

Employee Voice Behavior in Regional Banking: The Effects of Job Autonomy, Person–Organization Fit, and Work Engagement

Akbar Mursalin¹, Elfitra Azliyanti²

^{1,2}Department of Management, Bung Hatta University, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Nov 23, 2025
Revised Dec 05, 2025
Accepted Dec 20, 2025

Keywords:

Job Autonomy
Person-Organization Fit
Work Engagement
Voice Behavior

ABSTRACT

In the era of industrial and digital transformation, organizations are required to remain adaptive and innovative to maintain competitiveness. The banking sector, including regional institutions such as Bank Nagari, faces increasing customer demands and service-related complaints, necessitating stronger employee involvement in continuous improvement efforts. This study examines the influence of job autonomy, person–organization fit, and work engagement on employee voice behavior at the Main Branch Office (KCU) of Bank Nagari, located on Jalan Pemuda No. 21, Padang. The research was conducted in 2025 using a quantitative, cross-sectional design. Data were collected from 108 employees through structured questionnaires and analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results indicate that person–organization fit has a significant positive effect on employee voice behavior (Coef = 0.21; $p = 0.000$), whereas job autonomy (Coef = 0.06; $p = 0.455$) and work engagement (Coef = -0.007 ; $p = 0.879$) show no significant influence. These findings suggest that value alignment between individuals and the organization is more essential in fostering employee voice than structural or motivational aspects. Practically, the study highlights the importance of creating an open organizational climate, strengthening recruitment based on value congruence, internalizing organizational culture, and promoting leadership that encourages employee expression to enhance innovation and organizational development within the banking sector.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Akbar Mursalin,
Department of Management,
Bung Hatta University,
Jl. Bagindo Aziz Chan Jl. By Pass, Aie Pacah, Kec. Koto Tengah, Kota Padang, Sumatera Barat 25586
Email: akbarmursalin222@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

In the era of Industry 4.0 and Society 5.0, organizations are required to be adaptive, innovative, and responsive to the rapid changes in the business environment. Human resources are no longer considered merely as supporting factors but as strategic assets that determine the success of organizations (Lena, 2002). Particularly in the banking sector, competition has been driven by digital transformation, customer behavioral shifts, and the proliferation of financial institutions. Local banks such as Bank Nagari are not exempted from these challenges, facing a significant increase in customer complaints over the last three years (Bank Nagari, 2024). This situation indicates potential service quality issues that require continuous innovation and improvement, where employee voice behavior becomes an essential mechanism for problem-solving and organizational development (Knoll & Redman, 2016; Salsabila et al., 2023; Kao et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022); (Chiang & Chen, 2021).

Previous studies show that voice behavior is a discretionary verbal communication of ideas, suggestions, or constructive criticism that aims to improve organizational functions (Morrison, 2011; Chen et al., 2020; Chan, 2014). Employees who engage in voice behavior contribute to organizational innovation, decision-making effectiveness, and problem-solving (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Chen et al., 2018). However, voice behavior is highly influenced by several contextual and individual factors. Among them, three critical antecedents are job autonomy, person–organization fit, and work engagement. This study focuses on investigating how these variables shape employee voice behavior within the context of a regional development bank, which presents different dynamics compared to national or multinational banks.

First, job autonomy reflects the degree of freedom and discretion employees have in organizing their work tasks. Autonomy encourages individuals to take initiative, develop ideas, and actively participate in organizational improvement (Kao et al., 2022; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Susanto, 2019). Research indicates that autonomy fosters responsibility, innovation, and proactive behaviors, including voice (Chiang & Chen, 2021; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Caso et al., 2015). In banking institutions, job autonomy can reduce rigid bureaucratic procedures and promote creative solutions to customer service challenges. Nevertheless, some studies reveal that autonomy alone may not always significantly drive employee voice, particularly in highly structured organizations (Chen, 2016).

Second, person–organization (P–O) fit emphasizes the alignment of employee values with organizational norms and culture. High congruence between personal and organizational values fosters commitment, satisfaction, and a stronger inclination to express constructive opinions (Kristof, 1996; Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Kao et al., 2022). Employees who perceive strong value alignment are more motivated to contribute through voice behavior that supports organizational goals (Liang et al., 2012). Empirical evidence also demonstrates that P–O fit positively influences promotive voice behaviors, enabling employees to offer solutions and innovative suggestions rather than mere complaints (Reisa & Sudibjo, 2020; Sylvana et al., 2024). This study thus positions P–O fit as a crucial determinant of voice behavior in regional banks.

Third, work engagement reflects the psychological state of vigor, dedication, and absorption in one's work (Bakker, 2006; Osborne & Hammoud, 2017; Bhave, 2023). Engaged employees show enthusiasm, pride, and persistence in their jobs, which drives them to speak up for organizational improvements (Setiawan Maulana et al., 2023; Yaqoub et al., 2020). Studies suggest that employees with higher engagement levels are more likely to perceive voice as part of their core role rather than as an extra burden (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Cheng, 2009)(Cheng, 2009). Conversely, low engagement often leads to silence and disengagement, reducing opportunities for constructive feedback. In the banking context, engagement becomes particularly important in ensuring that employees remain proactive in addressing service quality issues and customer concerns.

A review of the literature reveals extensive research on the antecedents of voice behavior, including job autonomy, P–O fit, and engagement (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Chen et al., 2018; Knoll & Redman, 2016; Kalemci et al., 2019; Rubbab, 2020). However, most studies are concentrated in multinational corporations or manufacturing industries. Research on regional development banks, such as Bank Nagari, remains limited despite their unique organizational culture, bureaucratic structures, and customer service dynamics. As a regional bank that supports inclusive and sustainable economic development, Bank Nagari's ability to respond to customer feedback and maintain service excellence relies heavily on employees' willingness to engage in voice behavior. However, empirical studies examining the determinants of voice behavior in regional banking institutions remain limited.

Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the effects of job autonomy, person–organization fit, and work engagement on employee voice behavior at the Main Branch Office (KCU) of Bank Nagari. This research contributes theoretically by enriching the literature on voice behavior in the regional banking sector, and practically by providing insights to strengthen organizational practices that enhance proactive employee participation.

Relationship between Job Autonomy and Voice Behavior

Job autonomy refers to the degree of freedom and discretion employees have in scheduling their work and determining procedures to accomplish tasks (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Higher autonomy fosters responsibility, initiative, and creativity, which in turn enhance employees' willingness to express constructive suggestions (Morrison et al., 2011; Lepine & Van Dyne, 2001). Prior research has consistently shown that autonomy positively influences proactive behaviors, including voice, because employees feel empowered to act beyond formal roles (Chiang & Chen, 2021; Susanto, 2019; Caso et al., 2015). Therefore, employees who experience greater autonomy are more likely to demonstrate higher levels of voice behavior.

H1: Job autonomy has a positive effect on employee voice behavior.

Relationship between Person–Organization Fit and Voice Behavior

Person–organization (P–O) fit reflects the compatibility between individual values and organizational culture (Kristof, 1996). When employees perceive high congruence, they develop stronger affective commitment and higher satisfaction, which encourage them to engage in behaviors that support organizational goals (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Alfes et al., 2016). Previous studies reveal that P–O fit is positively associated with discretionary behaviors such as organizational citizenship behavior and promotive voice, because employees are motivated to safeguard and improve the organization they identify with (Kao et al., 2022; Reisa & Sudibjo, 2020; Sylvana et al., 2024). Thus, P–O fit can be considered a key determinant of voice behavior in organizations.

H2: Person–organization fit has a positive effect on employee voice behavior.

Relationship between Work Engagement and Voice Behavior

Work engagement is a positive psychological state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption in work (Bakker, 2006). Engaged employees are more likely to go beyond formal job requirements and show proactive behaviors, including speaking up about issues and opportunities for improvement (Osborne & Hammoud, 2017; Setiawan Maulana et al., 2023). Research demonstrates that engagement fosters psychological safety and intrinsic motivation, which enhance employees' tendency to voice constructive opinions (LePine, 1998; Yaqoub et al., 2020; Cheng, 2009; Bhawe, 2023). Conversely, low engagement is often linked with silence and withdrawal. Therefore, employees with higher engagement are expected to be more vocal in supporting organizational development.

H3: Work engagement has a positive effect on employee voice behavior.

Based on the background above, the research problems are formulated as follows:

1. How does job autonomy influence employee voice behavior at KCU Bank Nagari?
2. How does person–organization fit influence employee voice behavior at KCU Bank Nagari?
3. How does work engagement influence employee voice behavior at KCU Bank Nagari?

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative descriptive method. The cross-sectional design was chosen because the data were collected at a single point in time using the same instrument, allowing the researcher to examine the causal relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable simultaneously. The research was conducted at the Main Branch Office (KCU) of Bank Nagari, Padang.

Data collection was carried out in 2025 through direct distribution of questionnaires to employees at the branch. The population in this study consisted of 292 employees working at the KCU Bank Nagari. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula with a margin of error of 5%, resulting in a sample of 169 employees. After data collection, 108 valid and usable questionnaires were obtained for analysis. The sampling technique used was simple random sampling. Dependent Variabel in this study is Employee Voice Behavior (Y) – measured through three dimensions: self-oriented voice, other-oriented voice, and change-oriented voice. Independent Variabels is Job Autonomy (X1) – measured through three dimensions: work method autonomy, work scheduling autonomy, and work criteria autonomy. Person–Organization Fit (X2) – measured through four dimensions: value congruence, needs–supplies fit, personality–organization fit, and

demand–abilities fit and Work Engagement (X3) – measured through three indicators: vigor, dedication, and absorption. The data were collected using a questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

The questionnaire was distributed directly to employees. Before data analysis, the instrument was tested for validity and reliability. Validity Test: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used, and items with a factor loading greater than 0.50 were considered valid and Reliability Test: Cronbach's Alpha was applied, with values greater than 0.60 indicating acceptable reliability.

The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression. Descriptive analysis was used to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and variables. Multiple linear regression was employed to test the effect of Job Autonomy (X1), Person–Organization Fit (X2), and Work Engagement (X3) on Employee Voice Behavior (Y).

First, Descriptive analysis aims to describe the characteristics of each research variable by presenting the data in distribution tables. This analysis does not relate one variable to another. However, obtain the score of each indicator and the questionnaire items, the following formula was used:

$$\frac{(5.F_{SA}) + (4.F_A) + (3.F_N) + (2.F_{DS}) + (1.F_{SDS})}{(F_{SA} + F_A + F_N + F_{DS} + F_{SDS})} \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where:

F_{SA} = Strongly Agree,

F_A = Agree,

F_N = Neutral,

F_{DS} = Disagree,

F_{SDS} = Strongly Disagree.

Second, Multiple linear regression was applied to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The regression model was expressed as:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

where:

Y = Employee Voice Behavior,

X1 = Job Autonomy,

X2 = Person–Organization Fit,

X3 = Work Engagement,

a = constant,

b1, b2, b3 = regression coefficients,

e = error term

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The demographic profile of respondents in this study was categorized by gender, marital status, educational background, job position, age, and years of service. Based on data from 108 respondents, the majority were male (63 respondents or 58.3%), while female respondents accounted for 45 respondents (41.7%). In terms of marital status, most respondents were married (96 respondents or 88.9%), while 12 respondents (11.1%) were single.

Regarding educational background, the majority of respondents held a bachelor's degree (95 respondents or 87.9%), followed by master's degree holders (9.3%). Only a small proportion had a senior high school education (0.93%), a diploma (0.93%), or a doctoral degree (0.93%). In terms of job position, most respondents were staff (98 respondents or 90.7%), while 10 respondents (9.3%) worked as managers.

The respondents' age ranged from 26 to 55 years, with an average of 39.24 years. Their length of service ranged from 2 to 35 years, with an average of 14.58 years. The testing in this section was conducted to ensure the accuracy and reliability of each questionnaire item supporting the variables in this study. Construct validity testing was employed to determine whether or not a questionnaire item is valid. According to Dachlan in Dharma, (2022) construct validity serves as a benchmark to ensure that measurement items represent the hypothesized construct, which is reflected through a set of elements or questionnaire items. This validity test was conducted using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The results of the data processing are summarized in the table below.

Table 1. Result Validity and Realibility Test

Variable	Valid item	Factor Loading	CR
Job Autonomy	9	0,66-0,90	0,83
PO-Fit	13	0,66-0,99	0,84
Work Engagement	17	0,65-0,84	0,88
Voice Behavior	7	0,72-0,90	0,63

The results of the instrument testing demonstrated that all constructs in this study met the required validity and reliability standards. The Job Autonomy construct showed 9 valid items, with factor loadings ranging from 0.66 to 0.90, all of which exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.50. Its Composite Reliability (CR) was 0.83, indicating that the instrument was reliable and internally consistent. Similarly, the Person–Organization Fit (P–O Fit) construct contained 13 valid items, with factor loadings between 0.66 and 0.99. The CR value of 0.84 further confirmed the high internal consistency of this construct. For the Work Engagement variable, the analysis revealed 17 valid items with factor loadings ranging from 0.65 to 0.84, surpassing the minimum standard for validity. Its CR value of 0.88 indicated very strong reliability. Lastly, the Voice Behavior construct was measured with 7 valid items, showing factor loadings between 0.72 and 0.90, which confirmed the validity of all items. However, the CR value obtained was 0.63, slightly below the generally accepted threshold of 0.70, suggesting that while the instrument remains acceptable for research purposes, its internal consistency is relatively lower compared to the other constructs.

The descriptive analysis was conducted to describe the characteristics of each research variable. Data were presented in the form of frequency distribution tables mean scores. The results show that the indicators of Job Autonomy, Person–Organization Fit, Work Engagement, and Employee Voice Behavior were all in the high category based on mean score interpretation.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistic of Research Variabel

Variable	Mean	Std.Deviation	Category
Job Autonomy	33,81	4,43	High
PO-Fit	49,46	7,71	High
Work Engagement	64,69	8,73	High
Voice Behavior	28,16	3,55	High

The descriptive statistics presented in Table 2 show that all research variables fall into the high category. Job Autonomy obtained a mean score of 33.81 with a standard deviation of 4.43, indicating that employees perceive a relatively high level of autonomy in their work. Person–Organization Fit recorded an average of 49.46 with a standard deviation of 7.71, which suggests that respondents generally experienced a strong alignment between their personal values and those of the organization. Work Engagement showed the highest mean score among the variables at 64.69 with a standard deviation of 8.73, reflecting that employees demonstrated a high level of enthusiasm, dedication, and absorption in their work. Meanwhile, Voice Behavior obtained a mean score of 28.16 with a standard deviation of 3.55, signifying that employees also tend to actively express constructive opinions and suggestions in their workplace. Overall, these results indicate that all constructs measured in this study are perceived positively and at a high level by the respondents.

To empirically examine the effect of Job Autonomy, Person–Organization Fit, and Work Engagement on Employee Voice Behavior, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. The summary of the results is presented in the table below:

Table 3. Hypothesis Testing

Variable	Coef	P>[t]	Notes
Job Autonomy	0,06	0,455	Not Support
PO-Fit	0,21	0,000	Support
Work Engagement	-0,007	0,879	Not Support

From Table 3, it can be observed that Job Autonomy has a regression coefficient of 0.06 with a significance value of 0.455, which is greater than the alpha level of 0.05. This indicates that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that Job Autonomy positively influences Employee Voice Behavior. Therefore, the first hypothesis (H1) is not supported. This result contradicts the findings of LePine, (1998). However, within the banking sector, this phenomenon can be attributed to several structural, cultural, and psychological factors that are inherent to the industry. Banking institutions are characterized by high levels of bureaucracy and rigid hierarchical structures. As a result, even though employees may possess technical autonomy in determining work methods, schedules, and performance standards, the space available for expressing opinions remains limited. This aligns with Morrison (2011), who explains that bureaucratic and hierarchical organizations tend to discourage employees from speaking up due to strict rules and standardized procedures.

Similarly, the findings of Dedahanov et al. (2019) indicate that job autonomy does not directly influence voice behavior. Svendsen (2018) also highlights that job autonomy does not have a direct effect on voice behavior; instead, it serves as a moderating factor that strengthens the relationship between leadership and employee voice. This is consistent with conditions commonly found in banking institutions, where voice behavior is more likely to be accepted when expressed at managerial levels rather than by staff-level employees.

Furthermore, the statistical testing results show that Person–Organization Fit has a regression coefficient of 0.21 with a significance value of 0.00, which is below the alpha level of 0.05. This provides sufficient evidence to conclude that Person–Organization Fit has a positive influence on Employee Voice Behavior. Thus, the second hypothesis (H2) is supported. This finding is consistent with and reinforced by the study of Kao et al., (2022). These findings indicate that person–organization fit reflects the extent to which employees share similar characteristics or values with the organization, as well as the degree to which both parties mutually fulfill each other's needs. Employees who experience strong person–organization fit tend to develop a sense of belonging and heightened responsibility toward their work, which subsequently enhances their motivation and willingness to participate actively in the organization. This sense of alignment encourages employees to voice their ideas, suggestions, or concerns for organizational improvement. Accordingly, the second hypothesis (H2) is supported. In banking institutions with formal and structured work environments, such alignment becomes particularly critical. Employees whose values match the organization's culture are more likely to feel attached to the institution and to trust its systems, thereby increasing their willingness to contribute constructively—whether by expressing ideas, offering suggestions, or providing critical feedback for organizational growth. These results are consistent with Kao et al. (2022), who found a positive relationship between person–organization fit and employee voice behavior. Similarly, Morrison (2011) explains that employees who perceive strong alignment with organizational values are more inclined to protect and improve the organization, which becomes a key internal motivation for engaging in voice behavior.

Finally, the analysis also reveals that Work Engagement has a negative regression coefficient of -0.007 with a significance value of 0.879, which is higher than the alpha level of 0.05. This clearly indicates that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that Work Engagement has a positive influence on Employee Voice Behavior. Consequently, the third hypothesis (H3) is not supported. This result also contrasts with the findings of Cheng, (2009). These findings suggest that work engagement does not serve as a driving factor for employee voice behavior at KCU Bank Nagari. The results indicate that the presumed positive relationship between work engagement and voice behavior is not supported. Consequently, the third hypothesis (H3) is rejected. This outcome may be explained by the organizational characteristics of the banking sector, which are typically

hierarchical, bureaucratic, and compliance-oriented. In such environments, even highly engaged employees may feel socially unsafe or reluctant to express their opinions due to perceived risks and rigid organizational norms. This finding contrasts with Cheng (2009), who reported that work engagement positively influences employee voice behavior. However, it aligns with the study by Ibrahim et al. (2021), conducted in financial institutions in Malaysia, which found that work engagement does not significantly affect employees' willingness to speak up. Employees with high work engagement may demonstrate strong commitment to their tasks, yet this commitment does not necessarily translate into the courage to take risks by voicing their ideas or concerns.

4. CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical evidence on the influence of job autonomy, person–organization fit, and work engagement on employee voice behavior among 108 employees of KCU Bank Nagari. The findings reveal that job autonomy does not significantly affect employee voice behavior, indicating that the level of freedom employees possess in organizing their tasks does not necessarily encourage them to express their ideas or concerns. In contrast, person–organization fit demonstrates a positive and significant effect, suggesting that when employees perceive a strong alignment between their personal values and those of the organization, they are more likely to speak up for the benefit of the organization. Meanwhile, work engagement is found to have no effect on voice behavior, implying that even highly engaged employees may refrain from expressing their views in environments perceived as hierarchical or restrictive. These findings carry several implications for organizational management at KCU Bank Nagari. The absence of a significant effect of job autonomy on voice behavior highlights the need for the organization to foster a more open and psychologically safe climate. Despite having technical autonomy in performing their tasks, employees may still feel constrained by strict procedures, hierarchical structures, and concerns about potential social risks when voicing their opinions. Therefore, strengthening formal communication channels and cultivating trust and psychological safety becomes essential. The positive influence of person–organization fit underscores the importance of value alignment between employees and the organization. Enhancing this alignment requires not only recruitment processes that assess value compatibility but also ongoing cultural internalization efforts, such as core value training and reinforcement of the organizational vision and mission. When employees experience strong value congruence, they develop a deeper sense of belonging, responsibility, and motivation, which naturally encourages constructive voice behavior. Lastly, the lack of a significant relationship between work engagement and voice behavior suggests that engaged employees may be committed to their tasks but still hesitant to take interpersonal risks associated with speaking up. This finding indicates the need for leadership practices that explicitly encourage open dialogue and empower employees to contribute ideas without fear of negative consequences. By promoting open communication and supportive leadership, the organization can enhance innovation and foster continuous organizational improvement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the Management of Bank Nagari KCU for the support, cooperation, and valuable assistance provided during the data collection and research process. Their openness and willingness to facilitate this study greatly contributed to the successful completion of this work. The author also extends heartfelt appreciation to the supervising lecturers for their guidance, constructive feedback, and continuous encouragement throughout the development of this research. Finally, the author acknowledges Universitas Bung Hatta for providing academic resources, a supportive learning environment, and the opportunity to conduct this study as part of the academic requirements.

REFERENCES

- Alfes, K., Shantz, A., & Alahakone, R. (2016). Testing additive versus interactive effects of person-organization fit and organizational trust on engagement and performance. *Personnel Review*, 45(6), 1323–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2015-0029>
- Bakker, A. B. (2006). *schaufeli2006 EE definition.pdf*. 701–716.
- Bhave, S. vishnu. (2023). *EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT*. 02.

- Caso, L., D'Ambrosio, R., & Transirico, M. (2015). W 2, p -solvability of the Dirichlet problem for elliptic equations with singular data. *Abstract and Applied Analysis*, 2015(October 2003), 331–362. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/635035>
- Chan, S. C. H. (2014). Paternalistic leadership and employee voice: Does information sharing matter? *Human Relations*, 67(6), 667–693. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713503022>
- Chen, A. S. Y., & Hou, Y. H. (2016). The effects of ethical leadership, voice behavior and climates for innovation on creativity: A moderated mediation examination. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.10.007>
- Chen, L., Li, M., Wu, Y. J., & Chen, C. (2020). The voicer's reactions to voice: an examination of employee voice on perceived organizational status and subsequent innovative behavior in the workplace. *Personnel Review*, 50(4), 1073–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2019-0399>
- Chen, S. J., Wang, M. J., & Lee, S. H. (2018). Transformational leadership and voice behaviors: The mediating effect of employee perceived meaningful work. *Personnel Review*, 47(3), 694–708. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2017-0016>
- Cheng, Jan W. (2009). *Industrial Management & Data Systems Article information :*
- Chiang, C. F., & Chen, J. an. (2021). How Empowering Leadership and a Cooperative Climate Influence Employees' Voice Behavior and Knowledge Sharing in the Hotel Industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 22(4), 476–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2020.1802391>
- Dharma, S. (2022). *Analisis Statistik Terapan Dalam Penelitian Sosial Dengan Stata (1st ed.)*. In Media. in media.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory, Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(170), 250–279. http://web.mit.edu/curhan/www/docs/Articles/15341_Readings/Group_Performance/Hackman_et_al_1976_Motivation_thru_the_design_of_work.pdf
- Kalemci, R. A., Kalemci-Tuzun, I., & Ozkan-Canbolat, E. (2019). Psychological Antecedents of Promotive and Prohibitive Voice: a Two-Wave Examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(2), 126–141.
- Kao, K. Y., Hsu, H. H., Thomas, C. L., Cheng, Y. C., Lin, M. T., & Li, H. F. (2022). Motivating employees to speak up: Linking job autonomy, P-O fit, and employee voice behaviors through work engagement. *Current Psychology*, 41(11), 7762–7776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01222-0>
- Knoll, M., & Redman, T. (2016). Does the Presence of Voice Imply the Absence of Silence? The Necessity to Consider Employees' Affective Attachment and Job Engagement. *Human Resource Management*, 55(5), 829–844. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21744>
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49(1), 1–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x>
- Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 454–470. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1807>
- Lena Ellitan. (2002). Praktik-Praktik Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Manusia Dan Keunggulan Kompetitif Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 4(2), pp.65-76. <http://puslit2.petra.ac.id/ejournal/index.php/man/article/view/15623>
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853–868. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.853>
- Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., & Farh, J. L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive Voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0176>
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 373–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2011.574506>
- Morrison, E. W., Wheeler-Smith, S. L., & Kamdar, D. (2011). Speaking Up in Groups: A Cross-Level Study of Group Voice Climate and Voice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020744>
- Osborne, S., & Hammoud, M. S. (2017). Effective Employee Engagement in the Workplace. *International Journal of Applied Management and Technology*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.5590/ijamt.2017.16.1.04>
- Reisa, A., & Sudibjo, N. (2020). *Employee Voice Behavior : Pengaruh Self-efficacy , Kepribadian Proaktif dan Work Engagement dalam Organisasi Pendidikan*. 141–151.
- Salsabila, D. R., Eliyana, A., & Sridadi, A. R. (2023). Voice Behavior: A Systematic Literature Review – A Model of Antecedents and Outcomes. *Jurnal Ecodemica : Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 7(1), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.31294/eco.v7i1.14617>
- Setiawan Maulana, M., Sofiah, D., Prasetyo, Y., & Psikologi, F. (2023). Work engagement pada karyawan: Bagaimana peranan perceived organizational support? *INNER: Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1),

20–27.

- Susanto, H. (2019). Otonomi Kerja, Pola Karir Dan Locus of Control Pegawai Tidak Tetap Pemerintahan (PTTP) (Studi Kasus DPMPSTP Kota Surabaya). *Prosiding FRIMA (Festival Riset Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Akuntansi)*, 0917242530(2), 413–418. <https://doi.org/10.55916/frima.v0i2.62>
- Sylvana, A., Awaluddin, M., Dueramae, H., & Sanusi, N. U. Y. (2024). The Role of Person-Organization Fit , Person-Job Fit , and Job Satisfaction in Enhacing the Performance of Universitas Terbuka ' s Lectures. *Al-Mashrafiyah: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan Dan Perbankan Syariah*, 8(1).
- Um-E-Rubbab, & Mehdi Raza Naqvi, S. M. (2020). Employee voice behavior as a critical factor for organizational sustainability in the telecommunications industry. *PLoS ONE*, 15(9 September), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238451>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256902>
- Yaqoub, E., Ismail, M., Abdullah, H., & Alnoor, A. (2020). Effect of Perceived Support on Employees Voice Behavior Through the Work Engagement: A Moderator Role of Locus of Control. *International Journal of Process Management and Benchmarking*, 1(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijpmb.2020.10033080>
- Zhu, H., Khan, M. K., Nazeer, S., Li, L., Fu, Q., Badulescu, D., & Badulescu, A. (2022). Employee Voice: A Mechanism to Harness Employees' Potential for Sustainable Success. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020921>