SPEAK! PARADOXICAL EFFECTS OF A MANAGERIAL CULTURE OF "SPEAKING UP"[1]

Miguel Pina e Cunha
Fundação Amélia de Mello Professor of Leadership
Nova School of Business and Economics
Universidade Nova de Lisboa
mpc@novasbe.pt

Ace Volkmann Simpson
UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney
ace.simpson@uts.edu.au

Stewart R. Clegg
UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney
Nova School of Business and Economics
Universidade Nova de Lisboa
Newcastle University Business School, Newcastle UK
s.clegg@uts.edu.au

Arménio Rego
Católica Porto Business School, Universidade Católica Portuguesa *and*
Business Research Unit, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
arego@porto.ucp.pt

SPEAK!

PARADOXICAL EFFECTS OF A MANAGERIAL CULTURE OF "SPEAKING UP"

Abstract

We explore the intrinsic ambiguity of speaking up in a multinational healthcare subsidiary. A culture change initiative, emphasising learning and agility through encouraging employees to speak up, gave rise to paradoxical effects. Some employees interpreted a managerial tool for improving effectiveness as an invitation to raise challenging points of difference rather than as something 'beneficial for the organization'. We show that the *process* of introducing a culture that aims to encourage employees to speak up can produce tensions and contradictions that make various types of organizational paradoxes salient. Telling people to "Speak up!" may render paradoxical tensions salient and even foster a sense of low PsySafe.

INTRODUCTION

In a classical view, managerialism argues that organizations should be normatively integrated by shared values expressed from a single source of managerial authority that is founded on technical rationality and in which success is measured merely in terms of profit (Klikauer, 2013). Managerialism has been challenged from various academic positions (Akella, 2008; Alvesson and Willmott, 1992; Fournier and Grey, 2000). Not only critical scholars have reservations about managerialism. Even in terms of the functionalist frame of reference to the need for organizational efficiency and effectiveness (the prime concern of managerialism) questions have been raised concerning the value of encouraging employees, even within limits, to express their concerns and insights (Wilkinson, Dundon, Marchington, and Ackers, 2004: Delbridge and Keenoy, 2010). It is what employees should be allowed to address that is seen to be significant. The limits to legitimate questioning are the main focus. Not all employees will frame definitions of the situation in accord with managerialist presuppositions. Accordingly, differences in employee and managerial interpretations of what it means to speak up can generate misunderstandings and paradoxical tensions. Employee disagreement with management has most frequently been framed as disrespectful or wrong by functionalists (Hofstede, 2001). On occasion, this may be because of an environment in which individual fear of speaking up flourishes (Detert and Edmondson, 2011; Morrison and Milliken, 2000). In the past, organizational politics frequently privileged employee compliance with managerial fiat (Clegg, 1989). Increasingly, however, managers are being encouraged by supervisors to recognize the value of adopting more "open" cultures that encourage employees to speak up.

The common definition of speaking up is "sharing one's ideas with *someone with the perceived power to devote organizational attention or resources to the issue raised*" (Detert and Burris, 2007, p. 870; our emphasis). Such encouragement, albeit already a form of subordination, is frequently glossed as "empowerment" (Detert and Trevino, 2010). Speaking up traverses a considerable continuum: from sharing one's ideas as ways of enhancing efficiency and effectiveness to articulating "non-issues" in order to change the organizational agenda (Clegg, 1989). While the former does not typically challenge the organization through the expression of voice, the latter does: typically it is defined as "confronting the organization" (Jablin, 1987, p.718; see also Mowbray, Wilkinson, and Tse, 2015).

Speaking up has attracted considerable publicity of late with the emergence and spread of the hash tag #MeToo in the movie and other industries. Such speaking up potentially challenges embedded conventional managerial wisdom and its sustaining conventions (Burris, 2012), in this case, highly gendered conventions. The impact of voice expressed in challenging ways is indicated by the frequent fate of whistleblowers (Alford 2002; Rothschild, 2008, 2013). If the individual is to feel secure in speaking up, 'psychological safety' in doing so is required. The notion of psychological safety (PsySafe) has attracted significant research attention since the 1990s. Kahn (1990, p. 708) defined PsySafe as the employee's "sense of being able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career." Edmondson and Lei (2014, p. 24) define PsySafe as favourable "perceptions of the consequences of taking interpersonal risks in a particular context such as a workplace". PsySafe is seen as a means of encouraging voice that is challenging rather than merely supportive of dominant assumptions; however, the level of PsySafe that is managerially assumed may differ widely from the sense that employee's make of managerial initiatives. Present practice is invariably informed by the traditions of the past. Managers used to

exercising managerial fiat may be unprepared or unwilling to accommodate challenging voice behaviours, leading to tensions and contradictions.

In this study we explore an intrinsic ambiguity in speaking up from which stem paradoxical effects. Our research context is a Southern-European subsidiary of Athina (a pseudonym), a multinational healthcare company undergoing a culture change initiative encouraging employees to speak up.[2] The assumption habitually underpinning the intentional adoption of a culture of speaking up is that it is 'beneficial for the organization'. We question what it means for an abstract value to be beneficial to an organization? Who receives the benefit? Different stakeholders may extract different benefits and what is beneficial for one is not necessarily so for another. We thereby problematize the notion of speaking up by uncovering its ambiguous conceptual core. We focus on voice expressed in challenging ways to explore the paradoxes made salient by the interplay between: (1) the explicit desire of top management to encourage employees' speaking up, and (2) the complex, plural and inconsistent ways in which employees interpret this espoused value. The politics of speaking are illustrated by analysing qualitative data on voice through a paradox lens (Cunha, Clegg and Cunha, 2002; Smith and Lewis, 2011), describing the simultaneous presence of apparently contradictory but interrelated dualistic messages, symbols or situations, creating dilemmas for respondents. Individually, each component of a paradox appears rational; when juxtaposed, however, they appear illogical, incompatible and even absurd (Lewis 2000; Smith and Lewis, 2011). The "situations of almost impossible choice" presented by paradoxes highlight the "seeming

---

[2] Speaking up is an issue of growing importance within health care settings due to both increased market competition and public scrutiny (Edmondson, Higgins, Singer, and Weiner, 2016). High profile scandals of long standing institutional abuse and mistreatment of service users has led to public inquiries, and subsequently health care policies, calling for the development of open and honest reporting cultures. Initiatives aiming to reverse so-called "closed cultures" and support "speaking up" behaviours in staff have followed (Dean 2014).

irrationality or absurdity of the situation" they pose for employees (Putnam, Fairhurst and Banghart, 2016, p. 75).

To engage with the paradoxes of speaking up, we ask: *What paradoxes become salient when an organization apparently decides to encourage its employees to speak up? Why would someone refuse, without being absurd, an invitation to speak up?* The paper is structured as follows: after discussing the relationship between speaking up and organizational learning, key concepts of PsySafe are introduced and its paradoxical relevance for empowering employee voice through a culture of speaking up is elaborated. We then describe the research setting, methods and findings. The results, analysed through an adaptation of Putnam's (1986) paradox categories and Smith and Lewis' (2011) tension taxonomy used as an analytical frame, suggest that even such a positive initiative as creating a culture characterized by a high level of speaking up has the potential for inducing nested paradoxical tensions, further giving rise to various anxieties and coping strategies. The findings contribute to the literature on employee voice, speaking up, and PsySafe, as sites of contradiction and paradox.

LEARNING TO SPEAK UP

There is instrumental value in explicitly seeking to foster a culture of speaking up: performance and competitive advantage can be enhanced through improved organizational learning (Wilkinson et al., 2004), gaining sustainable competitive advantage (D'Aveni, Dagnino and Smith, 2010; Edmondson, 2008). Different modes of learning are assumed to have different effects. Exploratory divergent learning is believed essential for competitive differentiation (de Geus, 2002; Easterby-Smith, Crossan and Nicolini, 2000), while exploitative convergent learning is seen to constrain organizational capacities (Hannan and Freeman, 1977; Miller, 1993), especially in intensely

dynamic environments (Jansen, van den Bosch, and Volberda, 2006). To counter convergent learning's "shared beliefs about speaking up" (Bashshur and Oc, 2015, p. 1540; see also Frazier and Bowler, 2015), employees are encouraged to suggest ideas (Salge and Vera 2013) that generate new organizational knowledge (Burns, Hyde, Killett, Poland, and Gray, 2014).

Employee voice (Budd, Gollan and Wilkinson, 2010; Lavelle, Gunnigle and McDonnell, 2010; Kim, MacDuffie and Pil, 2010) that supportively challenges "the status quo with the intent of improving the situation" (LePine and Van Dyne 1998, p. 853) is seen as an organizational benefit. For employees, speaking up may be perceived as an opportunity to bring attention to issues of concern and workplace disagreements (McCabe and Lewin 1992). Speaking up is of particular importance within the context of whistleblowing on corporate wrongdoing and is closely associated with employee voice (Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington, and Ackers, 2004). While whistleblowing may protect internal and external stakeholders from organizational wrongdoing (Kelton, 2016; Miceli et al., 2009), it also jeopardizes organizational reputation (Miceli et al., 2009) and can negatively affect the whistleblowers (Mesmer-Magnus and Viswesvaran, 2005; Near and Miceli, 1996).

A fear of speaking up may give rise to a dangerous and even toxic organizational culture (Brown and Worthington, 2017). For example, "fear inside VW may have prevented a company whistleblower from alerting senior management to the deception" (McGee and Wright, 2016), and the company's leadership contributed to such a climate of fear by reducing the employees' sense of security.

Other factors inhibiting employees from speaking up may include relevance (a problem is recognized but not perceived as important), identity (the employee sees their self as not important

enough to raise the issue), and discourse (the normalization of an issue via local language games – "the way we do things around here").[3] Discursively, the positive representation of employees speaking up (both for employees and organizations, and even for society) may clash with materially negative consequences (both perceived and real) for managers and employees. A speaking up culture, when interpreted from different situations within the organization, creates opportunity for diverse understandings of its affordances (McCabe and Lewin, 1992). Managers and employees have reason to *both* enact and support a culture of speaking up *and* to fear or avoid its uncomfortable consequences. Managers' (declared) goal of fostering speaking up may clash with the employees' received understanding of a culture in which "If you cannot bring good news, then don't bring any" (Dylan, 1967). Managers may also have reasons (e.g., ego defence) to fear speaking up. Questioning, rather than supporting the status quo, including the managers' own decisions, may not meet perceived expectations. Some employees may provide managers with intelligence on issues of managerial interest. Others may use speaking up as a channel to more widely voice opposition to specific managerial practices and agendas. Conflicting managerial and member expectations about the value and implications of speaking up can cause troubling tensions to become salient as paradoxes.

PSYSAFE AND SPEAKING UP

PsySafe facilitates an individual's freedom to speak up and give voice to apprehensions as "upward-directed, promotive verbal communication" (Edmondson and Lei, 2014, p. 27). For the most part, PsySafe tends to evoke "positive emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses" in employees (Hoogervorst, De Cremer and Van Dijke, 2013 p. 973). Problems that might otherwise

---

[3] We are grateful to one anonymous reviewer for this observation.

remain unnoticed by organizational elites are addressed. PsySafe sustains high performance organizations requiring collaboration and creativity for organizational learning in knowledge-intensive sectors (Burns et al. 2012; Carroll and Edmondson, 2002) by reducing interpersonal risks in uncertain and changing contexts (Edmondson and Lei, 2014), serving as an antidote to organizational rigidity and repression (Edmondson, 2012). Within a culture characterized by high PsySafe, speaking up is legitimated rather than being a "risky behaviour" that can "lead to personal harm" (Detert and Burris, 2007, p. 871). Concerns about problematic organizational practices can be shared rather than publically exposed (Miceli, Near, and Dworkin, 2009; Edmondson and Lei, 2014). Nonetheless, as Bashshur and Oc (2015) observe, PsySafe may be viewed as highly problematic by organizational elites (Jones and Kelly, 2014). Research accordingly suggests significant differences in voice behaviour within the same organization (Detert and Edmondson, 2011), owing to specific individual leadership responses, where different managers within the same organization may stimulate or constrain subordinates in expressing voice (Carroll and Edmondson, 2002). Employees may also develop varied individual perceptions concerning how safe it is to speak up (Schreurs, Guenter, Jawahar, and De Cuyper, 2015; Wei, Zhang, and Chen, 2015). Individual differences therefore add further complexity to the ostensive practices of PsySafe.

Variance in the perception of PsySafe and corresponding behaviours not only occur due to individual differences but also because of contextual conditions (Van Dyne, Ang, and Botero, 2003; Venkataramani and Tangirala, 2010). Employees react not only according to their experiences with organizational authorities but also in accord with other employees' perceptions (Wu, Tsui, and Kinicki, 2010). Organizational members characterized as experiencing low PsySafe, despite managerial injunctions to the contrary, may adopt self-censorship (Edmondson

and Lei, 2014). Potentially fragmented responses to an espoused policy can thus give rise to unexpected and paradoxical challenges. A possible consequence is the diminution of levels of PsySafe across the organization; employees initially inspired by perceived high levels of PsySafe might subsequently be swayed by the low PsySafe experience of others when voicing challenging views.

Edmonson and Lei (2014) further highlight the relevance of group/team level analysis (Edmondson 2004, 2008, 2012). Recognition that the antecedents of PsySafe operate at various levels (Edmondson and Lei, 2014) suggests that encouraging PsySafe at one level (e.g., at the organizational vertex) does not necessarily translate to other levels. Teams and team leaders at different levels are not necessarily coherent in terms of their interpretations. Nor are team level interpretations necessarily consistent with the PsySafe philosophy espoused at the top level. In short, the same organization may have different PsySafe zones (Edmondson, 2008). In questioning assumptions about the positive effects of speaking up, we accept Edmondson and Lei's (2014, p. 38) challenge to develop "a dynamic view of PsySafe" by exploring how contradictions at one organizational level (macro, meso, or micro) can make further paradoxical tensions salient at other levels. Paradox occurs in practice when "a statement … is falsified by its own utterance" (Cohen, 1950 p. 86) or when an order cannot be obeyed without disobeying it (Putnam, 1986; Watzlawick, Jackson and Bavelas, 1967). The pragmatic experience of paradoxes thus inhibits agency when members experience contradictory demands, such as both to "speak up" and "shut up", thus creating a *Catch-22* (Heller, 1961) situation that paralyses their ability to act at all.

METHODOLOGY

Research Context

Athina undertook a broad culture change initiative across its international divisions with the overall goal of creating a more flexible and responsive organization. In this new culture, empowered employees were expected to feel psychologically safe to "Speak up"[4] and voice their views, thus making the organization more agile in tackling emerging threats and opportunities. "Speaking up" was presented as an important new organizational value but the terms and conditions of its implementation were not specified.

The salience of concerns about speaking up emerged from two of our team (R1 and R4 – according to the order of authorship of this paper) being invited to deliver a leadership program spanning eleven-months,[5] involving training sessions, 360-degree feedback, personal coaching and individual interviews with sixteen middle level managers. The program was not dedicated to any value in particular and was not designed as a vehicle for the participants to speak up. We became aware of the issues as leadership program participants discussed not only the opportunities but also the challenges associated with the implementation of the imperative to "Speak up". While some Athina employees appeared to embrace the new values with enthusiasm, both in public and private, others expressed doubts about the practicability of speaking up, expressed mostly in the context of personal leadership development sessions. Intrigued by these concerns, we negotiated the opportunity to use a naturalistic approach to research contradictions in employee reactions to the implementation of the company's "Speak up" initiative.

Data Collection

---

[4] The nomenclature used in the organization for the policy.
[5] The sessions took place on a regular basis over this period.

"Naturally occurring data" (Silverman, 2006, p. 113) were collected in multiple ways, initially as ethnography (Westney and Van Maanen 2011) in which note taking was completed after multiple informal conversations with Athina employees, including middle and top managers as well as several conversations with the CEO. The more formal aspect of the data collection came from two sets of interviews lasting between thirty to sixty minutes conducted with each of the sixteen managers over an eleven-month period, with each group of interviews being separated by a period of about three months. PsySafe and speaking up were among the themes frequently discussed, revealing divergent and paradoxical interpretations of the application of speaking up in the company culture, a contradiction that attracted the researcher's theoretical sensitivity. The theme emerged spontaneously as part of the culture change effort and was not elicited by the researchers. No references to paradoxes or contradictions were mentioned in the interview settings; in a grounded theory approach the salience of these issues became evident as the conversations unfolded. They were thus not part of any script or plan: the opportunity to study contradiction and ambiguity in and around the "Speak up" initiative transpired serendipitously.

Interviews were not recorded on audio devices in consideration of strict industry rules relating to employees divulging confidential company information.[6] Accordingly notes were taken, with one researcher maintaining the focus of the conversation directly and explicitly, while the other wrote detailed notes of the main points that were raised and discussed. Theoretical sensitivity was gained *after* the first round of interviewing when analysing the results; accordingly specific quotes cited

---

[6] There is disagreement about recording interviews with managerial elites (Harvey, 2011). Lee (2004) suggests that people in positions of power are more likely to be hostile to being recorded., while Aberbach and Rockman (2002) report their experience that few elite respondents refused to be recorded and even those with initial reservations quickly lost any lingering inhibitions through the course of the interview process.

in the study come from the second interview round. Permission to use the data was secured from the respondents using the usual ethics protocols.

Participants were demographically quite homogeneous, predominantly female middle level managers, identified by Athina as candidates for promotion to meet future challenges, all holding academic degrees, including doctoral degrees, in business and science. Shortly after the leadership development program concluded, some participants were promoted to new positions. While all points of contact with Athina offered us a nuanced tacit understanding of the organization, the main evidence resulted from these interviews, although understanding was supplemented by reading publically available company documents.

Analysis

The interview notes were analysed with the support of an expanded research team to facilitate the combining of a mix of distant and proximal interactions with the company (Anteby 2013). Some of the research team (R2 and R3) had no direct contact with the site, which allowed them to build on R1 and R4's initial insights, including playing critical roles and devil's advocacy (Nemeth, Brown, and Rogers, 2001). While R1 often collaborates with Athina as an academic[7] this project was R4's first and only involvement. By expanding the research team to additionally include other team members at a distance to the field context, efforts were made to manage, if not eliminate, any perception of risk flowing from the relationship between R1 and the organization (Anteby, 2013).

---

[7] Despite this regular collaboration, R1 is a full time academic with no paid or unpaid positions in Athina and no conflicts of interest to declare. The collaboration with Athina is always framed by the Business School's executive education centre.

The data was analysed following the process suggested by Corley and Gioia (2004) to establish conceptually consistent first-order themes. Interview and discussion notes were reviewed for references to speaking up and PsySafe, which were categorized in open codes subsequently structured into conceptual clusters. These themes were further analysed through various categorisations of paradox provided both by Putnam (1986) and Smith and Lewis (2011).

Putnam (1986) articulates three related categories of paradoxical tensions: (1) self-referential loops, (2), mixed messages, and (3), system contradictions. *Self-referential loops* are cohesive statements, concepts or processes that contain embedded contradictions. The circular statement "I am lying", called the Liar's Paradox, is an example of a self-referential loop; if true, the statement is rendered false. *Mixed messages* comprise inconsistent verbal or non-verbal communications such as when a manager preaches teamwork while rewarding individual achievement. When tensions of this sort endure over time, they become embedded as *system contradictions,* comprising contradictions between an organization's stated goals and objectives, policies of recognition and reward, and the division of decision-making and power. Smith and Lewis (2011) similarly describe paradox resulting from tensions caused by conflicting interactions across four core domains of organizational practice: (1) learning (related to knowledge acquisition and change), (2) belonging (related to identity and interpersonal relations), (3) organizing (related to systems and processes), and (4) performing (related to goals and objectives).

The concepts and categories developed by Smith and Lewis (2011) and Putnam (1986) were used as a basis for coding: Putnam's (1986) paradox categories were reordered as a three-level hierarchical framework used to analyse Athina's culture change initiative: (1) mixed message paradoxes (related to the macro level of organizational identity); (2) system contradiction

paradoxes (related to meso level contradictory internal organizational processes), and (3) self-referential loop paradoxes (related to micro level individual practices conflicting with aggregate team and group process). Within each of these domains, Smith and Lewis' (2011) categories of tensions were further applied to the data, revealing five sub-domains of paradoxical tensions (Tables 1 and 2). These were: (1.1) *learning and belonging,* comprising tensions arising from the need to adapt and change while also retaining a stable sense of organizational identity; (2.1) *learning and performing* where tensions arose from conflicts between developing future capabilities while maintaining current successes; (2.2) *organizing and learning* tensions arising from contradictory emphases on efficiency and dynamism; (2.3) *organizing and performing* tensions occurring between processes and outcomes, and (3.1) *belonging and organizing* tensions that emerged from apparent incompatibilities between individual and group needs.

The overall framework thus viewed Athina's tensions as nested, where contradictions at one level interact to make contradictions salient at other levels. Cunha (2008, p. 1225) has proposed that the "image of paradoxes within paradoxes may … constitute a new and refreshing view of organizations for scholars to explore." Smith and Lewis (2011, p. 384) have also suggested "paradoxical tensions may be nested, cascading across levels, as the experience at one level creates new challenges at another."

Tables 1 and 2 about here

A final analytical step consisted of systematising individual responses to these paradoxical tensions. Paradox often induces psychological anxiety and defensiveness (Lewis 2011) involving struggles to suppress tensions and avoid confronting deeply held assumptions and beliefs. Individual's strategic responses to paradox range from the vicious to the virtuous (Beech, Burns, Caestecker, MacIntosh, and MacLean, 2004; Lewis 2011) as practices of selection, separation, integration and transcendence (Cunha 2008; Poole and Putnam, 2008). Common to the approaches of selection and separation is *denial* of one of the competing poles of a paradox. In contrast, integration and transcendence entail *acceptance* of both poles, with only transcendence effectively assimilating and ambidextrously bridging paradoxical tensions (Andriopoulos and Lewis, 2009). We analysed the (non)deployment of these strategies at different levels in our case study.

FINDINGS

(1) Mixed message paradoxes

1.1 – Tensions of learning and belonging: Contradictory organizational identities

Learning and belonging tensions concern conflicting needs both to change (on the basis of a new emphasis on learning) and to remain the same (on the basis of an existing identity informed by entrenched values, policies and practices). Individuals' ideas about an organization's identity are informed by its central, distinctive and enduring attributes (Albert and Whetten, 1985; Gioia, Schultz and Corley, 2000). Athina was generally represented by its' employees as a large, successful, performance-driven organization. Most participants' levels of engagement appeared high, with performance viewed as determining individual success, the organization resembling an achievement-oriented culture (Deshpandé, Farley, and Webster, 1993).

The cultural change program initiated from the top down challenged Athina employees' sense of its solid identity. By encouraging employees to speak up, Athina sought to develop capacities to learn and adapt faster for better competitive advantage (D'Aveni et al., 2010; Edmondson, 2008; de Geus, 2002; Easterby-Smith et al., 2000). Employees were now being directed not only to deliver expected business as usual results but also to be empowered as facilitators of improvement and innovation. Some interviewees seemed confused by the *mixed messages* (Putnam, 1986) communicated (explicitly and implicitly) through this change. While they were being *told* to speak up (in itself, paradoxical), they didn't feel comfortable (i.e., psychologically safe) openly voicing these concerns (another paradox), and consequently interpretations of the organization's identity varied amongst respondents.

Two main interpretations emerged. For some, the newly communicated values implied a new identity (i.e., the new values were reshaping company identity). For others, the organization's identity had already been fixed and remained the same (i.e., enacting the newly communicated values was made difficult by the old identity), which would eventually render the new discourse less pragmatic. For these people, the mixed identity messages seemed 'schizoid': to identify with one attribute was to disavow another (Petriglieri, 2015), creating a classic *Catch-22* (Heller, 1961). One employee expressed it as follows: "it is difficult to leave the profitability logic. We want to innovate but haven't left the efficiency mode. Sometimes it is schizophrenic" [I-16]. Another participant stated that for speaking up to work for all "there needs to be a better capacity to process feedback" [I-15]. These *mixed messages* comprised inconsistent organizational discourses (Berti 2017) or meta-communications. For the most part, divergent employee perspectives on Athina's core identity represented the *selection* response to paradox, denying one of the paradox poles and accordingly unconsciously choosing the opposite competing pole. In the long term, the opposite

pole endures, ineffectively repressed over time. As a paradox made salient by mixed messages, the unresolved tensions are also likely to generate additional perceptions of contradictions in systems, policies and practices.

(2) System contradiction paradoxes

Paradoxes made salient by mixed organizational messages were found to interact with and in some instances reinforce learning and belonging tensions emphasising both change and stability. These in turn made salient embedded *system contradictions* (Putnam, 1986) of competing contradictory values related to tensions of learning and performing, leadership practices involving tensions of learning and organizing, and job orientations conflicted by tensions of organizing and performing.

2.1 – Tensions of learning and performing: Contradictions in values

New values, new identity. Learning and performing tensions concern conflicts between building future capabilities while ensuring present success (Smith and Lewis, 2011). Learning and performance goals involve different cultural values (Elliott and Dweck, 1988). Whereas learning goals tolerate error, performance goals do not. In a learning culture, one is expected to speak up; in a performance culture, one is expected to deliver. According to the new values perspective held by management and some employees, Athina was becoming a learning organization concerned with underpinning values of speaking up (and PsySafe). One participant explained: "this is the first company in which I worked where values are taken seriously. I see values passing from paper to practice" [I-5]. Adopting a new set of values is a complex process: people have to revise established practices and develop new ones. A second participant admitted that "the new set of values is a true challenge" [I-16], noting that the culture change was desired but difficult. Changing

18

from a results-oriented to an innovation culture prompts significant identity work (Ibarra and Barbulescu, 2010) and value reorientation. Moreover, such changes entail a revised relationship of members with performance goals, a central and highly salient presence in Athina's everyday life. For some participants these contradictions remained unresolved.

New values, same identity. For other employees, Athina's values had not changed, despite the espousal of new values. As one participant observed: "the rhythm of work is too intense" [I-2] to allow people to spend time on innovation. Another noted: "we preach 'speaking up' but we don't give people time to do different things" [I-8]. The old logic prevailed despite the "newspeak" (our formulation, after Orwell [1948]), such that PsySafe was not taken for granted: "Every six months we fear we can be dismissed" [I-8]. The perceived lack of job security in a culture where performance reviews had always been central was seen as an obstacle to PsySafe and a barrier to speaking up. Although PsySafe promoted cooperation in Athina, internal competition was seen as being "so intense that it eliminates cooperative work … there is too much internal competition" [I-16]. While PsySafe demands cooperation, past emphases on performance and internal competition cannot be easily forgotten. Rivalrous pressures endemic to past practice coexisted with new pressures for present and future cooperation: "We are not yet in the error acceptance phase. The obstacle? Pressure to perform" [I-2].

Despite officially adopting a new set of values, some participants regarded Athina as struggling to shed its past focus on results. The cultural change was carried out in the midst of a market downturn, concomitant with the Eurozone crisis. Consequently, as members made sense of the new culture, in terms of receiver based communication it was secondary to their perceived need to maintain performance levels. As one participant noted: "The company is still very inconsequential

in terms of values" [I-1]. Performance was perceived as trumping the value of learning from speaking up. Athina's attempts to promote values of PsySafe and speaking up while also insisting on performance and productivity might be viewed as an *integration* response to paradox, characterized by efforts to combine the poles of a paradox either with the middle of the road approach of *neutralization* or the superficial attempt at a *forced merger,* with one pole privileged, the other receiving only lip service recognition.

2.2 – Tensions of organizing and learning: Contradictions in leadership practices

Tensions of organizing and learning arise from competing demands for efficiency and learning (Smith and Lewis, 2011), tensions that were apparent in the contradictory demands Athina's leaders made of their followers. Leaders play a critical role in framing the expression of employee voice (Edmondson, 2003; Detert and Burris, 2007; Fast, Burris, and Bartel, 2014; Hsiung, 2012). Transformational and approachable leaders are potentially more supportive of speaking up than transactional leaders, as the former encourage subordinate autonomy and initiative (Waldman, Javidan, and Varella, 2004), which paradoxically may also imply distance and isolation (Trevelyan, 2001). Selznick's (1957) work on creative and technical-rational (i.e., administrative) leaders is conceptually illuminating. Creative leaders direct others towards finding new and useful solutions, whereas administrative leaders strive for efficiency within the boundaries of the status quo (Mainemelis, Kark, and Epitropaki, 2015).

Creative leaders. Leaders who value creativity and improvement seek to nurture a culture supportive of novelty, favouring risk taking and assuming that a learning organization must cultivate an aesthetic of imperfection (Weick, 2002). How leaders react to honest mistakes and sincere concerns is important for employees in gauging safety and creating conditions in which a

culture of speaking up flourishes. As one participant remarked, "in some cases creative solutions that failed did not prompt punishment" [I-12], indicating a PsySafe environment supporting creativity. Innovation requires openness to mistakes when failing to achieve desired outcomes; a culture of PsySafe depends on members' perceptions that leaders deal with failure constructively. Although several participants described their leaders as accessible, overall references to a more formal administrative leadership approach dominated. The CEO was frequently represented as an example of approachability, exemplified by one participant who said, "the company is flat. It is easy to have access to the top floor" [I-10]; by contrast, managerial episodes involving a degree of formality in administrative relations were more prevalent.

Administrative leaders. Administrative leaders focus on efficiency and exploitation within the confines of the status quo, valuing compliance over risk taking, conformity over creativity, facts over doubts, even legitimate ones. One participant expressed this rather dramatically: "Speak up, speak up, speak up! I used to have a very low context boss: 'Give me the facts' (…). In reality people don't like to be confronted with criticism. Generally, it is not well accepted" [I-16]. Consistent with previous research (Edmondson and Lei, 2014; Nembhard and Edmondson, 2006), experiences of PsySafe were influenced by leaders' behaviours. As one participant summarized, "Speak up… There has been an evolution. However, to a great extent, it depends on the managers. People are now more vocal but there is a way to go" [I-7]. Another employee was more assertive in emphasizing anticipated negative managerial reactions to speaking up. When PsySafe is uncertain, risk avoidance and communication occur that is structured in politically safe terms (Heynoski and Quinn, 2012): "Sometimes there are many confirmatory emails. Nobody [in those teams] does anything without sending five emails for the sake of protecting oneself" [I-12]. The presence of such politically defensive forms of communication indicated a low degree of PsySafe.

Instances of individuals responding to such contexts with pragmatism by embracing one or another paradoxical pole depending on the political context, exemplifies the *separation* response (Poole and Putnam, 2008). Separation entails recognizing opposing paradoxical poles by treating them as independent and attempting to address each in isolation (Cunha, 2008) through temporal, spatial and topical separation. Over time, it is increasingly difficult to keep tensions separate.

2.3 – Tensions of organizing and performing: Contradictions in job interpretations

Tensions of organizing and performing concern conflicts between means and ends, which become particularly salient when practice involves addressing both job and customer demands. A job is a social construction: employees construct their meaning and relevance using socially received information (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978), taking into account what top managers say and how they behave. Here we analyse three areas of contradiction in the job orientation domain concerning job breadth, adaptation and compliance.

Job breadth. People assume boundaries of responsibility based on a multiplicity of social cues (Morrison, 1994). Definitions of job breadth vary inside organizations (Farh, Zhong, and Organ, 2004). At Athina, the participants' department mattered: while creativity emerged in customer-facing subunits, a compliance culture was prevalent in the back office. Accordingly, some participants defined their jobs in terms of compliance and rules (e.g., participants mentioned "an excess of internal focus" [I-16] or even "hyper-regulation" [I-4 and I-5] to the level that "it even creates anxiety" [I-4]), while others understood work as serving sometimes unpredictable customer needs and expectations requiring adaptation and innovation and therefore the need for speaking up when new solutions were necessary for addressing emergent issues (e.g., especially in "customer

facing areas"). In the first case, work was defined largely in terms of planning; in the latter, it entailed navigating between the planned and the emergent (Patriotta and Gruber, 2015).

Ample adaptation. Athina customer service employees represented their job as *doing the right things.* Making sense, adapting and improvising are critical (Cunha, Rego, and Kamoche, 2009), as customer needs and expectations cannot be fully anticipated. When a new solution is tried and fails, people may benefit from honestly speaking up to learn from the situation. One of our participants explained: "When you assume a mistake nobody jumps on you. They even support you. It has a positive effect" [I-12]. A positive response to honest mistakes was more visible in customer-facing units than the back office.

Narrow compliance. Speaking up was difficult to implement for some because the organization prized compliance and transactional approaches: the need to *do things right*, was emphasized, especially in the back office. As a participant stated: "The bureaucratic core of the company is too risk averse. The people who are not customer facing may not 'speak up'" [I-12]. Doing things right, focusing on the perfecting of the status quo, is an obstacle to trying novel approaches that heighten the possibility of making mistakes: "The new value set resulted from problems abroad. The logic is one of error avoidance. The logic is always one of finding the mistake" [I-3]. In other words, the organization aims to do the right things while doing things right, a difficult proposition of wanting change without changing. Lack of tolerance for mistakes inhibited courage and innovation, as reinforced by the following observations: "We have a culture of deviation avoidance" [I-3], in which "It is risky to expose oneself [to risks]" [I-11]. When risk-taking was not successful, the consequences could be significant: "This company is punishing. More than it thinks it is" [I-3]. Risk avoidance is integrated into the detailed company regulations: "Our

compliance systems are very strict" [I-3]. The consequence is that "everything is hyper-regulated, and that limits creativity" [I-4].

(3) Contradictory self-referential paradoxes

3.1 – Tensions of belonging and organizing: Self-referential loops

Tensions of belonging and organizing become salient through the competing needs of individual employees and the aggregate (Smith and Lewis, 2011), as seen in the deployment of voice by Athina's employees where cohesive self-referential statements contained embedded contradictions as self-referential loops. Speaking up as a formal value was interpreted in two distinct ways: some saw voice as an opportunity to express themselves as individuals and gain personal benefits (i.e., being a "good actor" [Bolino, 1999] and "looking good" [Grant and Mayer, 2009]). Others perceived voice as an opportunity to benefit the aggregate of the organization (i.e., being a "good soldier" and "doing good"). These two perspectives of voice, although influenced by the individuals' own characteristics, also resulted from different understandings of the process of PsySafe.

Personalized voice. Speaking up may be adopted in multiple ways. For some it constituted a form of impression management: "Some people here see speaking up as a space for personal promotion" [I-1]. There was resentment of those using it as an opportunity to stand out by conveying a desired image: "The microphone [in town hall meetings][8] is always grabbed by the same people. Always!" [I-1]. The value of speaking up ends up benefitting more extroverted individuals (LePine and van Dyn, 2001). Speaking up was sometimes practiced for its own sake: "Some people, even when

---

[8] The name used for general assemblies in which issues could be raised.

they know nothing about an issue, they start talking. This is speaking up, but speaking up of the wrong kind" [I-5]. Speaking up to promote oneself was perceived as culturally fitting, "In this house, humility is not perceived as a form of wisdom" [I-5], a comment that accords with politically informed analyses of organizational life (Pfeffer, 2015). Humility is often portrayed as a weakness or as an indicator of low self-esteem in business narratives (Ou et al., 2014). When humility wilts before the tough realities of competitive organizations, speaking up can be used as a political tool rather than as part of a learning approach. While recent literature links humility with organizational PsySafe (Van Dierendonck, 2011), our data suggest a textured and political process. In sum, introverts may find some venues, namely town hall meetings, difficult places to speak up: "I don't do it in the town hall meetings. It is too big!" [I-10]. As a result, speaking up may be transformed into a promotional tool, inhibiting its intended benefits: "There is a culture of protagonism and a silo mentality. We all have to be extroverts. You have to have a high profile. That's what leads you to the top" [I-1]. Silo cultures, internal competition, and individualistic biases, constitute important obstacles to the intra and inter-group cooperation Athina's leadership intended to promote (Schein, 2015).

Socialized voice. A further group of participants believed voice was mostly exerted on behalf of the value of organizational citizenship (Detert and Burris, 2007; Ohana, 2016), perceiving speaking up as an organizational good. A participant claimed: "There has been a good evolution of speaking up" [I-7]. Speaking up was seen as a practical matter not just a desirable value. Another stated: "we have an extremely high level of speaking up" [I-6]. The interpretive divergence is striking. Overall we see combinations of separation and selection responses in these descriptions. Notably absent is the *transcendence* approach of leveraging paradoxical tensions by counter-intuitively linking issues in unexpected ways that generate new perspectives reframing apparent

contradictions as vital interdependent components of an integrated wholeness (Clegg, Cunha, and Cunha, 2002; Bednarek, Paroutis and Sillince 2017). The CEO considered the introduction of speaking up as inherently positive, not perceiving pre-existing values as potentially problematic.[9] Overall, speaking up was viewed from on high as a new value to be inscribed upon an erased organizational page. Innovating positive practices collided with an existing order, founded on old managerialist assumptions that had been well learnt, thus inhibiting practices deemed superior, generating a cascade of unintended paradoxical consequences.

DISCUSSION

If voice improves the quality of organizational processes and decisions (Burris, 2012), formal support for speaking up should constitute a major opportunity for organizational improvement. The findings indicate that this enthusiasm may be naïve with respect to the unintended, interrelated organizational contradictions that may become salient as paradoxes of speaking up when the process of introducing voice unfolds in a pre-existing culture.

A unique contribution of this paper is that it builds empirically on Andriopoulos and Lewis' (2009) notion of nested paradoxes. We draw upon this concept to analyse a nested tiered hierarchy of employee frustration at managerially imposed absurdity. Our analysis counter-intuitively renders salient paradoxes associated with such positive processes as employee voice, speaking up, and PsySafe. Smith and Lewis (2011) and Lewis (2000) reference the absurd in their definitions of paradox. For example, Lewis (2000, p. 760) defines paradox in terms of "contradictory yet interrelated elements – elements that seem logical in isolation but absurd and irrational when

---

[9] Limited time might be a relevant consideration; this research was conducted over the period of a year, which might be too short a timeframe to see transcendence emerge.

appearing simultaneously." Similarly, Farson (1996, p. 13) claims "paradoxes are seeming absurdities." The absurdity experienced in the formal incorporation of speaking up within Athina culture could be viewed as making salient a pragmatic paradox, or, an injunction that cannot be obeyed or disobeyed. If employees felt truly free to speak up they would have done so without prompting. Yet, knowing they are expected to speak up can make their behavior contrived or tokenistic. One safeguard against pragmatic paradoxes is metacommunication (e.g. questioning the order, showing its absurdity; Putnam, 1986; Tracy, 2004; Watzlawick et al., 1967), however, this could be seen as an illegitimate form of speaking up, adding another nested paradox.[10]

The findings offer other important contributions to the literature on PsySafe and speaking up that are not idiosyncratic to Athina but generalizable to other organizations. Theoretically, we show that the *process* of introducing a culture that aims to encourage employees to speak up and voice their views can produce tensions and contradictions. These tensions make various types of organizational paradoxes salient. To create cultures of "true" speaking up (i.e., involving both supportive and challenging voices), organizations need to guarantee that the value is less imposed than embraced (Field, 1989). Telling people to "Speak up!" may render paradoxical tensions salient and even foster a sense of low PsySafe in (at least some) individuals: (a) those that perceive that only supportive but not challenging voice is welcome and (b) those that fear the negative consequences of voicing challenging views and communicating "bad news" (Bies, 2013).

A fundamental paradox inherent to the notion of PsySafe emerged from the data: that is the contradiction between the "extrinsic" value of PsySafe (i.e. as a tool to extract competitive advantage), versus its "intrinsic" value (i.e. nurturing a healthier and virtuous work environment

---

[10] We are grateful to one of our reviewers for pointing this out.

as a value in itself). To create an authentic notion of PsySafe, employees must feel cared for as people, members of a community; otherwise they will not tend selflessly to accept the unavoidable risks connected with speaking up. If the justifications for creating PsySafe conditions are fundamentally instrumental and managerial assumptions remain the dominant logic informing the organization, then any appeal to speak up will unavoidably be considered by employees in terms of risks/benefits (Clampitt, 2001), making salient some of the contradictions observed in this study. Specifically, within the context of this study, the value of speaking up was diffused from the core (the company's headquarters), but the situation in peripheral Southern Europe implied a particular reading of the value: the first condition for ensuring safety resided in performance, nothing else. Consequently, while some people saw the value as a reaffirmation of the organization's care for people, others saw it as a rhetorical device to be handled with care – as, in a company of kindred spirits, being a contrarian was not appreciated, as the self-proclaimed contrarians in our sample (including newcomers) pointed out. In other words, individual differences also informed experiences of PsySafe and speaking up (Van Dyne et al., 2003; Venkataramani and Tangirala, 2010), where the contrarians felt that their invitation to speak up was less genuine than that extended to insiders.

A related consideration is the contradiction between "bottom up" notions of PsySafe and speaking up and attempts to nurture it through "top down" managerialist initiatives. Contradictions of this sort bear relevance to instrumental views of organizational culture that have historically been the mark of practitioner approaches (Barley, Gordon, and Gash 1988) versus the more nuanced and complex views of the phenomenon that have emerged in the academic literature (Martin, Frost, and O'Neill, 2006).

The tensions described in this study are indeed paradoxes because they have been hierarchically imposed as contradictory managerial demands logical in isolation but impossible to fulfil when juxtaposed. Some experienced the situations created as "schizophrenic" [I-16], absurd, inconsistent or irrational, which sometimes led to inhibited action or "paralysis" (Smith and Lewis, 2011) through responses of denial, selection and separation. Such paradoxes are distinct from dilemmas between competing values with advantages and disadvantages that can be resolved by choosing one option over another; or dialectics, involving a thesis that is challenged by an antithesis and resolved through synthesis.

CONCLUSIONS

As far as we are aware, no existing studies relate organizational paradoxes to employee voice, speaking up and PsySafe across a nested hierarchy of organizational dimensions, as demonstrated in the current case study. Our findings thereby contribute towards extending existing research in many areas, not least on paradox at macro, meso, and micro levels (Costanzo and Di Domenico, 2015). We explored attempts to introduce a culture of speaking up in a division of a multinational healthcare company. The findings revealed a number of paradoxes introduced by the process of culture change promoting PsySafe and speaking up. Managerially, the cultural change program was favoured as a positive means for enhancing organizational innovation and creativity as an instrumental value. It was not intended that employees with a more negative disposition should speak up, raising issues that were managerially difficult or controversial. People were expected to speak up, but to do so in a context in which many recognised clearly that there were limits to their freedom and psychological safety in doing so. Speaking up was deemed managerially "useful" by its progenitors only when it was "dumbed down", i.e. when it did not challenge the status quo and

the vested interests of the organizational elite. Such "organizational stupidity" (Alvesson and Spicer, 2012), even when promoted off the back of introducing positive values, will not produce desired outcomes by fiat. Practically, numerous organizational neutralizers may confront the value of speaking up, most notably by employees' recollection of past practices and remembered history in the present. The importance of proclaimed values is established not only in discourse but also in practice. Future research could explore *at what times* it is acceptable to speak up in different cultural contexts.

Specific limitations in our study relate to the fact that it was premised on an emergent naturally occurring serendipitous opportunity to study paradoxical contradictions of speaking up and PsySafe ethnographically; accordingly, there was no interview protocol and systematic recording and transcription of the data. Athina also operates in a high power distance national culture, and this contextual feature may neutralize, or mitigate, management efforts to promote PsySafe and speaking up in organizations (Liang, Farh, and Farh, 2012). These limitations are counterbalanced by the strength of this study: it captures the unfolding of multiple interconnected paradoxes of speaking up during the period of emerging salience.

Future research could explore PsySafe from a paradoxical perspective as a meta-theoretical lens exploring the dynamic interplay of positive and negative processes that have been suggested in this study. Politics need further investigation: the study saw individuals use the cultural legitimacy of speaking up to push agendas, behaviour viewed by others as politically motivated, reinforcing cynicism and discrediting the value of speaking up. Since creating trust is a goal of PsySafe, managers may paradoxically undercut their intentions. Inconsistency and ambivalence in leadership messages should be considered in future research on situations where discourses of

senior executives and middle managers differ: do people respond to such inconsistency with cynicism (Fleming and Spicer, 2003) or with creative resistance (Courpasson, Dany, and Clegg 2012)? When paradoxical tensions of voice become salient, which messages prevail: values emanating from the top, examples from direct supervisors, or creative or cynical responses of managers and peers?

Considering that PsySafe and speaking up are culturally contingent (Frazier, Fainshmidt, Klinger, Pezeshkan, and Vrachev, 2017) and that paradoxical leadership is a cross-cultural endeavour (Zhang, Waldman, Han, and Li, 2015), it should also be acknowledged, as suggested in this paper, that the meanings attributed to the notion of speaking up will be as varied as the diversity of members represented in the organization. Organizations cannot promulgate cultural change programs that proffer democratic voice as transformative while also maintaining practices that imply the contrary; the ultimate paradox of offering voice with implicit conditions to employees is that they may well refuse to be what the organization wanted them to be (after Marley, 1979).

References

Aberbach, J.D. and Rockman, B.A., (2002). 'Conducting and coding elite interviews', *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *35*, pp.673-676.

Akella, D. (2008). 'A reflection on critical management studies,' *Journal of Management & Organization, 14,* pp. 100-110.

Albert, S. and D. A. Whetten (1985). 'Organizational identity'. In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavour* (vol.7; pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Alford, C. F. (2002). *Whistleblowers: Broken lives and organizational power*. Cornell University Press.

Alvesson, M. & Spicer, A. (2012). 'A stupidity-based theory of organizations,' *Journal of Management Studies, 49* , pp. 1194-220.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1992). *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage.

Andriopoulos, C. and Lewis, M.W. (2009), 'Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation', *Organization Science*, **20**, pp.696-717.

Anteby, M. (2013). 'Relaxing the taboo on telling our own stories: Upholding professional distance and personal involvement', *Organization Science, 24*, pp. 1277-1290.

Barley, S.R., Gordon, W.M. & Gash, D.C. 1988, 'Cultures of culture: Academics, practitioners and the pragmatics of normative control', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **33**, pp. 24-60.

Bashshur, M. R. and B. Oc (2015). 'When voice matters: A multilevel review of the impact of voice in organizations', *Journal of Management, 41*, pp. 1530-1554.

Bednarek, R., Paroutis, S. and Sillince, J. (2017). 'Transcendence through Rhetorical Practices: Responding to Paradox in the Science Sector', *Organization Studies, 38,* pp. 77-101.

Beech, N., H. Burns, L. de Caestecker, R. MacIntosh and D. MacLean (2004). 'Paradox as invitation to act in problematic change situations'. *Human Relations*, **57**, pp. 1313-1332.

Berti, M. 2017, Elgar Introduction to Organizational Discourse Analysis, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

Bies, R. J. (2013). 'The delivery of bad news in organizations: A framework for analysis', *Journal of Management*, **39**, pp. 136-162.

Bolino, M.C. (1999). 'Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors?', *Academy of Management Review*, **24**, pp. 82-98.

Brown, H. & Worthington, R. (2017). 'Corporate culture: Reflections from 2016 and lessons learnt', *Governance Directions*, **69**, pp. 100-102.

Budd, J. W., P. J. Gollan. and A. Wilkinson (2010). 'New approaches to employee voice and participation in organizations', *Human Relations*, **63**, pp. 303-310.

Burns, D., P. Hyde, A. Killett, F. Poland and R. Gray (2014). 'Participatory organizational research: Examining voice in the co-production of knowledge', *British Journal of Management,* **25**, pp. 133-144.

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

Carroll, J. S. and A. C. Edmondson (2002). 'Leading organisational learning in health care', *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, **11**, pp. 51-56.

Clampitt, P. G. (2001). *Communicating for managerial effectiveness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Clegg, S. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. London: Sage.

Clegg, S. R., J. V. Cunha and M. P. Cunha (2002). 'Management paradoxes: A relational view', *Human Relations,* **55**, pp. 483-503.

Cohen, L. J. 1950. Mr. O'Connor's" Pragmatic Paradoxes". *Mind*, **59,** pp. 85-87.

Corley, K.G. and Gioia, D.A. (2004). Identity ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spinoff. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* **49**, pp. 173-208.

Courpasson, D., F. Dany and S. R. Clegg (2012). 'Resisters at work: Generating productive resistance in the workplace', *Organization Science,* **23**, pp. 801-819.

Cunha, M. (2008). 'Paradox'. In S. R. Clegg and J. R. Bailey (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies* (pp. 1223-1225). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cunha, J.V., S. R. Clegg and M. P. Cuhna (2002). 'Management, paradox and permanent dialectics'. In S.R. Clegg (ed.), *Management and Organization Paradoxes*, pp. 11–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cunha, M. P., A. Rego and K. Kamoche (2009). 'Improvisation in service recovery', *Managing Service Quality,* **19**, pp. 657-669.

D'Aveni, R. A., G. B. Dagnino and K. G. Smith (2010). 'The age of temporary advantage', *Strategic Management Journal,* **31**, pp. 1371-1385.

Dean, E. (2014). 'In the wake of the Francis shock wave: Erin Dean looks at how the NHS has changed since the final report into the Mid Staffs scandal', *Nursing Standard*, **28**, pp. 22-25.

De Geus, A. (2002). *The living company*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Delbridge, R., & Keenoy, T. (2010). 'Beyond managerialism?', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **21**, 799-817.

Deshpandé, R., J. U. Farley and F. E. Webster Jr. (1993). 'Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: A quadrad analysis', J*ournal of Marketing*, **57**, pp. 23-37.

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

Detert, J.R., E. R. Burris, D. A. Harrison and S. R. Martin (2013). 'Voice flows to and around leaders: Understanding when units are helped or hurt by employee voice', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* **58,** pp. 624-668.

Detert, J. R. and A. C. Edmondson (2011). 'Leadership behaviors and employee voice: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work', *Academy of Management Journal,* **54**, pp. 461-488.

Detert, J. R., & Trevino, L. K. 2010. 'Speaking up to higher ups: How supervisors and skip-level leaders influence employee voice', *Organization Science*, 21: 249–270

Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M. and Ackers, P., (2004). 'The meanings and purpose of employee voice', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **15**, pp. 1149-1170.

Dylan, B. (1967). The Wicked Messenger, John Wesley Harding. New York: Columbia LP.

Easterby-Smith, M., M. M. Crossan and D. Nicolini. (2000). 'Organizational learning: Debates past, present and future', *Journal of Management Studies,* **37**, pp. 783-796.

Edmondson, A. C. (2003). 'Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams', *Journal of Management Studies,* **40**, pp. 1419-1452.

Edmondson, A. C. (2008). 'The competitive imperative of learning', *Harvard Business Review*, **86**, pp. 60-67.

Edmondson, A. C. (2012). *Teaming: How organizations learn, innovate, and compete in the knowledge economy*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Edmondson, A. C. and Z. Lei (2014). 'Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct', *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* **1**, pp. 23-43.

Edmondson, A. C., Higgins, M., Singer, S., and Weiner, J. (2016). 'Understanding psychological safety in health care and education organizations: A comparative perspective'. *Research in Human Development*, *13,* pp. 65-83.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (2000). 'Paradox, spirals, ambivalence: The new language of change and pluralism', *Academy of Management Review, 25,* pp. 703-705.

Elliott, E. S. and C. S. Dweck (1988). 'Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **54**, pp. 5-12.

Farson, R. (1996). *Management of the absurd: Paradoxes in leadership.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Farh, J.L., C. B. Zhong and D. W. Organ (2004). 'Organizational citizenship behavior in the People's Republic of China', *Organization Science,* **15**, pp. 241-253.

Fast, N.J., E. Burris and G. Bartel (2014). 'Managing to stay in the dark: Managerial self-efficacy, ego defensiveness, and the aversion to employee voice', *Academy of Management Journal*, **57**, pp. 1013-1034.

Field, R. H. (1989). 'Leaders as stars, pulsars, quasars, and black holes', *Business Horizons*, **32**(3), pp. 60-64.

Fleming, P. and A. Spicer (2003). 'Working at a cynical distance: Implications for power, subjectivity and resistance', *Organization,* **10**, pp. 157-179.

Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (2000). 'At the critical moment: conditions and prospects for critical management studies', *Human Relations, 53***,** pp. 7-32.

Frazier, M. L. and W. M. Bowler (2015). 'Voice climate, supervisor undermining, and work outcomes: A group level examination', *Journal of Management,* **41**, pp. 841-863.

Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., and Vracheva, V. (2017). 'Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension', *Personnel Psychology*, **70**, pp. 113-165.

Gioia, D. A., M. Schultz and K. G. Corley (2002). 'On celebrating the organizational identity metaphor: A rejoinder to Cornelissen', *British Journal of Management, **13**, pp. 259–278.

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

Harvey, W.S., (2011). 'Strategies for conducting elite interviews', *Qualitative Research*, **11**, pp. 431-441.

Heller, J. (1961) *Catch-22*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Heynoski, K. and R. E, Quinn (2012). 'Seeing and realizing organizational potential: Activating conversations that challenge assumptions', *Organizational Dynamics*, **41**, pp. 118-125.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoogervorst, N., D. De Cremer and M. Van Dijke (2013). 'When do leaders grant voice? How leaders' perceptions of followers' control and belongingness needs affect the enactment of fair procedures', *Human Relations*, **66**, pp. 973-992.

Hsiung, H. H. (2012). 'Authentic leadership and employee voice behavior: A multi-level psychological process', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **107**, pp. 349-361

Ibarra, H. and R. Barbulescu (2010). 'Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions', *Academy of Management Review*, **35**, pp. 135-154.

Jablin, F.M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit in F.M. Jablin, LL. Putnam,. K.H. Roberts & L.W. Porter (eds). Handbook of organizational communication. (pp.679-740). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jansen, J. J. P., V. D. Bosch, A. J. Frans and H. W. Volberda (2006). 'Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators', *Management Science,* **52,** pp. 1661-1674.

Jones, A. and D. Kelly (2014). 'Deafening silence? Time to reconsider whether organisations are silent or deaf when things go wrong', *BMJ Quality & Safety*, **23**, pp. 709-713.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). 'Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work', *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**, pp. 692-724.

Kelton, E. (2016). '14.7 billion reasons why Volkswagen should have welcomed whistleblowers', *Forbes*, June 29 (http://www.forbes.com/sites/erikakelton/2016/06/29/14-7-billion-reasons-why-volkswagen-should-have-welcomed-whistleblowers/#6277d9f662bc)

Kim, J., J. P. MacDuffie and F. K. Pil (2010). 'Employee voice and organizational performance: Team versus representative influence', *Human Relations*, **63**, pp. 371-394.

Klikauer, T. (2013). *Managerialism: A Critique of an Ideology*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lavelle, J., P. Gunnigle and A. McDonnell (2010). 'Patterning employee voice in multinational companies', *Human Relations*, **63**, pp. 395-418.

Lee, R. M. (2004). 'Recording technologies and the interview in Sociology, 1920-2000', *Sociology,* **38**, pp. 869-889.

LePine, M. A. and L. Van Dyne (1998). 'Predicting voice behavior in work groups', *Journal of Applied Psychology,* **83**, pp. 853-868.

LePine, M. A. and L. Van Dyne (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**, pp. 326-336.

Lewis, M. W. (2000). 'Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide', *Academy of Management Review,* **25**, pp. 760-776.

Lewis, M. W. and W. K. Smith (2014). 'Paradox as a metatheoretical perspective: Sharpening the focus and widening the scope', *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* **50**, pp. 127-149.

Liang, J., Farh, C. I., & Farh, J. L. (2012). 'Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination', *Academy of Management Journal*, **55**, pp. 71-92.

Mainemelis, C., R. Kark and O. Epitropaki (2015). 'Creative leadership: A multicontext conceptualization', *Academy of Management Annals,* **9**, pp. 393-482.

Marley, B. (1979). *Babylon system. Survival.* London: Island records

Martin, J., Frost, P.J. & O'Neill, O.A. (2006). 'Organizational culture: Beyond struggles for intellectual dominance', in S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence & W.R. Nord (eds), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies*, SAGE, London, pp. 725-53.

McCabe, D. M., & Lewin, D. (1992). 'Employee voice: A human resource management perspective', *California Management Review*, **34**, pp. 112-123.

Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). 'Whistleblowing in organizations: An examination of correlates of whistleblowing intentions, actions, and retaliation', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **62**, pp. 277–297.

Miceli, M. P., Near, J. P., & Dworkin, T. M. (2009). 'A word to the wise: How managers and policy-makers can encourage employees to report wrongdoing', *Journal of Business Ethics*, **86**, pp. 379-396.

Miller, D. (1993). 'The architecture of simplicity', *Academy of Management Review*, **18**, pp. 116-138.

Morrison, E. W. (1994). 'Role definitions and organizational citizenship behaviors: The importance of the employee's perspective', *Academy of Management Journal,* **37**, pp. 1543-1567.

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

Mowbray, P. K., Wilkinson, A., & Tse, H. H. (2015). 'An integrative review of employee voice: Identifying a common conceptualization and research agenda', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **17**, pp. 382-400.

Near, J. P. & Miceli, M. P. (1996). 'Whistle-blowing: Myth and reality', *Journal of Management*, **22**, pp. 507–526.

Nembhard, I. M. and A. C. Edmondson (2006). 'Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **27**, pp. 941-966.

Nemeth, C., Brown, K. & Rogers, J. (2001). 'Devil's advocate versus authentic dissent: Stimulating quality and quantity', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, **31**, 707-720.

Ohana, M. (2016), 'Voice, affective commitment and citizenship behavior in teams: The moderating role of neuroticism and intrinsic motivation', *British Journal of Management,* **27**, pp. 97-115.

Orwell, G. (1948) *1984*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ou, A. Y, Tsui, A. S., Kinicki, A. J., Waldman, D. A., Xiao, Z., & Song, L. J. (2014). 'Humble Chief Executive Officers' connections to top management team integration and middle managers' responses', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **59**, 34–72.

Patriotta, G and Gruber DA (2015). 'Newsmaking and sensemaking: Navigating temporal transitions between planned and unexpected events, *Organization Science* **26**, pp. 1574-1592.

Petriglieri, J. L. (2015). 'Co-creating relationship repair: Pathways to reconstructing destabilized organizational identification', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* **60**, pp. 518-557.

Pfeffer, J. (2015). '3 lessons from the Amazon takedown', *Fortune*, August 18 (accessed at http://fortune.com/2015/08/18/amazon-new-york-times/)

Pirson, M. (2018). 'A humanistic perspective for management theory: Protecting dignity and promoting well-being', *Journal of Business Ethics, XX*(X), XXX-XXX. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uts.edu.au/10.1007/s10551-017-3755-4

Poole, M. and L. L. Putnam (2008). 'Organizational paradox'. In S.R. Clegg and J.R. Bailey (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies* (pp. 1147-1149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L. L. (1986). 'Contradictions and paradoxes in organizations'. In L. Thayer (ed), *Organization communications: Emerging perspectives*, pp. 151-167. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Putnam, L. L., G. T. Fairhurst and S. Banghart (2016). 'Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach, *The Academy of Management Annals,* **10**, pp. 65-171.

Putnam, L. L., G. T. Fairhurst and S. Banghart (2016). 'Contradictions, dialectics, and paradoxes in organizations: A constitutive approach, *The Academy of Management Annals,* **10**, pp. 65-171.

Rothschild, J. (2008). 'Freedom of speech denied, dignity assaulted: What the whistleblowers experience in the US', *Current Sociology*, *56*(6), 884-903.

Rothschild, J. (2013). 'The fate of whistleblowers in nonprofit organizations', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, **42**, 886-901.

Salancik, G. R. and J. Pfeffer (1978). 'A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design', *Administrative Science Quarterly,* **23**, pp. 224-253.

Salge, T. O. and A. Vera. (2013), 'Small steps that matter: incremental learning, slack resources and organizational performance', *British Journal of Management*, **24**, pp. 156-173.

Schein, E. H. (2015). 'Organizational psychology then and now: Some observations', *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* **2**, pp. 1-19.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schreurs, B., Guenter, H., Jawahar, I. J., and De Cuyper, N. (2015). 'Speaking up when feeling job insecure: The moderating role of punishment and reward sensitivity', *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **28**, pp. 1107-1128.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. London: Sage.

Smith, W. K. and M. W. Lewis (2011). 'Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing', *Academy of Management Review,* **36**, pp. 381-403.

Smith, W. K. and M. W. Lewis (2012). 'Leadership skills for managing paradox', *Industrial and Organizational Psychology,* 5, pp. 227-231.

Tracy, S. J. (2004). 'Dialectic, contradiction, or double bind? Analyzing and theorizing employee reactions to organizational tension'. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 32(2), pp 119-146.

Trevelyan, R. (2001). 'The paradox of autonomy: A case of academic research scientists', *Human Relations,* **54**, pp. 495-525.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). 'Servant leadership: A review and synthesis', *Journal of Management*, **37**, pp. 1228-1261.

Van Dyne, L., S. Ang and I. Botero (2003). 'Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional construct', *Journal of Management Studies*, **40**, pp. 1359-1392.

Venkataramani, V. and S. Tangirala (2010). 'When and why do central employees speak up? An examination of mediating and moderating variables', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **95**, pp. 582-591.

Waldman, D. A., M. Javidan and P. Varella (2004). 'Charismatic leadership at the strategic level: A new application of upper echelons theory', *The Leadership Quarterly,* **15**, pp. 355-380.

Watzlawick, P., Jackson, D. D., & Bavelas, J. B. (1967). *Pragmatics of human communication: a study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. New York: Norton.

Wei, X., Zhang, Z.-X., and Chen, X.-P. (2015). 'I will speak up if my voice is socially desirable: A moderated mediating process of promotive versus prohibitive voice', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **100**, pp. 1641-1652.

Weick, K. E. (2002). 'The aesthetic of imperfection in orchestras and organizations'. In K.N. Kamoche, M.P. Cunha and J.V. Cunha (eds), *Organizational improvisation* (pp.166-184). London: Routledge.

Weick, K. E. (2015). 'Ambiguity as grasp: The reworking of sense', *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management,* **23**, pp. 117-123.

Wilkinson, A., Dundon, T., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004), 'Changing patterns of employee voice: Case studies from the UK and Republic of Ireland', *Journal of Industrial Relations*, **46**, pp. 298-322.

Westney, D.E. & Van Maanen, J. (2011), 'The casual ethnography of the executive suite',' *Journal of International Business Studies*, *42,* pp. 602-7.

Wu, J. B., Tsui, A. S., & Kinicki, A. J. (2010). 'Consequences of differentiated leadership in groups', *Academy of Management Journal*, **53,** pp. 90-106.

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y.-L., and Li, X.-B., (2015). 'Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences', *Academy of Management Journal*, **58**, pp. 535-565.

Table 1: Contradictions within defined organizational dimensions manifest a three-tiered hierarchy of nested organizational paradoxes.

Level of tension	Dimensions	Contradictions made salient "Mutually exclusive" but interdependent "bipolar opposites" that both "define and potentially negate each other." (Putnam, 2016, p. 70)	Salient contradictions become paradox "Contradictions that persist over time, impose and reflect back on each other, and develop into seemingly irrational or absurd situations." (Putnam 2016, p. 72)
Level 1 **Mixed messages**	1.1. Organizational identity	New identity as learning organization vs. Existing identity achievement oriented "performance machine"	*Learning and belonging* paradoxes become salient through conflicting needs to both change and to remain the same.
Level 2 **System contradictions**	2.1. Values	New values expected to redefine the organizational identity vs. Existing identity exerts pressure over the new values	*Learning and performing* paradoxes become salient through conflicts between building future capabilities and ensuring present success.
	2.2. Leadership practices	Speaking up prompts the need for creative leaders vs. Speaking up counters the normative concerns of administrative leaders	*Organizing and learning* paradoxes become salient through conflicts between competing demands for efficiency and learning.
	2.3. Job breadth	To operationalize speaking up organizational members have space to craft their jobs vs. From a normative perspective, and to avoid non-conformities, people are expected to respond to their jobs' duties	*Organizing and performing* paradoxes become salient through conflicts between means and ends (for example between job and customer demands).
Level 3 **Individual self-referential loops**	3.1. Implicit theories of voice	Speaking up is for the organization (i.e. citizenship) vs. Speaking up is for the speaker (i.e. impression management)	*Belonging and organizing* paradoxes become salient through the competing needs of individual employees and the aggregate.

Table 2: Levels of analysis and tensions with exemplar quotes [I = Informant]

Level 1: Mixed messages

Contradictory organizational identities	"it is difficult to leave the profitability logic. We want to innovate but haven't left the efficiency mode. Sometimes it is schizophrenic" [I-16]
	"there needs to be a better capacity to process feedback" [I-15]

Level 2: System contradictions

Contradictions in values	***New values, new identity:***
	"this is the first company in which I worked where values are taken seriously. I see values passing from paper to practice" [I-5]
	"The structure is flat, I can easily approach any member of the leadership team" [I-10]
	"the new set of values is a true challenge" [I-16]
	"there are inconsistencies around values" [I-1]
	"We all have to be extroverts" [I-1]
	New values, same identity:
	"the rhythm of work is too intense" [I-2]
	"we preach 'speaking up' but we don't give people time to do different things" [I-8]
	"Every six months we fear we can be dismissed" [I-8]
	"Internal competition is so intense that it eliminates cooperative work" [I-16]
	"People constantly compete with their colleagues" [I-11]
	"We are not yet in the error acceptance phase. The obstacle? Pressure to perform" [I-2]
	"The company is still very inconsequential in terms of values. We preach a religion that we don't practice" [I-1]
	"The company is not ready to deal with bad news, to deal with failure" [I-8]
	"Speaking up in a transparent way can be suicidal. You're a kamikaze if you do that" [I-16]
Contradictions in leadership practices	***Creative leaders:***
	"in some cases creative solutions that failed did not prompt punishment" [I-12]
	"the company is flat. It is easy to have access to the top floor" [I-10]
	Administrative leaders:
	"Speak up, speak up, speak up! I used to have a very low context boss: 'Give me the facts' (…). In reality people don't like to be confronted with criticism. Generally, it is not well accepted" [I-16]
	"Speak up… There has been an evolution. However, to a great extent, it depends on the managers. People are now more vocal but there is a way to go" [I-7]
	"Sometimes there are many confirmatory emails. Nobody [in those teams] does anything without sending five emails for the sake of protecting oneself" [I-12]
	"There is a spiral of overwork (…) We are consumed by the operations" [I-6]

Contradictions in job interpretations	**Ample adaptation:**
	"When you assume a mistake nobody jumps on you. They even support you. It has a positive effect" [I-12]
	"people come to console you" [I-12]
	Narrow compliance:
	"an excess of internal focus" [I-16]
	"hyper-regulation" [I-4 + I-5]
	"an obsession with rules" [I-4]
	"it even creates anxiety" [I-4]
	"The bureaucratic core of the company is too risk averse. The people who are not customer facing may not 'speak up'" [I-12]
	"The new value set resulted from problems abroad. The logic is one of error avoidance. The logic is always one of finding the mistake" [I-3]
	"We have a culture of deviation avoidance (…) Processes are very strong" [I-3]
	"It is risky to expose oneself [to risks]" [I-11]
	"This company is punishing. More than it thinks it is" [I-3]
	"Our compliance systems are very strict, in order to avoid ethical issues" [I-3]
	"everything is hyper-regulated, and that limits creativity" [I-4]

Level 3: Contradictory self-references

Self-referential loops	**Personalized voice:**
	"Some people here see speaking up as a space for personal promotion" [I-1]
	"There is speaking up for the good things but no speaking up for the bad things" [I-16]
	"The microphone [in town hall meetings] is always grabbed by the same people. Always!" [I-1]
	"Those who speak, speak too much; those who don't, stop speaking at all" [I-1]
	"Some people, even when they know nothing about an issue, they start talking. This is speaking up, but speaking up of the wrong kind." [I-5]
	"In this house, humility is not perceived as a form of wisdom" [I-5]
	"I don't do it in the town hall meetings. It is too big!" [I-10]
	"There is a culture of protagonism and a silo mentality. We all have to be extroverts. You have to have a high profile. That's what leads you to the top." [I-1]
	Socialized voice:
	"There has been a good evolution of speak up" [I-7]
	"we have an extremely high level of speaking up" [I-6]
	"I am very proud of this company of its mission" [I-10]
	"I have never felt so passionately involved with an organization" [I-8]

Author Biographies

Miguel Pina e Cunha is Professor of Organizational Theory and Behavior at at Nova School of Business and Economics, Lisbon. He has authored over 80 publications on topics concerning positive and negative organizing, and emergent processes in organizations, such as improvisation, surprise and serendipity.

Ace Volkmann Simpson is Senior Lecturer in Management within the UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney. Ace's research brings a critical-social perspective to positive organizational scholarship and has been published in journals such as the *Journal of Management, Journal of Business Ethics* and the *Journal of Management Inquiry*.

Stewart Clegg is Distinguished Professor of Management at UTS Business School, University of Technology Sydney and Visiting Professor at Nova Business School, Lisboa, Portugal. A prolific publisher of books as well as articles in leading academic journals in social science, management and organization theory, he has won numerous honours for his research achievements.

Arménio Rego is a Professor at the Católica Porto Business School, Porto, Portugal, and member of the Business Research Unit (ISCTE-IUL, Portugal). He has published in journals such as *Journal of Business Ethics, Journal of Business Research, Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, Journal of Management, Organization Studies*, and *The Leadership Quarterly*, among others. His research deals with positive organizational scholarship.