burdensome and unpopular (Marett et al., 2023; Zhan et al., 2024). This paradox of effectiveness and inconvenience made 2FA amenable to the various types of voice we wanted to represent in the vignettes. Each vignette was of equal length (seven panels) across the four types of safety voice and the different male-female pairings.

4.1 Measures

Aside from the two factors manifested by the vignettes, latent variables were measured using pre-existing scales. Potential moderators identified from existing research included voice behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), power distance (Dorfman & Howell, 1988), general security concern (Workman et al., 2008), and affective commitment to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Safety voice was measured using the four-dimension scale developed by Bazzoli and colleagues (2020) and was used primarily for manipulation check purposes.

The dependent variable, intention to initiate security change, was based on scales developed to measure voice influence (Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Oc et al., 2005). We adapted the items to represent future consideration of making changes to the company information security program. Participants were asked, from the perspective of the manager in the vignette, to rate the likelihood they would make the recommended change, the speed with which they would pursue the change, the intent to allocate resources to make the change, and the likelihood they would investigate whether others have made the change. As with the aforementioned variables, their responses were captured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'.

The instrument was designed as follows. Participants were first asked to provide their demographic information, and their response to their sexual identification routed them to the appropriate set of vignettes (male or female manager). The vignette itself followed with the appropriate attention and manipulation check items. Participants then provided their assessments of the employee in the vignette, including affective commitment and power distance, and their intention to change security if they were themselves the manager in the scenario. Finally, they were asked to provide their own general security concern and their own voice behavior in the workplace.

4.2 Pilot Test

A pilot test of the stimuli and study procedures was conducted using a snowball sample of undergraduate students and their parents. This produced a sample of 197 participants, 110 female and 87 male. Manipulation checks of the four types of voice were tested using one-way ANOVA of the safety voice measures. The results indicated that the participants in the promotive voice group felt the dialogue was significantly more promotive than the other types of voice ($F=3.53$; $p<0.01$), the

prohibitive group rated their dialogue as significantly more prohibitive ($F=6.60$; $p<0.001$), and the hostile group deemed their dialogue as significantly more hostile ($F=2.82$; $p<0.05$). The preventive group felt that their dialogue was more preventive but not to a significant degree. Thus, the dialogue for that treatment was adjusted before proceeding to the main data collection. A realism check indicated that the situation portrayed in the vignette was representative of something that could occur in a workplace. On a scale ranging from 1 (not realistic) to 5 (very realistic), the pilot sample judged it with a mean of 4.13. The median time to complete the experiment was 6.9 minutes.

The measures for the latent variables were also assessed for convergent and discriminant validity. Confirmatory factor analysis revealed that one item for general security concern and two items for organizational commitment loaded onto inappropriate constructs, and a reliability analysis subsequently recommended that their associated variables would improve in internal consistency if removed from the analysis. All three items were deemed to be problematic and were dropped from the instrument.

We conducted a second pre-test of the study materials with a sample of business professionals. Two hundred ten full-time employees and managers (105 male and 105 female) were recruited through an online survey panel service. This time, all four types of safety voice passed the manipulation checks, meaning that the revised vignette scripts were more fitting for the type of voice intended to be represented. The revised scales appeared to be psychometrically sound, showing appropriate levels of reliability, convergent, and discriminant validity. Finally, the business professionals rated the vignette as being realistic (a mean 4.12 out of 5.0), very similarly to the prior pilot test.

5. Data Collection and Results

Data for the main study was collected through the use of an online survey panel service. The sample consisted of business professionals working throughout the United States, ultimately resulting in 140 valid responses from males and 140 from females. Sixty percent of the participants identified as full-time employees working forty or more hours a week, and 12 percent described themselves as seasonal or temporary employees. The remaining 28 percent reported themselves as business owners or managers. Participants ranged from 19 to 60 years of age, with a mean age of 37.4 years. All participants reported using a computer and the Internet at work. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four voice treatments, and they were only exposed to the single vignette they were assigned to.

As with the pilot test, the manipulation checks provided evidence that the treatments were portraying the appropriate types of voice, and a realism check again suggested that the scenario was true to life across treatments. The median time needed to complete the experiment was 7.3 minutes. A confirmatory factor analysis once again indicated appropriate convergent validity among the variables. Table 1 below displays the descriptive statistics and intercorrelations for the latent variables measured following the experiment. All of the variables had sufficient internal reliability and the average variance explained for each variable suggested adequate discriminant validity. A single moderator candidate, power distance, did not significantly correlate with the dependent variable, so it was decided not to represent it as a covariate in the subsequent data analysis. The other three variables, on the other hand, did correlate significantly with security change intentions, so they were all retained as covariates.

	M (SD)	α	CR	1	2	3	4	5
1) CHANGE INTENT	4.15 (0.6)	0.61	0.73	**.83**				
2) ORG COMMIT	3.72 (0.8)	0.89	0.93	.31**	**.92**			
3) POWER DIST	1.68 (0.5)	0.71	0.88	-.11	.02	**.82**		
4) SECURITY CON	4.40 (0.7)	0.87	0.88	.35**	.19**	-.09	**.92**	
5) VOICE BEHAVIOR	4.03 (0.7)	0.87	0.94	.32**	.15*	-.24**	.40**	**.86**

Table 1. Correlation matrix with square roots of AVE provided in bold in the diagonal. ** = p<0.01, * = p<0.05

To test the hypotheses, we used a two-way ANCOVA mixing the independent variables, type of safety voice and sex, with affective commitment, general security concern, and voice behavior as the covariates. An initial Levene's test indicated no heterogeneity in variance between the treatment groups. Table 2 reports the means for security change intention for each of the eight groups. The main effects of independent variables were tested first. The ANCOVA found no significant main effect for the type of safety voice ($F(3,276) = 1.87$, $p = 0.13$), though a post hoc Bonferroni test removing the covariates suggested that hostile voice was significantly less influential than promotive voice ($p = 0.01$) and preventive voice ($p = 0.02$). Nevertheless, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

However, Hypothesis 2 was supported, as males were found to be more influential toward encouraging security changes than females ($F(1,276) = 10.79$, $p= 0.001$). Overall, the ANCOVA model explains 27 percent of the variance in security change intentions. Table 3 displays the effect sizes for the independent variables and the covariates.

VOICE TYPE	SPEAKER		
	MALE (n = 140)	FEMALE (n = 140)	TOTAL
PROMOTIVE (n = 71)	4.39 (0.5)	4.21 (0.6)	4.30 (0.6)
PREVENTIVE (n = 70)	4.36 (0.6)	4.20 (0.7)	4.28 (0.6)
PROHIBIT (n =73)	4.12 (0.5)	4.01 (0.5)	4.06 (0.5)
HOSTILE (n = 66)	4.15 (0.7)	3.74 (0.8)	3.94 (0.7)
TOTAL	4.25 (0.6)	4.04 (0.7)	

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the treatment groups.

	MS	F	p	λ^2
MODEL	3.30	9.78	<.001	0.27
VOICE TYPE	0.63	1.87	0.13	0.02
SEX	3.64	10.79	.001	0.04
VT * SEX	0.13	0.39	0.76	0.00
AFF COM	5.13	15.20	<.001	0.05
SEC CON	5.40	15.99	<.001	0.05
VOICE BEH	3.29	9.77	.002	0.03

Table 3. Results of the ANCOVA.
NOTE: MS = mean square value; λ^2 = effect size

To follow up on the initial findings described above, we conducted a post hoc comparison examining the type of safety voice offered by a same sex or opposite sex employee, again with the participant serving in the role of the manager receiving the input. Table A1 in the Appendix reports the descriptive statistics for behavioral intention to change security across the four types of safety voice, the two sexes of the employee offering the safety voice, and the two sexes for the manager being asked to consider the suggestions. The most influential setting found was promotive voice being offered from a male employee to a female manager ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.4$). The least influential setting involved hostile voice being offered by a female employee to a male manager ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.9$), followed closely by hostile voice from a female employee to a female manager ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.6$). There was no significant three-way interaction between voice type, employee sex, and manager sex, but the statistical power for that comparison was insufficient for a valid ANOVA, so this result should be taken with caution.

6. Discussion

We believe that this study aligns with calls for research that explores individual differences found in IT workers who respond to security issues in the workplace on a regular basis (Singh et al., 2023). Indeed, cybersecurity is a stressful job that requires constant monitoring, testing, and re-education for workers to be effective. This is where safety voice comes into play; the input of front-line users can be a valuable resource that can help extend the radar of cyber-professionals. As this study shows, the manner in which the recommendations are voiced could result in different outcomes, depending on the recipient. However, this study should be considered preliminary at most. Follow-up work examining the actual decision-making of security managers is critical to applicability of this research.

Our study found preliminary evidence that female managers are more influenced by and receptive to safety voice. Previous work on voice behavior and manager avoidance behavior suggests that males often have a larger "perceptual distance" gap between their own perceived effectiveness and the perceptions of their subordinates (Yang & Li, 2018). This gap can manifest itself in agentic decision-making and can create a less collaborative environment compared to female managers. Meta-analyses back up this notion, as women have been found to be more encouraging and supportive of subordinates than men (Eagle & Carly, 2003).

While our findings could indicate that female managers are more receptive to voice behaviors due to more supportive and collaborative leadership styles, it is also possible that male speakers were more influential due to the topic of discussion. The IT and cybersecurity industry is predominantly male, with estimates of 4 males for every single female obtaining computer science degrees (Cimpian et al., 2020). Female participants of this study may have been more influenced by the male speaker vignettes because they don't frequently interact with female members of the IT industry. The lower numbers of female IT workers could have negatively impacted manager's abilities to view female voices as "expert" voices on security topics. This is an issue that demands further investigation. Alternatively, it is also possible that this study's findings provide additional evidence of male voices being perceived more favorably as demonstrating leadership. As McClean and colleagues (2018) noted, male employees who speak up in the workplace are more likely to be perceived as leaders than their female counterparts and, as a result, their recommendations are seen as more legitimate than women's similar voice behavior.

Our study also indicated that hostile voice is the least influential of the four safety voice types. This aligns with previous research indicating that voice types that elicit positive emotional responses are more effective than voice types that are perceived as a threat or attack (Chen & Trevino, 2022). Hostile voice is the only safety voice behavior that directly criticizes the organization for failing to make a policy change and could be perceived as a direct attack on the manager's judgment. This study examined effectiveness of voice behaviors in private, one-on-one conversations with managers. We would expect hostile voice to be even less effective when delivered in public settings like meetings, as supported by previous research indicating that all voice types delivered in public settings are perceived as threatening to managers (Isaakyan et al., 2021). Finally, there could also be some sex differences when accepting the type of security change being recommended, with women possibly being more open to behavioral changes to security while men being more likely to pursue technical changes (McGill & Thompson, 2021).

Although this study did not find evidence for a main effect between the four different types of safety voice behavior, it did make an exploratory contribution to the emerging body of literature related to sex differences in voice behaviors. This study found that that male managers were not as easily influenced as female managers, which could have other unintended consequences for subsequent voice behaviors within the workplace. Previous research indicates that there are sex differences in engaging in voice behavior (Yan et al., 2022; Eibl et al., 2020; Sherf et al., 2017). Self-efficacy predicts voice behaviors, and past research indicates that female employees typically have lower voice self-efficacy levels (Yan et al., 2022). Past research indicates that voice instrumentality, the belief that speaking up makes a difference, has a direct influence on voice behavior (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2012; Morrison, 2014; Sherf et al., 2020). When voice rejection occurs, it lowers perceived voice self-efficacy and reduces subsequent voice behaviors (Zhu et al., 2023). If our study findings indicate that male managers are more likely to reject voice suggestions, it could have an impact of unintentionally silencing subsequent female voice behavior in the workplace. For an issue like security threats this is particularly worrisome as the potential damages of allowing threats to remain unaddressed could be catastrophic to the organization.

Although this study should be best considered to be an initial investigation into safety voice and information security, we believe that there are some early implications of this research. First, it appears that the predictions about present- and future-orientation put forth by CLT seems to largely hold true in the context of security recommendations, despite the results failing to find statistical significance. Promotive and preventive safety voice did trend toward being more effective than prohibitive and hostile voice types. We see results like these aiding in our understanding of preventing insider threats within the organization. Safety voice is a type of bottom-up, employee-driven input that is thought to be beneficial toward user acceptance of security policies (Posey et al., 2015), and employees using promotive and preventive voice to encourage personal responsibility could help establish a more secure culture within the organization. In fact, the influence of organizational culture on the acceptance of safety voice would be worthwhile factor to test in future iterations of this research.

Second, there is the disappointing result that male safety voice seems to be more effective than that proffered by female employees. As mentioned before, this result parallels earlier work that suggests a stereotypical difference in influence between the two sexes. This result is especially sobering given that vignettes were used in order to reduce socially desirable responses from study participants. If the results here reflect true attitudes and perceptions of anonymous study participants who are free to report

their true feelings about the source of employee input, then it appears that there are significant challenges for organizations that seek to create a safe environment in which all voice behavior is recognized equally. Differences in acknowledgement of voice behavior also poses an additional challenge for those seeking to increase female participation in STEM careers like information security. It is also entirely possible that other individual differences, whether innate or socially-constructed, could inhibit the acceptance of safety voice. One's sex could also intersect with age, race, country of origin, or disability status of the speaker to reduce security effectiveness despite her best intentions.

7. Conclusion

This study examined the role of safety voice when offering information security recommendations within an organization. Four types of safety voice were tested in an experimental setting, and different permutations of males and females were represented in the vignettes. Though exploratory, we found initial results that will hopefully encourage more investigation into the intersection of safety voice and organizational security. Construal level theory, at least in this early phase of research, seems to predict the level of influence rendered by the types of safety voice. Likewise, the results parallel work in organizational behavior on sex differences and voice, and future research is needed to isolate stereotypes and feelings of self-efficacy when speaking up about security issues. Where information security is concerned, uncovering obstacles and barriers that discourage all employees from offering input should be a top priority for researchers.

8. References

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.

Bain, K., Kreps, T.A., Meikle, N.L., & Tenney, E.R. (2021). Amplifying voice in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(4), 1288-1312.

Bazzoli, A. & Curcuruto, M. (2021) Safety leadership and safety voices: Exploring the mediation role of proactive motivations. *Journal of Risk Research*, 24(11), 1368- 1387.

Bazzoli, A., Curcuruto, M., Morgan, J. I., Brondino, M., & Pasini, M. (2020). Speaking up about workplace safety: An experimental study on safety leadership. *Sustainability*, 12(18).

Cavusoglu, H., Cavusoglu, H., Son, J. Y., & Benbasat, I. (2015). Institutional pressures in security management: Direct and indirect influences on organizational investment in information security control resources. *Information & Management*, 52(4), 385-400.

Chan, M., Woon, I., & Kankanhalli, A. (2005). Perceptions of information security in the workplace: Linking information security climate to compliant behavior. *Journal of Information Privacy and Security*, 1(3), 18- 41.

Chen, A., & Trevino, L. K. (2022). Promotive and prohibitive ethical voice: Coworker emotions and support for the voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(11), 1973-1994.

Cimpian, J.R., Kim, T.H., & McDermott, Z.T. (2020). Understanding persistent gender gaps in STEM. *Science*, 368(6497), 1317-1319.

Dorfman, P. W. and J. P. Howell (1988) "Dimensions of National Culture and Effective Leadership Patterns: Hofstede Revisited." In *Advances in International Comparative Management* (3) pp.127-150.

Dutton, J. E., & Ashford, S. J. (1993). Selling issues to top management. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(3), 397-428.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 807-834.

Eibl, B., Lang, F.R., & Niessen, C. (2020). Employee voice at work: the role of employees' gender, self-efficacy beliefs, and leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(4), 570-585.

Flowerday, S. V., & Tuyikeze, T. (2016). Information security policy development and implementation: The what, how and who. *Computers & Security*, 61, 169-183.

Gefen, D., & Straub, D. (1997). Gender differences in the perception and use of e-mail: An extension to the technology acceptance model. *MIS Quarterly*, 21(4) 389–400.

Hughes, R., & Huby, M. (2004). The construction and interpretation of vignettes in social research. *Social Work and Social Sciences Review*, 11(1), 36-51.

Isaakyan, S., Sherf, E.N., Tangirala, S., & Guentler, H. (2021). Keeping it between us: Managerial endorsement of public versus private voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 106(7), 1049-1066.

Johnston, A., & Hale, R. (2009). Improved security through information security governance. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(1), 126-129.

Khanolainen, D., & Semenova, E. (2020). School bullying through graphic vignettes: Developing a new arts-based method to study a sensitive topic. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19.

Kinicki, A. J., Hom, P. W., Trost, M. R., & Wade, K. J. (1995). Effects of category prototypes on performance- rating accuracy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(3), 354-370.

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(2), 326-336.

Le Poire, B. A., Burgoon, J. K., & Parrott, R. (1992). Status and privacy restoring communication in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 20(4), 419-436.

Marett, K., Xiao, S., & Kim, S. (2023). Security compliance and work-issued mobile devices: Out of sight, out of mind?. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, 21(4), 913-945.

McClean, E.J., Kim, S., & Martinez, T. (2022). Which ideas for change are endorsed? How agentic and communal voice affects endorsement differently for men and for women. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(2), 634- 655.

McClean, E. J., Martin, S. R., Emich, K. J., & Woodruff, C.T. (2018). The social consequences of voice: An examination of voice type and gender on status and subsequent leader emergence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(5), 1869-1891.

McGill, T., & Thompson, N. (2021). Exploring potential gender differences in information security and privacy. *Information & Computer Security*, 29(5), 850-865.

Morrison, E.W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 1(1), 173-197.

Nakashima, N. A., Daniels, D. P., & Laurin, K. (2017). It's about time: Divergent evaluations of restrictive policies in the near and distant future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 142, 12-27.

Niemimaa, M., & Niemimaa, E. (2019). Abductive innovations in information security policy development: An ethnographic study. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 28(5), 566-589.

Oc, B., Bashshur, M. R., & Moore, C. (2015). Speaking truth to power: The effect of candid feedback on how individuals with power allocate resources. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 450-463.

Paananen, H., Lapke, M., & Siponen, M. (2020). State of the art in information security policy development. *Computers & Security*, 88, 1-14.

Posey, C., Roberts, T. L., & Lowry, P. B. (2015). The impact of organizational commitment on insiders' motivation to protect organizational information assets. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 32(4), 179-214.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Bourg, C. (2004). Gender as Status: An Expectation States Theory Approach. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Psychology of Gender*, pp. 217–241. The Guilford Press.

Schreurs, B., Hamstra, M. R., & Davidson, T. (2020). What's in a word? Using construal-level theory to predict voice endorsement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(1), 93-105.

Sherf, E.N., Tangirala, S., & Weber, K.C. (2017). It is not my place! Psychological standing and men's voice and participation in gender-parity initiatives. *Organizational Science*, 28(2), 193-210.

Singh, T., Johnston, A. C., D'Arcy, J., & Harms, P. D. (2023). Stress in the cybersecurity profession: A systematic review of related literature and opportunities for future research. *Organizational Cybersecurity Journal: Practice, Process and People*, 3(2), 100-126.

Siponen, M. (2005). Analysis of modern IS security development approaches: Towards the next generation of social and adaptable ISS methods. *Information and Organization*, 15(4), 339–375.

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

Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440-463.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119.

Venkatesh, V., & Morris, M. (2000). Why don't men ever stop to ask for directions? Gender, social influence, and their role in technology acceptance and usage behavior. *MIS Quarterly*, 24(1), 115-139.

von Solms, R., & von Solms, B. (2004). From policies to culture. *Computer & Security*, 23(4), 275–279.

Workman, M., Bommer, W. H., & Straub, D. (2008). Security lapses and the omission of information security measures: A threat control model and empirical test. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24(6), 2799-2816.

Xu, F., Hsu, C., Wang, T., & Lowry, P. B. (2023). The antecedents of employees' proactive information security behaviour: The perspective of proactive motivation. *Information Systems Journal*, in press.

Yang, I., & Li, L. M. (2018). 'It is not fair that you do not know we have problems': Perceptual distance and the consequences of male leaders' conflict avoidance behaviours. *European Management Journal*, 36(1), 105-116.

Zhan, X., Durcikova, A., & Galletta, D. (2024). The Paradox of Choice: Digital Akrasia in the Deployment of Multi-Factor Authentication. Proceedings of the 57th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Honolulu HI USA.

Zhu, Y., Long, L., Zhang, Y., & Wang, H. (2023). Remember to say "thanks" when rejecting others: the moderating role of leader gratitude expression in the relationship between leader voice rejection and employees' subsequent upward voice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-023-09928-y.

Yan, T.T., Tangirala, S., Vadera, A.K., & Ekkirala, S. (2022). How employees learn to speak up from their leaders: Gender congruity effects in the development of voice efficacy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(4), 650-667.

Appendix.

Voice Type	Combinations of Employee (E) and Manager (M)			
	Male E Male M	Male E Female M	Female E Male M	Female E Female M
Promo	4.22 (0.5)	4.55 (0.4)	4.25 (0.6)	4.19 (0.6)
Prevent	4.27 (0.6)	4.44 (0.5)	4.11 (0.8)	4.28 (0.6)
Prohibit	4.11 (0.5)	4.12 (0.6)	3.96 (0.6)	4.05 (0.5)
Hostile	4.09 (0.5)	4.20 (0.8)	3.62 (0.9)	3.86 (0.6)

Table A1. Descriptive statistics for behavioral intent to change, Means (SD).