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Burnout and Innovative Work Behaviors for Survivors of Downsizing:

An Investigation of Boundary Conditions
Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore conditions in which innovative behavior can have either desirable or undesirable effects. The current study surveyed employees who remained in an organization following downsizing. Voice costs and perceived influence were measured as boundary conditions. Based on our understanding of Conservation of Resources theory, these variables may be particularly important to consider how individuals view innovative work behaviors in stressful situations such as experiencing downsizing. The results of this study revealed that engagement in innovative work behaviors (IWB) was associated with reduced burnout in employees when they perceived few costs of speaking up in the post downsized environment, but at very high perceptions of voice cost (above 1.74 standard deviations above the mean), this relationship was positive. Similarly, and contrary to what was expected, engagement in innovative work behaviors was negatively related to burnout when employees perceived they had little influence within the organization. We discuss possible interpretations of this unexpected result. This study adds to the small body of work that examines outcomes, rather than predictors, of innovative behavior and as well as identifies conditions in which engaging in innovative behaviors has a negative impact on the individual.
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Burnout and Innovative Work Behaviors for Survivors of Downsizing:
An Investigation of Boundary Conditions

Innovation has become the “industrial religion” of the twenty-first century (West, 2000), and the value of innovation increases in times of change or turbulent environments (Janssen, Van de Vliert, & West, 2004). As such, researchers and practitioners alike have been motivated to understand the predictors of successful innovative work behaviors (IWB). A sizeable body of research over the past 20-30 years identifies various antecedents of individual innovation at work (see Hammond et al., 2011 for a meta-analysis). However, research examining outcomes of IWB has received significantly less attention by comparison (Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014). Engaging in innovative behaviors might have positive or negative outcomes for individuals depending on the context (Huhtala & Parzefall, 2007). It may be especially true for those individuals who remain in organizations following downsizing because this time of organizational change is often marked by high demands and uncertainty. Being a survivor after downsizing can leave individuals feeling guilty and overwhelmed (Appelbaum & Donia, 2000) and may be expected to take on some of the work from those who have been laid off. Survivors may experience decreased well-being (Kalimo, Taris, & Schaufeli, 2003) and a greater desire to leave the organization (Maertz, Wiley, LeRouge, & Campion, 2010). Engaging in innovative behavior at this time could result in intrinsic motivation and feelings of fulfillment, but it could also lead to additional stress and workload.

The purpose of this study is to examine moderators of the relationship between innovative work behaviors and burnout and turnover intentions after downsizing. We approach innovative work behavior as a behavioral response to workplace stress for survivors of downsizing. In doing so, we draw upon the employee voice literature, consistent with previous research (Zhou & George, 2001) and integrate the Conservation of Resources
We suggest that IWB will be negatively related to burnout and turnover when individuals believe they have influence in their department and they do not perceive high costs associated with using their voice. Alternatively, when individuals expend resources through engaging in innovative behavior, but are met with an unsuitable work environment (i.e., low perceived influence and high voice costs), they are likely to experience greater burnout and intentions to leave their organizations. We chose these variables as they map on to previous conceptualizations of voice/silence. Specifically, Morrison and Milliken (2000) made the distinction between silence based on fear (perceived high voice costs), and silence based on an inability to make a difference (low perceived influence). Environments marked with high voice costs and low perceptions of impact may shape an individuals’ view of IWB as either a demand or a resource (Huhtala & Parzefal, 2007) and thereby affect its outcome.

Our study makes three major contributions to the literature on downsizing, IWB, and employee wellbeing. First, we investigate outcomes, rather than only predictors of IWB. Although there is a substantial body of research examining downsizing effects on IWB and the predictors of IWB generally, substantially less research has examined outcomes of employee voice and innovation (Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014; Gandolfi & Oster, 2009; Ng & Feldman, 2012). Second, we address certain conditions in which engaging in IWB may have negative effects, thereby meeting calls to go beyond a pro-innovation bias or innovation maximization fallacy which suggests innovation is inherently and always good for organizations (Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014; Janssen, Van de Vliert, & West, 2004). Finally, we extend research on innovation in times of downsizing by examining boundary conditions for understanding when IWB may benefit the individual and when it increases negative outcomes (Janssen, 2004).

**Employee Voice in Times of Change**
Research examining times of organizational change, including downsizing, highlights the importance of employee voice. Voice includes the expression of information, ideas, and opinions about improvements (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003) including bringing cost-saving ideas to management, pointing out potential problems, or making suggestions on how to improve processes (Withey & Cooper, 1989). Voice behaviors overlap considerably with individual employee creativity and innovative behaviors, and, as such, creativity and IWBs have been discussed as important forms of voice (Zhou & George, 2001). Employees use voice to benefit others (Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003) or for their own benefit in response to a dissatisfying situation (Withey & Cooper, 1989). Likewise, innovation benefits the individual, group, or organization and has been discussed as arising out of problem identification or job dissatisfaction (West & Farr, 1990; Zhou & George, 2001).

Dissatisfaction for survivors of downsizing may stem from perceived unfairness or injustice, a breach in psychological contract, a rise in job insecurity, increased workload, or loss of close co-workers (Baruch & Hind, 2000). Although a negative reaction is not an inevitable outcome of downsizing, the evidence suggests that survivors frequently exhibit negative reactions to the downsizing experience (Baruch & Hind, 2000). Here, we use the term innovative work behaviors (IWB) to capture behaviors relating to generating and promoting new ideas and solutions (creativity), as well as working towards the implementation of these ideas (Ng & Feldman, 2013).

**Conservation of Resources Theory**

The Conservation of Resources (COR) theory is especially relevant to workplace stress and may be useful in understanding survivors of downsizing specifically. The theory posits that “individuals strive to obtain, retain, protect, and foster those things that they value” (Hobfoll, 2001, p. 341). There are two main principles of COR theory: the first regarding the primacy of resource loss and the second regarding resource gain (Hobfoll,
The first principle states that resource loss is more significant than resource gain. The second principle suggests that individuals must invest resources for future gain, or protection of current resources or to recover from lost resources. Furthermore, resource gain acquires greater significance in the context of resource loss. In other words, resources become more important when demands are high. Following on from this, COR theory suggests that people with more resources are better able to recover from resource loss and more capable of building resources.

When threatened with stressful demands (e.g. downsizing) individuals choose to either engage in self-protective mechanisms to avoid losing resources (resource conservation) or invest energy and resources into securing additional resources (resource acquisition) (Hobfoll, 1989). For example, survivors experience job stressors such as increased workload, feelings of guilt, and job insecurity (Brockner, 1992). Individuals faced with these stressors might become less proactive and less innovative, and may adhere to the formal requirements of their jobs (i.e. conserve resources). Alternatively, individuals may engage in IWB to acquire additional resources to promote job performance, to reduce burnout, or to cope with dissatisfying situations. Although offering new ideas and suggestions may be risky, it may be capitalized on for individuals’ future benefits (Ng & Feldman, 2012). In the present study, we are concerned with this voice-outcome relationship because there is substantially less known about the outcomes of engaging in voice or IWB than antecedents (Ng & Feldman, 2012).

As IWB can represent an investment of resources to recover from resource loss or for future gain, the question then becomes, does IWB relate to resource gain or resource loss? One way to examine this empirically is to investigate well-being outcomes for individuals. When experiencing resource depletion, either through a resource loss or from failing to capitalize on a resource investment, individuals are likely to experience stress, burnout, and decreased well-being (Hobfoll, 2002). Alternatively, if gains are made from an investment of
resources, decreased burnout and increased well-being should result. Given their relevance for COR theory and importance in the workplace, we focus here on burnout and turnover intentions.

Resource Depletion Hypothesis. According to Janssen, et al., (2004) innovative work is likely to result in increased workload and complex tasks for employees whose jobs require novel problem solving and idea generation. Similarly, engaging in voice depletes resources (Ng & Feldman, 2012). These activities, in times of change, may be deemed by the survivor as resulting in increased job demands and pressures due to the associated ambiguity and insecurity in the organization. Even outside of times of downsizing, innovative work behaviors can be demanding (Janssen, 2004) and engaging in innovative related behaviors may be perceived as increased job demand leading to emotional exhaustion, burnout, and turnover. The COR model may help to explain the relationship between innovative work and increased burnout, whereby, in response to threat, the individual relies on avoidance techniques and may emotionally or physically withdraw from the organization.

Because innovative work gives employees extra tasks requiring complex problem solving and uncertainty about outcomes, these demands can be exhausting for an employee (Huhtala & Parzenfall, 2007). Janssen (2003) found that employees engaged in innovation may be likely to engage in conflict with others and meet resistance to ideas that might result in change. Over time, this can result in frustration, antagonism, and animosity. In the end, relationships with co-workers and supervisors may be compromised, especially if perceptions of fairness are low (Shih & Susanto, 2010). Different approaches to problem-solving or resistance to change resulting from an innovation also put demands on the employee that can be exhausting (Janssen, et al., 2004; Tomkovick & Miller, 2000). Furthermore, supervisors who are superiority-oriented are likely to see innovative employees as a threat (Janssen et al., 2004). Finally, according to economics research, innovation is often related to short-term...
losses, placing even more pressure on employees to engage in innovative behaviors, even though it may eventually result in increased productivity and financial gains at the organizational level (Nickell, 1995). These immediate losses may result in an increased workload for employees along with the stress of uncertainty about whether engaging in IWB will eventually pay off or not (Janssen, 2004). This uncertainty and stress may lead to burnout and a desire to leave the organization. Halbesleben and Buckley (2004) note “the initial threat to resources is a stressor; however, the continued loss or threat to resources, particularly after a great deal of resource investment in work, is said to lead to burnout” (p. 862). Further, when taxed emotionally, individuals tend to over-utilize avoidance or withdrawal coping tactics (Leiter, et al., 1993), including turnover intentions.

Resource Acquisition Hypothesis. There may be downsides to engaging in IWB, yet there may also be benefits, and surviving employees may draw on IWBs as a useful resource. Innovative behaviors may be a means of standing out and impressing management in the post downsized firm. The opportunity to go beyond the formal requirements of the job in the pursuit of innovative activities can lead to personal growth and development and as such, enhanced employee well-being and engagement (Huhtala & Parzfall, 2007). Using voice constructively, as an expression of idea generation or problem-solving has been related to personal empowerment and congruence (Wood & Wall, 2007) and personal control (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). In this instance, the surviving employee may view IWB and its associated job demands as a challenge to overcome and an opportunity to develop themselves further. This perception and the subsequent employee voice behaviors which result can enhance engagement and reduce burnout. This is consistent with other work, which views IWB as a resource. For example, in their meta-analysis on burnout, Lee and Ashforth (1996) coded innovation as a job-relevant resource and found a moderate negative
relationship with dimensions of burnout. The COR model classifies this response to workplace stress as a resource acquisition strategy.

In summary, engaging in IWB may be associated with either increased or decreased burnout or turnover intentions and empirical evidence exists for both. Likewise, Huhtala and Parzefall (2007) concluded that innovation can be understood both as a resource and a demand. We suggest that both may hold, depending on individual perceptions of the work environment. In other words, the context may moderate the IWB-outcome relationship. Some research has found support for perceptions of fairness moderating outcomes of individual IWBs (Janssen, 2004; Shih & Susanto, 2010). In the present study, we consider two additional moderator variables of these relationships: voice costs and the perceived influence one has in one’s job.

**Voice Cost as a Moderator**

Although innovation, by definition, aims to benefit individuals, groups, or organizations (West & Farr, 1990), engaging in IWB is replete with risks and may lead to unintended negative costs (Janssen, 2003). Additionally, speaking up in an organization may lead to loss of reputation, or retaliation, and may involve significant emotional costs, especially when confronting those in power (Withey & Cooper, 1989). Individuals may generate ideas but run into frustrations when making those ideas public or garnering support for implementing their ideas. Having a supportive climate within an organization may help to mitigate some of these personal risks. There is ample evidence that perceptions of an open and supportive environment significantly inhibit or promote creativity and innovation (Hunter, Bedell, & Mumford, 2007). Perceived voice costs such as “the possibility of retaliation, loss of reputation, and the emotional costs of confronting people with power” (Withy & Cooper, 1989, p. 523) represent a perceived possibility of experiencing punitive responses to speaking out, making recommendations, and putting forth new ideas.
It is likely that individuals who do engage in IWB in an unsupportive environment (marked by high costs of speaking out) may be met with frustration, and perhaps burnout. The importance of climate for innovation seems to be particularly strong when the organization’s external operating environment is unstable and characterized by high competition and pressure (Hunter, Bedell, & Mumford, 2007), as would be the case for participants in the present study. We hypothesize that in environments where individuals perceive high voice costs engaging in IWB will be positively related to burnout.

**Hypothesis 1 – Voice costs will moderate the relationship between engaging in IWB and burnout for survivors of downsizing. When voice costs are high, there will be a positive relationship between engaging in IWB and burnout, and when voice costs are low, there will be a negative relationship.**

Applying the same logic, when met with high voice costs, it is likely that innovative survivors may be more likely to withdraw and intend to leave the organization. As such, we hypothesize:

**Hypothesis 2 – Voice costs will moderate the relationship between engaging in IWB and turnover intentions for survivors of downsizing. When voice costs are high, there will be a positive relationship between engaging in IWB and turnover intentions, and when voice costs are low, there will be a negative relationship.**

**Perceived Influence as a Moderator**

Perceived influence concerns the sense employees have that they can impact the organization, group, or department in which they are embedded (Spreitzer, 1995). In other words, it represents perceptions that an individual can make a difference (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrow, 2000). Psychological influence does not reside in the individual, nor is it a characteristic of a job, but rather, is dynamic, reflecting the changing interplay between the person and his or her job situation (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). The extent to which an
individual perceives they have influence may maximize the outcomes of engaging in innovative behaviors for survivors.

Mishra and Spreitzer (1998) theorize that survivors of downsizing will react most actively and constructively when they feel a sense of empowerment and control to be able to make a difference. In conditions of high perceived influence, individuals may believe offering suggestions and engaging in IWBs can make a difference. In a daily diary study, Devloo, Anseel, Beuckelaer, and Feys (2016) found that lack of perceived success, which may be similar in many ways to perceived influence, hindered the potential of innovative work behaviors to satisfy an individual’s basic psychological needs. Therefore, when perceived success, or ability to influence is low, engaging in IWBs may have negative consequences. Perceived influence may be associated with perceptions of competence and support in the innovation process, leading to less stress and emotional exhaustion. As such, it is likely that when perceptions of influence are high, IWBs may be associated with decreased burnout.

**Hypothesis 3– Perceived influence will moderate the relationship between engaging in IWB and burnout for survivors of downsizing. When influence is low, there will be a positive relationship between engaging in IWB and burnout, but when influence is high there will be a negative relationship.**

Extending this line of reasoning, when individuals believe they have little influence in their organization, engaging in IWB may go unrewarded, thereby increasing their desire to leave the organization. Interestingly, Brockner, Spreitzer, Mishra, Hochwarter, Pepper, and Weinberg (2004) found that the relationship between perceived influence and commitment to the organization was stronger in times of downsizing, potentially augmenting these effects. Further, perceiving influence may lead to less frustration with the innovation process and a
belief that the employee can exert influence to make the situation better and therefore less likely to want to leave. As such, we hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 4– Perceived influence will moderate the relationship between engaging in IWB and turnover intentions for survivors of downsizing. When influence is low, there will be a positive relationship between engaging in IWB and turnover intentions, but when influence is high there will be a negative relationship.*

**Method**

**Sample**

The targeted population for this study was employees who remained in organizations following downsizing. The types of jobs and organizations varied across industries for the 190 participants including knowledge-intensive services (25%) manufacturing (18%), financial services/insurance (18.8%), pharmaceuticals (10.5%), retail (7%), construction (6%), and hotel and catering (3%). Respondents ranged in age from 18-64 years with the majority indicating they were between 25-44 years; approximately equal numbers of males and females participated. The sample was well-educated with 44% having university degrees and 34% having postgraduate degrees. Most respondents (80%) had worked with the organization for over three years when completing the survey and held middle-management or professional positions.

**Procedure**

A purposive sampling technique targeted employee in organizations wherein downsizing had been publicly announced in Ireland. Initial contact was made with senior members of these organizations in HR positions through a network of business connections,
most of whom were past students of our HRM Master’s program. An email invitation requesting participation in the study, criteria for inclusion in the study, detail on the purpose of the research and providing a link to the online survey was distributed by the contact in each organization to targeted employees (those who were employed when the downsizing took place). This initial contact also requested that employees distribute the email invitation to other organizational members that could contribute to the study, and to other organizations they knew where downsizing had taken place, in effect using snowball sampling (Vogt, 1999). Consistent with commonly used language in Ireland the term “redundancy” was used in place of downsizing. A screening item was used to ensure participants in these organization had undergone downsizing: “Others in your organization have been made redundant.” Twelve participants were not included in the study who indicated “disagree” to this statement.

**Measures**

For all items, respondents were asked to rate their agreement on a 5-point scale, where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.”

**IWBs.** The scale developed and validated by Scott and Bruce (1994) was used to measure IWB. This scale consisted of six items measuring IWBs and required respondents to rate the extent to which they were involved in innovative activities. Included were such statements as “promote and champion ideas to others” and “investigate and secure funds needed to implement new ideas” ($\alpha = .92$). Whereas some may argue the use of self-report measures of innovation are not ideal, in the context of this study they were most appropriate. Because the present study is focused on engagement in IWBs as a predictor, not an outcome, objective indicators were less relevant. We were interested in the experience of engaging in IWBs rather than another’s assessment of the extent to which they do so. Similarly, Janssen
(2000) argues that employees themselves are most appropriate as they are most aware of subtle innovative behaviors that may lie outside of the view of a supervisor.

**Perceived influence.** Perceived influence was measured with three items from Spreitzer’s (1995) psychological empowerment scale. A sample item includes “I have significant influence over what happens in my department” (α = .90).

**Voice cost.** Voice costs were measured with four items from Withey and Cooper (1989). A sample item includes “It's risky to say too much about working conditions in this office” (α = .90).

**Burnout.** We used Wharton’s (1993) scale on emotional exhaustion to assess burnout. The scale consisted of five items such as “You feel emotionally drained from work” and “You feel burned out from your work” (α = .92).

**Turnover intentions.** The intent to turnover scale was taken from O’Neill, Harrison, Cleveland, Almeida, Stawski, Snead, and Crouter, (2009). This scale consisted of three items addressing employees’ intentions to search for another position, to leave the organization, and to find alternative employment (α = .88).

**Control variables.** Because survivor responses to downsizing are dynamic and variable (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998), we control for the time since the downsizing was announced with a one-item indicator. Additionally, as increased job demands may affect the burnout and turnover intentions, we included two dummy-coded (0=no, 1=yes) items respondents indicated they experienced increased work demands.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis.** Before testing our hypotheses, the factor structure of a theoretical five-factor structure (IWB, voice cost, influence, burnout and turnover intentions) was examined using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) within Mplus8. Results of the proposed model demonstrate acceptable fit with the data: $[χ^2(179) = 378.92, p < 0.00; RMSEA = .075, CFI = .927]$. Furthermore, the fit for the hypothesized factor structure was...
better than alternative models, such as four-factor models combining burnout and turnover intentions [$\chi^2 (183) = 562.95, p < 0.001; \text{RMSEA} = .102, \text{CFI} = .86$] or combining influence and IWB [$\chi^2 (183) = 671.01, p < 0.001; \text{RMSEA} = .116, \text{CFI} = .82$], or a one factor [$\chi^2 (189) = 1820.52, p < 0.001; \text{RMSEA} = .209, \text{CFI} = .40$].

All items held significant loadings on their predicted constructs with standardized factor loadings ranging from .70 to .91, which exceeds thresholds of 0.60 or above to ensure adequate reliability (Bagozzi & Youjae, 1988). Additionally, we computed the average variance extracted (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) and composite scale reliability (Raykov, 1997). The average variance extracted ranged from .64 to .75, which exceeded the recommended cutoff of 0.50. The average variance extracted was larger than the maximum shared variance and the square root of the average variance extracted was larger than the inter-construct correlations providing some evidence of discriminant validity. The composite scale reliabilities for each construct were similar to the coefficient alphas and all exceeded the recommended cutoff of 0.70.

Results

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all included variables are presented in Table 1. Responses ranged across the full 5-point scale (1 = minimum and 5 = maximum) for all five core constructs. Perceived influence and voice costs were related to both burnout ($r = -.30, p < .01; r = .47, p < .01$ respectively) and turnover intentions ($r = -.33, p < .01; r = .41, p < .01$ respectively). It is also worth noting that IWB was negatively related to burnout and turnover intentions ($r = -.18, p < .05; r = -.17, p < .05$, respectively).

Table 2 presents the final regression model for both burnout and turnover. We used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) recommendations for testing moderation and Aiken & West’s (1991) recommendations for estimating simple slopes. Voice costs had significant direct relationships with both burnout and turnover intentions ($\beta = .32, p < .01$ and $\beta = .30, p < .01$, respectively).
respectively) as well as the direct effect of perceived influence was significant and negative with burnout and turnover intentions ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$ and $\beta = -.23, p < .05$, respectively).

Together, control, independent, and moderator variables explained 35% of the variance in burnout and 19% of the variance in turnover intentions (Steps 1 and 2 in the regression). The two interaction effects were entered in Step 3 and together explained an additional 4% of the variance in burnout.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 specified the moderating role of voice costs. As suggested in hypothesis 1, the interaction of voice costs and IWB on burnout was significant ($\beta = .17, p < .01$). The simple slopes of IWB on burnout were graphed for participants who were either above high levels (+1 SD) or low levels (-1 SD) of voice costs (Preacher, Curran, & Bauer, 2006). As indicated in Figure 2, when voice costs are low, there was a significant negative relationship between IWB and burnout ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$). However, when voice costs were high, the relationship is positive, although not significant ($\beta = .11, n.s.$). Furthermore, the calculated region of significance (outside of -.74, 1.74) suggests that simple slopes are significant at ($\alpha=.05$) for values lower than .74 standard deviations below the mean and above 1.74 standard deviations above the mean. However, Hypothesis 2 was not supported as the interaction between IWB and voice costs on turnover intentions was not significant.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 specified perceived influence as a moderator. In support of Hypothesis 3, the interaction of influence and IWB on burnout was significant ($\beta = .16, p < .05$). Graphing simple slopes reveal an interaction opposite of the direction specified in Hypothesis 3. As indicated in Figure 2, when perceived influence is low, there is a significant negative relationship between IWB and burnout ($\beta = -.19, p < .05$) and when perceived influence is high, the relationship is positive, although not significant ($\beta = .11, n.s.$). Furthermore, the calculated region of significance (outside of -.61, 3.24) suggests that simple
slopes are significant at (α=.05) for values lower than .61 standard deviations below the mean and above 3.24 standard deviations above the mean. Therefore, some support was provided for Hypothesis 3, in that there was a significant interaction; however, it was in the opposite direction than expected. Hypothesis 4 was not supported as the interaction between IWB and influence on turnover intentions was not significant.
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Discussion

The purpose of this study is to examine moderators of the relationship between IWB and burnout and turnover intentions after downsizing. We drew from Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and viewed engaging in IWBs as a behavioral response to workplace stress for survivors of downsizing as either a resource loss or resource acquisition strategy. We found that the direct relationship between IWB and burnout and turnover was not significant but depended upon perceptions of voice costs and perceived impact in the organization. Specifically, our research highlights that for survivors of downsizing, engaging in IWB is associated with reduced emotional exhaustion in conditions of low voice costs and low perceived influence.

Findings of this study highlight the negative impact of perceived voice costs on the IWB and burnout relationship. Engaging in IWBs was associated with reduced burnout for individuals who perceived low costs of speaking up. Survivors who reported greater voice costs in their immediate work environment also reported greater burnout and intentions to leave their organizations overall. As outlined in previous research (Withey & Cooper, 1989) the perceived consequence of speaking up in the post-downsized organization appears to have had a negative impact on employee well-being. Further to this, burnout increased when survivors who engaged in innovative behaviors perceived very high voice costs. When IWBs are viewed as a form of employee voice (Zhou & George, 2001) and an effortful demand
(Janssen, 2004), the negative impact of engaging these behaviors on employee well-being when such voice activities are deemed risky, does not seem surprising. In this instance, investing in innovative behaviors may become a risky liability and a demand (Huhtala & Parzfall, 2007). It appears that for IWBs to enhance engagement and well-being in the post downsized organization, it must be met with an appropriate and supportive environment where speaking up does not appear to come with a cost.

Regarding perceived influence, the results were more complicated. Consistent with prior research (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrow, 2000), perceived influence was negatively related to both burnout and turnover. However, contrary to our hypotheses, engaging in IWB was associated with less burnout only when perceived influence was low, not high, as predicted. When perceived influence is low, offering creative suggestions and new ideas may reduce burnout as it may involve an opportunity to voice ideas to compensate for a lack of influence. Additionally, there might be less pressure or responsibility and accountability to implement them. Our results indicated that for individuals with very high perceived influence (greater than 2.31 standard deviations above the mean), the relationship between IWB and burnout was positive. For these individuals, the belief they can influence their organization (high perceived influence), they may simply be trying to do too much. Janssen (2005) found that perceived influence was only related to increased IWBs when supervisor support was high. It may be that those who perceive that they have greater influence also feel the weight of their responsibility and perceived influence is not seen as empowering, but rather as a source of stress. Alternatively, it is viewed as another demand to an already heavy load. Future studies would need to determine if this is the case.

Theoretically, findings of this study add to a small body of work examining outcomes, rather than predictors, of IWB. A focus solely on predictors is problematic as it based on a potentially incorrect assumption that innovation is universally good for organizations
(Janssen et al., 2004). In doing so, we add to the small body of work suggesting that IWBs can lead to negative outcomes such as increased workload and complex problem solving (Huhtala & Parzefall, 2007) and stress (Janssen, 2004), depending upon the conditions in which IWBs occur. This study also contributes to the body of work linking IWBs with employee well-being. Whereas innovation has been considered a resource that presents opportunities for job enhancement (Lee & Ashforth, 1996), this may only be true in certain situations, such as when voice costs and perceived influence are low. Finally, this contributes to COR theory (Hobfoll, 2002), by proposing a model that specifies when engaging in IWB is more closely tied to a resource loss or a resource acquisition.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

As with all research, this study is not without limitations. Our empirical findings are based on a restricted sample. Because of the sensitive nature of the topic, many organizations were not willing to allow us to survey their employees; therefore, we reverted to convenience and snowball sampling. As this provided us with participants from a wide variety of jobs and organizations, these sampling methods are also limited. The focus was on firms that had undergone downsizing, but we do not have a comparison of these relationships for firms who had not downsized.

The present study may be limited through the use of self-report measures and the potential for common method bias associated with this type of measurement (Podsakoff et al., 2012). We attempted to reduce the potential effect of method bias through several means recommended by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2012). Procedural methods include using proximal separation between constructs with other scales not included in this study. Further, we attempted to increase participants’ motivation to answer honestly by explaining that we valued their experience. Further, we felt that self-report was the most appropriate for our variables of interest, particularly for burnout and turnover. Similarly, Ng and Feldman
(2012) state “the use of self-reports in research on stress is inevitable because there appear no better or more accurate ways to measure perceptions of workplace stress than asking employees to report themselves” (p. 229). The inevitability is arguably true for turnover intentions as well.

Because a cross-sectional sample was used in this study, we cannot conclude causality. Although our framework presents a causal relationship of reduced burnout from IWB, it is also possible that higher levels of burnout lead to reductions in IWB. In line with the COR theory, one might argue that higher levels of burnout can cause reductions in IWB. Employees with less emotional resources might not be able to engage in behavior that helps to conserve or to build resources. However, given the presence of resource spirals (Hobfoll, 2011), the relationship may be reciprocal. Future research, especially that utilizes experimental methods, is needed to eliminate endogeneity concerns and address causality (Antonakis, Bendahan, Jacquart, & Lalive, 2014).

Future research might consider different methodologies such as daily diary or longitudinal studies to address daily variation or long-term effects. Future studies could also control for employee attitudes and the relationship with their supervisor before any downsizing occurs. We did not look at the relationship with the supervisor in this study and it would be a noteworthy contribution for future research to try to understand how that relationship impacted employees’ ability to cope with the downsizing event and engage in IWB after downsizing.

Additionally, there may be other variables that were not measured that affect IWB, burnout, and turnover intentions. For example, employee perceptions of trust, justice, psychological empowerment and elements of work design may affect survivors’ primary and secondary stress appraisals (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998) and their perceived ability to cope. According to COR theory (Hobfoll, 2002), individuals with more resources are better
positioned to gain resources. Therefore, perceptions of resources from the work environment (e.g. social support, high-quality leadership or supportive workplace climates) or personal resources (self-efficacy, emotional stability, core self-evaluation) may affect the extent to which the investment of innovative work behaviors reduces or enhances burnout or turnover intentions. We recommended future research to examine these personal and environmental resource factors as they relate to outcomes of IWB. Qualitative studies may be useful to take a deeper look into the decision-making process in which individuals engage when deciding to engage in IWBs, especially in demanding situations as post-layoff contexts.

Additionally, future research might consider environmental demands and stressors, such as how much change has occurred in a group as a result of downsizing (number of employees, etc.), perceptions of the leader, and identifying resources lost as a result of the organizational change, which could allow us greater insight into the effect of the downsizing on employee voice, IWB and burnout in survivors. Additionally, the type of voice costs might influence the results as Gambarotto and Cammzzo (2010) argue that silence due to top management fear was less important than silence due to fear of sharing knowledge and information with colleagues.

**Practical Implications and Conclusions**

Our study highlights the role of voice costs and perceived influence among survivors of downsizing. These findings are important because others have suggested that innovation is recognized as critical for future organizational success especially in post-downsized firms (Richtnér & Ahlström, 2006) and the achievement of new strategic direction and organizational goals depend on the survivors’ attitudes, commitment, and motivation levels (Littler, Wiesner & Dunford, 2003). Our research provides practical insights into the well-being of survivors of downsizing and engagement in IWB in post-downsized firms.
Managers should be aware of the negative implications of perceptions of voice costs and make conscious efforts to create open and trusting environments. In our study, perceptions of negative responses to speaking out such retaliation, loss of reputation, or other emotional costs (Withy & Cooper, 1989) was directly associated with burnout and turnover intentions. Further, individuals who perceived very high voice costs and also engaged in IWB reported highest levels of burnout. Efforts organizations put forward to create trusting and open environments that encourage engagement in IWB in an environment in which individuals feel open to speak without fear of retaliation may pay off in reduced burnout. Creating an open environment can make engagement in IWB less emotionally exhausting in post-downsized environments. Interviewees of middle management survivors spoke of specific requests of top leadership to visit the employee dining room or attend training sessions, to stop blaming them, and above all to listen (O’Neill, & Lenn, 1995). Indeed, employees who reported both low voice costs and highest engagement in IWB reported the lowest levels of burnout. Management training and open and transparent communication may help to reduce perceptions of voice costs.

Organizations need to be cognizant of the complex linkages among perceived influence, IWB, and burnout in survivors of downsizing. We suggest that managers should promote psychology empowerment and perceived influence for its potential positive impact on reactions to downsizing (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998) and the direct association of influence with decreased turnover and reduced burnout in our study. We also recommend management to promote sharing of ideas especially among those who feel less powerful. IWB may be an antidote in reducing burnout for these individuals. As some research suggests that downsizing has been shown to have an overall negative impact on an organization’s innovative capability (Richtnér & Ahlström, 2006), effort to promote the engagement in IWBs may pay off in
terms of reduced burnout especially when individuals perceive little costs associated with such voice and individuals who do not perceive much influence in the organization otherwise.

Finally, we also advocate “that corporate decision makers of the future should approach downsizing with great caution. The long-term negative effects of such actions on creativity and innovation may only retrigger the corporate woes that started the cycle in the first place” (Amabile & Conti, 1999, p. 638). Our findings highlight employee burnout as an additional corporate woe that is especially problematic in environments of high voice costs and for individuals with greater influence.
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Figure 1: Hypothesized Model
Table 1  
Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations of included variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Time since downsizing</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased work demands</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IWB</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Influence</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Voice cost</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Burnout</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01.
### Table 2

**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses (Final Model)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th></th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time since downsizing</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Workload</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Cost</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Influence</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation × Voice Cost</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation × Influence</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05, **p** < .01.
Figure 2: The interaction of employee voice cost on the IWB-burnout relationship.

Figure 3: The interaction of perceived influence on the IWB-burnout relationship.
Appendix 1: All included items and standardized factor loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice Costs:</strong> Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More complaints would be made if people did not fear the effects on their own jobs.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's risky to say too much about working conditions in this office.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are penalties for speaking up too loudly about work-related problems.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be a waste of time to speak up about things going on here.</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative Work Behaviors:</strong> Please rate the extent to which you:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search out new technologies, processes, techniques, and/or product ideas.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate creative ideas.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote and champion ideas to others.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate and secures funds needed to implement new ideas.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop adequate plans and schedules for the implementation of new ideas.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are innovative.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burnout:</strong> Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel emotionally drained from work.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel used up at the end of the work day.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You dread getting up in the morning and having to face another day on the job.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel burned out from your work.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You feel frustrated by your job.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intentions. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think a lot about leaving your organisation.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are actively searching for an alternative to the organisation.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As soon as it is possible, you will leave your organisation.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Impact. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your impact on what happens in my department is large.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have a great deal of control over what happens in your department.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have significant influence over what happens in your department.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>