CONSIDERING THE VOICE AND SILENCE EMPLOYEE AS DISTINCT CONSTRUCTS: RECOGNITION DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN FORMS OF SILENCE BASED ON DIFFERENT MOTIVES

GHADER HOSSEINZADEH , SOMAYEH GHODRAT , MOHAMMAD REZA FATHI

University Of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran
ghader. Hosseinzadeh69@gmail.com, somayehghodrat@gmail.com, mrf1396@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This studies, examine the voice and silence of employee as distinct constructs. As shown in this study, silence based specifically on pro-social motivation did not emerge from the inductive investigation in Study 1. This may be due to declining assumptions related with silence in the workplace, which eliminate respondents from thinking about this type of silence. This also may be due to the expectation of benefits sometimes related with performing pro-social behaviors and that because of the concealed nature of silence; people would not expect this type of pro-social behavior to result in the related benefits. However, the different silence motivation may be differentially related to other individual and organizational outcomes. Practitioners stand to benefit from this line of inquiry because existing measures of voice do not estimate the nature or expans of intentional silence. Results show that five dimensions of silence motivation (inefficient, relational, protective, diffident, and deviate) appeared from the data, which can be reliably measured and provide incremental value for understanding and estimating employee silence.

Keywords: Iran; employee silence; organizational silence; employee voice

INTRODUCTION

Employees' not willing to speak up about work-related issues has been linked to many important individual and organizational outcomes (Clapham & Cooper, 2005; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Over the years, a number of different concept have been developed to describe different forms and aspects of employees' willingness or unwillingness about the important issues, situations, in the workplace (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). These concept may differ in the direction of level of analysis and the type of situation to which one may speak up or remain silent (e.g., idea for improvement, ethical violation, dissatisfaction), and whether the first focus is on verbal construction or repression (Brinsfield, Edwards, & Greenberg, 2009; Morrison, 2011). In addition, a number of different concept have been examined as former of employees' willing or unwilling to speak up at work (psychological safety, organizational climate, trust; Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). But previous researchers have important perception regarding employees' communicative behaviors. In spite of the of different concept and previous researches, compete that still they do not know about the nature

and scope of situations where employees have something significant to say, but feels to forced remain silent (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Morrison, 2011). Scholars have suggested a number of issues, which may deficits in our understanding, including (i) previous research has supposed about speaking up behavior (i.e., voice) fully applies to intended silence (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003); (ii) researchers that has focused on silence, has mainly been conceptual or qualitative (Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000), (iii) previous research has focused on employees wanting to avoid the risks related with speaking up to the prevention of other motivation for remaining silent (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). However, consider a person who is naturally outgoing. This person may state themselves, and others may rate them high on measures of voice. However, the expans, nature, and implications of their silence may not surface with estimation of voice. Conceptual and qualitative research focused on intended silence has been critical in advancing our knowledge (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne et al., 2003). This research consider the voice and silence as clear concept and the identification that there may be significant clarions between forms of

silence based on different motivation (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). However, any method of scientific inquiry involves in the resulting theory's simplicity, and accuracy (Thorngate, 1976). Afterwards, there have been several quantitative research to test previous conceptual and qualitative efforts (Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). Previous research has focused on the risks which have explicitly or implicitly placed psychological safety related with speaking up and as a mediator between former variables and voice behavior (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). Therefore, there is evidence that silence may be based on motivation other than risk avoidance (Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011). This first focus on silence as a tactic of positive consequences related with speaking up which has resolved many questions. As describe employee silence of conceptualizations and definitions as the intended holding significant information, including questions, interests, and suggestions (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Due to lack of attention, employee silence does not refer to the unintended failure to communicate and have nothing to say (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Translating conceptualization of this silence into a valid construct is reliably difficult to measured, but important strides have been made. Vakola and Bouradas (2005) measured organizational silence by estimation factors such as employees' perception of management, communication opportunities. Tangirala and Ramanujam (2008) adapted items suggested by Van Dyne et al. (2003) to estimate the expans to which employees intended to hold back ideas, or information about patient safety in their workgroup. Detert and Edmondson (2011) empirically estimated employees' when and why speaking up at work is risky or unsuitable (i.e., implicit voice theories). Morrison et al. (2011) examined group voice, which consists whether speaking up is safe and whether it is effective. Previous efforts have led to perception and in the workplace in our understanding of silence. However, none of the previous efforts to quantitatively examine silence have examined the nature, implications of different forms of silence. Hence, in our knowledge gaps remain, and questions such as those before discussed remain unresolved. Moreover, investigating voice behavior and concluding employee silence is dificult because the presence of voice is not necessarily equivalent to an absence of intended silence. Estimating the behavior of silence is insufficient because silence behavior by itself is not showing a conscious desire to remain silent. Estimating intention is a right direction to remain silent, but does not have different meanings that may underlie a desire to remain silent (Van Dyne

et al., 2003). But limits silence as a response to the risks related with speaking up. In our knowledge, to resolve gaps related to the nature, and implications of different forms of silence, some scholars have conceived it as a multidimensional construct based on motivation (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). They suggest that it is the underlying motivation that give meaning to the behavior of silence and distinguish it from an absence of voice. They also suggest that it is the motivation for the phenomenological differences between different forms of silence. Hence, different motivation have been suggested in the literature (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003), but there has been no attempt to empirically examine the nature, scope, and implications of different silence motivation. According to previous research on employee silence motivation, silence motivation represents the energetic forces that provide the stimulus for intended silence (Pinder's, 1989). The form is a reason and the direction to toward intended silence. In addition, the motivation themselves are not unique to silence. But the same motivating could be an stimulus for silence or voice (e.g., a person could be motivated to remain silent or speak up on the basis of a desire to defend oneself). Rather, it is when a specific motivating is coupled with an intention to remain silent that it represents the phenomenological experience of employee silence. For instance, the same motivating could be an stimulus for silence or voice (e.g., a person could be motivated to remain silent or speak up on the basis of a desire to defend oneself). In addition, silence motivation are clear from former in that motivation are essential to the experience of employee silence, whereas potential former are more psychologically away from the center. In summary, the direct examination of silence motivation should improve our understanding of situations where employees have something significant to say, but remain silent. Silence motivation represents a way to quantify different forms of silence and should serve as a catalyst toward the examination of silence for a reasons than typically has been the case.

Study 1

Different reasons, regarding an inductive examination of study that employees have for remaining silent in response to important issues, situations, or interests at work. In addition, to examine two boundary restrictions that has been incompatibly in previous research. The first is the focal issue, situation, or concern to which employees

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

remain silent. Pinder and Harlos (2001) restricted employee silence as taking place in response to a perceived injustice. Van Dyne et al. (2003) restricted it to the intended ideas, information, and opinions for useful ways to improve work. Milliken et al. (2003) identified eight different types of issues to which employees remained silent. Second, the target of the silence is examined. Previous research forces employee silence toward a superior within the organization (Morrison, 2011), others have examined silence targeted at workgroup members (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), whereas others have left the target broader (Pinder & Harlos, 2001, p. 334).

Sample

Respondents including of undergraduate business administration students with at least five years' work experience (n = 246, Islamic azad university of kermanshah), and science and research branch students (n = 210, kermanshah), undergraduate business administration students Islamic azad university (n = 330, Sanandaj), and front-line and administrative employees of the universities (n = 136). A total of 922 responded and 876 reported at least one event to which they had intended remained silent at work. To recruited students via e-mail by sending an e-mail on researcher behalf. The average age of respondents was 34 years, the average work experience was 10 years, 84 percent were male, and 16 percent were female. Respondents spanned multiple functions and hierarchical levels in a range of organization.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

To ask the respondents to think for a four events when they intended remained silent in response to an important issue, situation, or concern at work. Considering that the motivation for silence may be deferent, regarding to the type of issue, situation, or concern, an employee is remaining silent, as well as the type of target their silence is first, to ask respondents to describe each issue, situation, or concern to which they intended remained silent. To ask them to provide a brief description of the person(s) silent (silence target) and the reason(s) (silence reason). Collecting information about silence events and targets, In addition the reasons, provided perception regarding the content field and boundary restrictions of the concept, and helped the latter three studies with regard to these considerations. In a progressive process to analysis the responses and developed and applied a model statements (short non-

contextual descriptions) of each response. This capable similar descriptions of similar subject to be applied to responses and therefore reduced the number of responses which otherwise would consist of only minor non-substantive differences. Since each respondent provided separate responses regarding the event, target, and reason for silence, I developed and applied separate model for each of these three questions. Throughout this phase, two experts who had experience conducting qualitative research checked the evolving model lists and application of model statements to responses. We discussed issues regarding objectivity, clarity, and consistency and refined the models.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Events to which employees remain silent

Respondents (N = 876) provided 2064 responses (I asked each respondent to provide up to four events). From these 2064 responses, I created 138 unique models to describe the various types of events to which respondents reported remaining silen. Afterwards, to provid a lists of four independent judges (doctoral students in management) of the 138 silence event models, and divide them into a groups. From this process, a majority appeared that the seven broader silence event categories shown in Table 1 represented the 138 silence event models. To estimate the reliability of the seven categories relative to the original 2064 responses, to ask three different colleagues to assign one of the categories to a random sample of 10 percent of the original responses. I then calculated Fleiss' kappa to decide among the three judges (Fleiss, 1971). The analysis shown a k=0.63. K of 0.70 or greater is generally thought to be sufficient for psychological measurement (Fleiss, Levin, & Paik, 2004), but the level of decision is expected to decrease as the number of model increases. In addition, according to investigation with low decision, it was apparent that some of the responses described events which used more than one model. Therefore, to consider the consequent kappa to be acceptable (Table 1). As the silence event was unfair treatment, which described for 24 percent of the total responses. Someone behaving unethically was the second most common event type (19.6 percent). Interests about a co-worker's competence (17.9 percent), and idea for improvement (14.2 percent) were relatively common silence events. As shown, a number of other types of events also were

reported, but their relative frequencies were significantly less (Table 1).

Targets of silence

According to above investigative procedure, develop models of events and employees remain silent, models of seven different types of targets of silence appeared from the responses (Table 2). Because only seven different models of targets appeared, I did not ask independent judges to go into a groups, as I did with the more several silence event models. However, to estimate the reliability of the seven target models, I asked the three judges who coded the sample for silence events to assign one of the seven target models to a random sample of 12 percent of the original responses. The analysis shown a k = 0.84. As shown, employees may remain silent to arrange of different types of targets. In fact, every type of conciveable workplace target appears represented in this model; however, some are much more frequent targets of silence than others. For example, management were the two most frequently reported targets and together account for nearly 72 percent of the responses. This is not a surprising consideration related to harm with speaking up to people in positions of power. Co-workers also were a relatively common target (18 percent), which is not the commonness of these relationships. As shown, a number of other types of targets were reported, but their relative frequencies were significantly less (Table 2).

Table 1. Study 1: Silence event types.

Types of events to which respondents reported remaining silent	Silence events reported	% of total
Experienced unfair treatment	383	23.7
Someone else behaving unethically	235	17.5
Involve about a co-worker's competence	305	15.5
Operational process involve for improvement	271	14.3
Involves with company decisions	191	6.5
Personal performance issue	162	7.2
Involve about management competence	145	5.0
Someone else being treated unfairly	107	4.2
Unclear	165	8.1
Total	2064	100

Table 2. Study 1: Silence targets.

Respondents reported remaining silent	Silence targets reported	% of total
Upper management	830	41.5
Co-worker	540	16.6
Team members	124	3.2

Everyone	105	2.6
Outside authorities	95	1.4
Subordinate	100	1.2
Customer	50	0.8
Unclear	220	4.7
Total	2064	100

MOTIVATION FOR REMAINING SILENT

From the 2064 responses, respondents provided 3370 statements regarding the remaining silent reasons. There are more statements regarding many respondents which provided more than one reason per response. Models of 120 different motivations for silence appeared from the 3370 statements regarding reasons for silence. To estimate the reliability of the 120 models relative to the 2064 responses, I asked three independent judges to assign one of the 120 models to a random sample of 9 percent of the responses. The analysis shown a k = 0.75. I used them as items to decide dimensionality through investigative and CFAs in Studies 2 and 3, respectively. In this study, according to responses, the conceptual range of motivation for remaining silent is quite different, than described for in the existing literature. Often reported silence reason model was "I did not think it would do a good to speak up." Other reported reasons included "to avoid conflict with another individual," "due to fear of revenge," "management did not interested in hearing about these types of issues," "I did not want to get involved," and "I did not want to be observed as a complainer" (Table 3). Table 3 shows, items related to silence as a tactic to avoid the risks related with

speaking up (Detert & Edmondson, 2011) described for a moderate proportion of the total responses.

Summary of Study 1

Over a decade employee silence was introduced management sciences as a multidimensional construct (Pinder & Harlos, 2001), but to date, there has been only empirical examination (Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). Therefore, the purpose of this study was inductive investigation of the content field and motivation for employee silence regarding our empirical and theoretical understanding of the construct. In this study, 876 respondents reported and these responses used different types of events and targets to which employees remained silent and furthers our understanding of the scope and pervasiveness of silence in regard to these factors. In addition, respondents reported remaining silent for a wide variety of different reasons. Therefore, these findings create previous conceptual work on employee silence motivation (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003) and provide the foundation for a comprehensive and orgniazed study of the phenomenon.

Table 3. Study 1, silence reason exemples, and Study 2, EFA pattern matrix.

		Silence factor/dimension (Study 2)				
		1	2	3	4	5
Item description	Reported frequency (Study 1)	deviate	Relative	protective	Diffident	inefficient
To purposefully harm	6	0.97	_0.02	0.05	_0.09	_0.03

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

another individual					
To purposefully harm the organization	12	0.92	0.04	_0.07	0.05	_0.06
To make management look bad	4	0.85	_0.05	0.09	_0.06	0.12
I did not want to go beyond the minimum required of me*	21	0.47	0.07	_0.03	0.13	0.07
I didn't want to harm my relationship with another individual	45	_0.02	0.95	0.12	_0.24	_0.09
I did not want to create tension with co-worker	75	_0.05	**0.95**	0.04	_0.18	_0.03
To avoid conflict with another individual	210	_0.05	0.93	0.09	_0.19	0.06
To protect my relationship with another individual	120	0.05	0.89	0.02	_0.12	_0.04
To avoid hurting someone's feelings	52	0.18	0.76	_0.13	0.04	_0.09
I did not want others to think negatively of me*	32	_0.02	0.56	_0.05	0.55	0.03
To protect another person from harm*	91	0.22	0.53	0.23	_0.04	_0.15
I did not want to be viewed as a complainer*	131	_0.03	0.52	_0.16	0.47	0.23
To protect my image or Reputation*	102	0.09	0.45	0.06	0.39	0.03
I did not want to be viewed as causing problems*	78	_0.08	0.47	0.15	0.39	0.09
I was planning on leaving the organization soon*	21	0.05	_0.16	_0.11	0.03	_0.03

I only recently became aware of the situation/ incident*	6	0.05	_0.09	_0.09	0.06	_0.09
I felt it was dangerous to speak up	18	0.09	_0.03	0.92	_0.15	0.01
To protect myself from harm	27	_0.06	0.07	**0.86**	_0.07	_0.08
I felt it was risky to speak up	25	_0.09	_0.02	0.88	_0.02	0.04
I believed that speaking up may negatively impact my career	145	0.07	_0.07	0.85	0.02	0.09
I was afraid of adverse consequences	85	_0.11	0.04	0.79	0.11	0.03
I have previously witnessed others experience negative consequences about the speaking up *	35	0.07	0.05	0.65	0.24	_0.09
I have previously experienced negative consequences as a result of speaking up*	45	0.11	0.06	0.53	0.23	0.13
I felt it was safer to do Nothing*	31	_0.09	0.17	0.44	0.14	0.08
I believed that time would handle the situation*	41	0.02	0.02	_0.18	0.14	_0.08
I was too proud to speak up about the incident*	16	0.09	_0.09	0.16	_0.03	0.06
I did not feel confident	70	_0.03	_0.12	0.03	0.84	0.01

enough to speak up					
I was unsure what to say	124	_0.03	_0.08	_0.04	0.66	_0.02
I felt insecure	77	_0.02	_0.18	0.22	0.66	0.06
I was uncertain*	142	0.03	_0.08	0.02	0.64	_0.04
I did not want to draw attention to myself*	59	_0.14	0.35	_0.13	0.63	0.08
I did not fully understand the issue*	75	0.19	_0.28	_0.02	0.52	_0.06
I was unsure who to speak up to*	30	0.04	0.04	0.04	_0.25	0.12
I had nothing new to add to discussion*	13	0.03	0.19	0.02	_0.23	0.13
I was too busy at the time to speak up*	20	_0.12	_0.17	0.05	0.18	0.03
I wanted co-worker to learn from their mistake*	10	_0.03	0.06	0.09	_0.14	0.08
Management did not appear interested in hearing about these types of issues	145	0.06	_0.03	0.09	_0.16	0.96
No one was interested in taking appropriate action	65	_0.02	0.12	_0.08	_0.12	0.92
I did not feel I would be taken seriously	50	_0.03	0.01	_0.14	0.18	0.73
I did not think it would do any good to speak up	370	_0.19	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.60
I had previously spoken up about similar issues, but it did not do any good*	30	0.35	_0.06	0.12	_0.13	0.54
I have witnessed others	60	0.29	_0.04	0.19	_0.09	0.53

speak up about similar issues, but it did not do any good*					
I wanted to handle the situation myself*	10	0.08	0.04	_0.17	_0.13	0.19
The issue did not personally affect me	45	0.14	0.21	_0.08	0.12	_0.05
I did not care what happened	55	0.36	0.22	0.02	0.12	0.03
I did not want to get involved	130	_0.09	0.25	0.09	0.18	0.03
I did not care about the Organization*	21	0.36	0.06	_0.12	_0.12	0.29
It is not my responsibility to speak up*	75	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.25	0.17
I did not think it is worth the effort to speak up*	80	_0.14	0.18	_0.12	0.19	0.35
I believed someone else should speak up*	130	0.15	0.01	0.16	0.29	0.03
I was taught not to Complain*	10	_0.06	0.09	_0.06	_0.03	_0.09
Eigen values		21.23	4.97	4.22	3.34	1.97
Explained variance %		33.87	8.07	5.98	4.78	3.79

Resource, Chad, 2012.

Table 3 includes both the complete list of silence reason exemple derived in Study 1, and the EFA pattern matrix derived in Study 2.

Study 2

Hinkin (1998) belived that measures can be developed either deductively or inductively, as well as argues that the inductive approach is appropriate for investigative research on phenomena when the conceptual basis for a construct may not result in a recognizable dimensions. Therefore, in this study, I created Likert-type scale items based on the silence reason models inductively derived in Study 1 and conducted an EFA to examine their underlying dimensionality.

SAMPLE

Respondents including undergraduate business students of Islamic azad university (n = 268, 89 percent response rate, Sanandaj) with at least four

years' work experience, students of Islamic azad university (n = 174, 93 percent, Kermanshah), and science and research branch students (n = 218, 88 percent, Kermanshah). A total of 660 (92 percent) responded (Preacher & MacCallum, 2002). I recruited students via e-mail for their participation. The average age of respondents was 25 years, the average work experience was seven years, 73 percent were male, and 36 percent were female. This sample was from Study 1, and respondents spanned multiple functions and hierarchical levels in industries.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Employees may be opposed with some issues, events, or may be desire at work to remain silent which the reasons may be quite different. The following questions were managed: according to your experience the reasons for wanting to remain silent in response to the issues, events, or interests in your current job (if presently employed), or your recent job (if not presently employed). Following the instructions, I provided the measures of employee silence, followed by an appropriate convertible term, and then concluded with the model statements derived in Study 1. I presented items in random sample and estimated by using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = not at all to 5 = to a very large expans.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

To examine the factors structure, I stateed an EFA using SPSS v.17 with maximum likelihood extraction and diagonal revolution. As silence factors were not expected that be completely independent of one another, therefore I chose diagonal revolution. In Table 3 I manage the EFA pattern matrix of the silence reasons as well as scheme of the eigenvalues which show a break point with five data points above the break, and I explained variance for each of the five factors at the bottom of Table 3. which show 62.17 percent of the total variance. Regarding items represented a particular factor on the loading weight on an first factor and used a loading weight of at least 0.50 on the first factor and a loading on no more than 0.32 on another factor as general guidelines (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In addition, items 26, 27, 35, and 50 conformed to the retention criteria, but not for redundancy and parsimony considerations. Table 3, shows selected items as loading on a particular factor have their factor scores shown with bold italics. Items shown with an asterisk were not retained. I developed preliminary labels which

represent each factor through discussion and majority with the same two colleagues who helped check the evolving model list in Study 1 (Table 3).

DEVIATE SILENCE

Silence as a form of deviate workplace behavior has littl attention in the management literature. However, evidence propose that this behavior may have negative consequences. Gruys and Sackett (2003) in an investigation of the dimensionality of non-advantageous work behavior identified Misuse of Information as a clear dimension. This dimension contained five related items, one of which is conceptually similar to deviate silence. However, their other four items appear from deviate silence (Table 3). On the basis of empirical evidence, one could consider that deviate silence is more pervasive than reported in Study 1. This may be due to respondents' unwillingness to report such deviate behavior or respondents' paradigmatic assumptions around the topic of silence eliminate them from the silence question. Therefore, according to the general investigative nature of this research, I decided to retain deviate silence as a dimension for further investigation in the subsequent two studies.

RELATIONAL SILENCE

Relational silence described 694 or 16.28 percent of the total responses in Study 1. Regarding items that include this dimension, it appears that people often remain silent because they do not want to harm a relationship. Researchers also have before found that employees may remain silent for relational oriented reasons. Van Dyne et al. (2003), reported fear of damaging a relationship as a reason for silence at work. This dimension appears partly related to the pro-social motivation for silence which they conceived as proactive and other-oriented on the basis of benevolence and cooperation. However, the items including relational silence are not necessarily reflective of benevolence. Instead, these items could be based on the motivation of self-interest, but it also could be argued that, all of the motivation could be tied back to self-interest. In addition, the low cross-loadings of these items suggest that respondents between these items and items loading on other apparently more self-interested silence motivation. In addition, Van Dyne et al (2003) also conceived pro-social silence as protecting propriety knowledge

to benefit the organization, which is clear from relational silence.

Protective silence

Protective silence described for 576 or 11.95 percent of the total responses in Study 1. This dimension has before been suggested in the literature and continues to be a common focus of research on silence. Pinder and Harlos (2001) used the term inactive silence to describe carefully deletion on the basis of fear of the consequences related with speaking up. Morrison and Milliken (2000) emphasized the emotion of fear as a key motivator of organizational silence. This dimension is also consistent with psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) as a critical precondition for speaking up in work contexts. In addition, Milliken et al. (2003) found that 23.3 percent of respondents reported punishment as a reason for not speaking up about the problems in the workplace. As shown in Table 3, items including this dimension are based on external consequences related with speaking up. However, external consequences appear to be clear from the more internally focused shown by the next dimension.

Diffident silence

Items loading on this factor described for 530 or 10.35 percent of the total responses in Study 1. This dimension is arranged items related to anxieties, uncertainties regarding the situation. There may be conceptual between this dimension and protective silence to the expans that this dimension is related to remaining silent to avoid negative outcomes. With diffident silence, however, the negative outcomes appear internally focused, whereas the negative outcomes related with protective silence are more external in nature. In addition, the absence of little cross loading of items provides support for this dimension as a clear form of silence. LePine and Van Dyne (1998) found that self-esteem had a positive influence on peoples' stateive behavior. Also, LePine and Van Dyne (2001) suggested that neurosis is negatively related to voice behavior. Clearly, more work is needed to decide the discriminant validity of this form of silence.

Inefficient silence

Items loading on this dimension described for 796 or 19.12 percent of the total responses in Study 1. Items are related to the opinions that speaking up would not

be useful in accomplishing change relative to the focal issue, situation. Related reasons for silence have before been suggested in the literature. For example, Morrison and Milliken (2000) imagined a silence as characterized, by the shared opinion that speaking up about problems in the organization. Pinder and Harlos (2001) conceived employee compliance as implying a deeply felt acceptance of organizational circumstances, feelings of resignation, and hope for improvement. However, the label "inefficient" better represents the clear nature of this dimension as the items loading on this factor are more focused on the opinion that speaking up would not positively affect the situation.

Summary of Study 2

Researchers have suggested that employee silence is a multidimensional construct based on different motivation. This study creates and extends the reasoning through investigative of the factor structure of the silence derived in Study 1. However, the results show that the dimensionality is more different than the silence dimensions compliance in the literature (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). In this study, five clear silence dimensions appeared. The protective dimension is similar to as inactive silence and has been the main focus of subsequent research (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). However, other dimensions also appeared, which have not been directly examined in research on employee silence but also appear to be common (inefficient, relational, diffident).As shown, a deviate silence dimension appeared to be much less common. However, as discussed earlier, this may be due to methodological reasons.

Study 3

The inability and weaknesses of EFA is to quantify the goodness of fit of the resulting factor structure. In contrast, CFA enables estimation of the quality of the factor structure by statistically testing the significance of the all model and of item loadings on factors. This provides a stricter interpretation of the dimensionality than does EFA (Hinkin, 1998). Therefore, in this study, I conducted a CFA of the silence items retained in Study 2 to further test and refine construct validity.

Sample

Respondents included of undergraduate business students of Islamic azad university (n = 360, 75

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

percent response rate, Sanandaj) with at least four years' work experience, students of Islamic azad university (n = 204, 71 percent, Kermanshah), and science and research branch students (n = 458, 85 percent, Kermanshah). A total of 1022 (65 percent) responded. For CFA, recommendations regarding sample size vary significantly. For example, Schwab (1980) recommended using at least 10 times as many respondents as items. I recruited students via e-mail for their participation. The average age of respondents was 34 years, the average work experience was ten years, 89 percent were male, and 10 percent were female. This sample was from Study 1 and 2, and respondents spanned multiple functions and hierarchical levels in industries.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

I randomly presented one of the two following respondents: (a) think of a time at work when you either experienced an unfair or unethical situation, or (b) think of a time at work when you faced a significant operational problem or opportunity for improving a particular work process. According to the specification of these two of the previous research (Milliken et al., 2003) and the findings of Study 1 where employees reported frequently remaining silent to both of these types of events. In addition, the apparent conceptual between these two types of events capable investigation of construct validity thourghout significantly different types of events. Depending on which random scenario was presented, I then presented the respondents with the appropriate instructions: Below are different reasons employees may have to remain silent to their management in response to (a) an unfair or unethical situation at work, or (b) Forcing an operational problem or opportunity for improvement at work. Next, items randomly selected from study 2. Because the target of silence was limited to management was based on the findings of Study 1 in which these targets appeared as the most common (Table 2).

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Factor structure

Regarding CFA by using LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) the maximum likelihood estimation with the raw data as input is used. First, five different factor structures compared. In this analysis, all responses included (i.e., both scenarios). All items in the first model, were showing larger factor. The second model was a two-factor model, with deviate silence as the first factor and the remaining four dimensions as the second factor (Table 3). This formation was based on the differential in contribution to explained variance in Study 2 between deviate silence and the other four dimensions, and the conceptual difference between deviate silence and the other four dimensions. The three-factor model was based on dividing the second factor in the two-factor model into the two dimensions of restfulness (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). The three-factor model was separating relative items into a dimension and was guided by previous theorizing (Van Dyne et al., 2003). In the four-factor model, the diffident dimensions of items were allocated to an additional factor (Table 3). Regarding the conceptual similarity between items representing this dimension and individual traits, have been linked to state voice (e.g., neurosis, self-efficacy). The five-factor model was based on the factor structure that appeared in Study 2. Many researchers measure chi-square relative to its degrees of freedom, with a ratio of 2 often used as an uncontrolled of good fit (Arbuckle, 1997). Regarding to chi-square calculations, none of the models fit well (Table 4). In Monte Carlo studies the CFI and the NNFI have been shown as sample size effects (Bentler, 1990). Therefore both the CFI and NNFI is a better fit with a value of 0.90 (Wegener & Fabrigar, 2000). Both the CFI (0.97) and NNFI (0.97) suggest that the five-factor model is a good fit to the data. The RMSEA optimally chosen parameter values, fit the population covariance matrix (Brown & Cudeck, 1993, pp. 137–138). It then measures that discrepancy relative to the degrees of freedom. Brown and Cudeck (1993) have argued that values greater than 0.10 show poor fit, values between 0.08 and 0.10 show mediocre fit, values between 0.05 and 0.08 show reasonable fit, and values less than 0.05 show good fit. According to RMSEA (0.089), the five-factor model falls into the "mediocre" range (Table 4). Estimating that is the five-factor model significantly better than the other models which are traditionally accomplished by using a chi-square difference test. For example, the difference in chi-square between the five- and four-factor models is 682, which is itself distributed as chi-square with 5 degrees of freedom. As the value is statistically significant, suggesting that the five-factor model is significantly better than the four-factor model. Therefore, the chi-square difference test shows the five-factor model is a better fit than the four-factor model, the four-factor model is better than the three-factor model, and so on. But it is not clear that a five-factor model is a restricted version of the other models because new latent variables are

introduced. However, the comparisons of model can be made by using the 90 percent confidence and the

separation of the RMSEA (Colquitt, 2001).

Table 4. Study 3: Silence measures—CFA results.

Model no.	No. factors	N	x^2	Δx^2	df	x^2/df	CFI	NNFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% confidence interval
1	1	1022	7079	5369***	408	17.48	0.81	0.81	0.255	0.23, 0.25
2	1	1022	5188	3477***	407	12.84	0.87	0.86	0.21	0.19, 0.20
3	2	1022	4270	2559***	405	10.62	0.91	0.89	0.19	0.18, 0.19
4	5	1022	2408	697***	397	6.08	0.94	0.95	0.12	0.12, 0.12
5	5	1022	1714	0	392	4.38	0.96	0.97	0.089	0.084, 0.092
6	5	510	1099	_617***	392	2.81	0.96	0.96	0.091	0.085, 0.097
7	5	478	1112	_605***	392	2.85	0.96	0.96	0.093	0.087, 0.098

All Δx2 calculations use Model 5 as a starting line.

Models 1–5 include all responses (i.e., both scenario types combined).

Model 6 includes only responses for the scenario type of unfair or unethical situation.

Model 7 includes only responses for the scenario type of operational problem or opportunity for improvement.

Study 3, Analysis and results, for descriptions of the different models.

***p<.001.

This comparison shows that the five-factor model is significantly better than the four-factor model because their confidence separation do not overlap. In addition, the four-factor model is significantly better than the three-factor model, and so on. To estimate different types of issues and situations, to which employees may remain silent, therefore, as calculated fit indices for the five-factor model regarding of the two subsets of scenario types (unfair or unethical situation; Model 6) and (operational problem or opportunity for improvement; Model 7). In addition, as a multi-group CFA tested the invariance of the five-factor model throughout the two subsets of scenario types, as well as throughout the three subsamples of undergraduate students,

(MBA students), and employees of the participating organization. Models 6 and 7 shows and reported (Table 4) a similar level of fit as when all cases were included (i.e., 90 percent confidence separation for RMSEA overlap), this does not mean that the models are invariant throughout these different scenarios. In the multi-group CFA, five-factor model compared with all factor loadings forced to be equal for the different subsamples with one in which all factor loadings were allowed to vary. Results shown that the chi-square difference was statistically significant (Δx2 [38df] = 168), indicating that the factor loadings might not be invariant throughout these two different scenarios. Therefore, the statistics between the two models were similar, the factor loadings may be equivalent from a practical standpoint. Similarly, results from the multi-group analysis throughout respondent subsamples also shown that the chi-square difference was significant (undergraduates of Islamic azad university (Sanandaj) compared with students of Islamic Azad university (Kermanshah), Δx2 [38df] = 79) and (students of Islamic Azad university (Kermanshah), compared with employee sample, Δx2 [38df] = 102), showing that the factor loadings might not be invariant throughout the three subsamples. Fit statistics, however, between the three subsamples shown notable similarities and differences. The CFI for undergraduate of Islamic Azad university Sanandaj (n = 360), Islamic Azad university of Kermanshah (n = 204), and employee (n = 458) samples respectively were 0.96, 0.96, and

0.98. The NNFI were respectively 0.95, 0.96, and 0.97. The RMSEA were 0.095, 0.098, and 0.069 respectively throughout the three subsamples. As shown, the CFI and NNFI are similar throughout these subsamples, but the RMSEA propose that the five-factor model fits the employee subsample better than the undergraduate of Islamic Azad university Sanandaj or Islamic Azad university of Kermanshah subsamples. This is supported by the 90 percent confidence separation of the RMSEA, which is 0.065 to 0.075 for the employee subsample, whereas it is 0.087 to 0.12 for the undergraduate of Islamic Azad University Sanandaj and Islamic Azad university of Kermanshah subsamples combined. In the first analyses, reconfigured the model with one second-order latent construct with all five dimensions indicating this higher order factor ($\Delta x2$ [8df] = 125). The second analysis consisted of two second-order latent factors indicted by protective, relational, and diffident, and inefficient, and deviate ($\Delta x2$ [7df] = 121). The third analysis was identical to the second except that I did not assign deviate to a second-order construct ($\Delta x2$ [7df] = 104). Chi-square difference tests shown that the fit was significantly worse for all the second-order factor models compared with the first-order model. Table 5 shows the correlation relationships between the various dimensions of employee silence, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas to estimate scale reliabilities. Correlations between the various silence dimensions are in all cases significant, (Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998).The standard deviations show sufficient discrimination between respondents (DeVellis,

1991), and all of the scales have sufficient reliability to conclude that each is estimating a singular factor construct (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Summary of Study 3

By comparing a single common factor model, the goal of this study was quantitatively estimate the goodness of fit of the measurement models, as well as models with different silence dimensions combined in Study 2. Although the fit of the five-factor model as shown by the RMSEA is not considered good by many contemporary standards, it is significantly better than the models with fewer factors. In addition, on the basis of the CFI and NNFI, the five-factor model appears to fit the data well. In addition, the fit of the five-factor model is significant with the subsample of actual employees (RMSEA = 0.068), suggesting that the different forms of silence may be significant to employees in an organizational as opposed to students with less work experience. In addition, the models are not statistically invariant throughout the two scenarios examined in this study; the fit statistics are similar throughout these scenarios to suggest practical equivalence. This suggests that silence is experienced differently in different situations. Also further evidence of construct validity is obtained by examining how the scales incrementally predict voice behavior and correlate to conceptually related factors.

Table 5. Study 3: Descriptive statistics and correlations

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Deviate silence	1.61	1.01	(.94)				
Relative silence	3.35	1.67	.25**	(.91)			
Protective silence	3.11	1.47	.32**	.54**	(.93)		
Diffident silence	2.78	1.32	.38**	.48**	.59**	(.89)	
Inefficient silence	3.15	1.44	.32**	.26**	.52**	.55**	(.91)

Alpha reliabilities are shown on the diagonal in parentheses.

N= 1022.

*p<.05; **p<.01.

Study 4

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

To examine the incremental value in examining employee silence motivation and explanation of the nomological network (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), the scales developed in the previous studies to a different group of respondents were managed. In addition, the measurement of four related concept (employee voice behavior, psychological safety, neurosis, and extraversion), as well as several demographic variables used in previous voice-related research were managed (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998).

Employee voice behavior

Van Dyne and LePine (1998), suggest that, pro-motivating behavior emphasizes the stateion of useful challenge intended to improve rather than merely criticize" (p. 109). Investigations of this conceptualization of voice rely on a co-workers' ratings of the focal employee's voice behavior (Morrison et al., 2011). Although a central principle on silence motivation are not equivalent to an absence of voice behavior, becuase they are related. As well as motivation is an essential part of behavioral intention and subsequent behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), therefore, the silence motivation is negatively related to voice behavior that is distinguishable by one's management. In addition, the study of voice behavior is the most common approach to this area of inquiry (Morrison, 2011), a logical step in determining construct validity of silence motivation is to examine convergent, divergent, and incremental predictive validity relative to voice behavior.

Hypothesis 1: Voice behavior negatively related to each of the five employee silence motivation.

Psychological safety

This construct has been successfully adapted to measure individual-level perception of psychological safety with the organization as the center (Baer & Frese, 2003). Edmondson, (2003) in his finding shows a significant relationship between psychological safety and employee voice behaviors. Regarding that, protective silence on motivation to protect oneself from negative consequences related with speaking up, therefore psychological safety negatively related to the protective dimension of employee silence. Regarding that diffident silence on personal anxieties and uncertainties, psychological safety negatively related to the diffident dimension of employee silence. Because in a psychologically safe environment, employees' personal anxieties and

uncertainties may be salient or personal defenselessness perceived as likely to be exploited. Regarding that relational silence not harming a relationship, therefore this dimension of employee silence negatively related to psychological safety. Because in a psychologically safe environment, speaking up may not have negative impact on a relationship, or damage to a relationship may not have negative consequences.

Hypotheses 2a–2c: Psychological safety negatively related to (a) protective silence, (b) diffident silence, and (c) relational silence.

Neurosis

Neurosis is a personality trait described as anxious, depressed, angry, worried, (Barrick & Mount, 1991). LePine & Van Dyne, (2001) shown a negative relationship between one's willingness to state themselves and neurosis, and Colbert, Mount, Harter, Witt, & Barrick, 2004; Cullen & Ones, (2001) also has shown a positive relationship between neurosis and deviate workplace behavior.Therefore, according to both, negative relationship between neurosis and self-stateion, showing a positive relationship between neurosis and deviate workplace behavior, therefore, deviate silence positively related to neurosis. Regarding to the situation diffident silence is based on one's anxieties, uncertainties. Judge, Bono, Erez, & Locke, (2005) has shown a positive relationship between neurosis and diffident-related concept. Therefore, negative relationship between neurosis and self-stateion, showing a positive relationship between neurosis and diffident-related concept, redarding that diffident silence positively related to neurosis.

Hypotheses 3a–3b: neurosis positively related to (a) deviate silence and (b) diffident silence.

Incremental validity examining the silence motivation relax not only on their own reliability and internal validity but on demonstrating incremental validity over other predictors of voice behavior. Therefore, according analyses which controlled for demographic factors used in previous research on voice (gender, age, and organizational period). To test the incremental effects of silence motivation on voice behavior, psychological safety and neurosis were controlled. In addition, regarding this, a personality trait described as friendly, forceful , and activ (Barrick & Mount, 1991), and which has been

shown to predict voice behavior (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001).

Hypothesis 4: Each of the five silence motivation predicts voice behavior in analyses controlling for demographic variables, psychological safety, neurosis.

Sample

I entered a total of 636 employees, and 442 (72 percent) completed survey. Their managers also rated 380 (84 percent) from this sample for voice behavior. Organizational members were assured about the respondents that their responses would be kept strictly private. The average age of respondents was 33 years, the average period with this organization was seven years, 34 percent were female, and all were clear from the respondents in the previous studies.

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

There are different reasons for employees may have remain silent to their management in response to encountering an operational problem or opportunity for improvement at work. Management was specified as the target of silence because of the relatively high frequency that managements were reported as targets of silence in Study 1 and because the dependent variable was managements rating of employee voice. The type of event for various motivation for silence was restricted to an operational problem or opportunity for improvement because of (i) this type of event was reported in Study 1, (ii) previous research on employee voice and silence has focused on these types of events (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Van Dyne et al., 2003), and (iii) management at the participating organization was interested in silence in this context. According to these instructions, the silence scales of respondents were presented. Rgarding measures of psychological safety, neurosis, and extraversion following the silence scales. To measure psychological safety by adapting five items from Edmondson's (1999) and measured team psychological safety to the organization as the foci (Baer & Frese, 2003). To estimate both neurosis and extraversion with three-item which developed by Langford (2003). Next,regarding several demographic questions which asked respondents . Therefore estimated respondents' age using five categories ranging from "20 to 26" to "60 or older." Also organization periods estimated respondents' with six categories ranging from "less than one year"

to "12 years or longer." To mitigate common-method variance (cf. Campbell & Fiske, 1959), and rated all their direct reports' voice behavior with five items adapted from Van Dyne and LePine (1998), which matched to the employee responses.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

As shown in Table 6, Cronach's alphas for four out of the five silence scales are above the .83 threshold, indicating the good internal consistency (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Study 3, however, suggests that further research needs to be expanded upon to determine whether or not more items are needed. In general, correlations are as expected (e.g., voice behavior has a positive association with both psychological safety and extraversion). Expectedly, although the five silence motivations are positively correlated, they are not indicating a clear phenomenon. The results obtained in this study indicate that that four out of the five dimensions of employee silence are negatively related to voice behavior, so we argued and found support for Hypothesis 1. Moreover, the low to moderate of these relationships fail to show any equivalence between the dimensions of employee silence motivation and absence of voice behavior, but there is not a relationship between deviate silence and voice behavior that is distinguishable by management. This may be caused by harmful behavior (Robinson & Bennett, 1995), and therefore less recognizable, however more research is needed to decide. Based on the results, protective silence, diffident silence, and relative silence are all negatively related to psychological safety, and support for Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c was also provided. Related to subject specific evidence like construct validity and these three dimensions of silence, expanses conceptually related to negative related-speaking up consequences are to be varied, and the negative consequences associated with each of these dimensions are different (Study 2). The results depict that deviate silence and inefficient silence are not notably related to psychological safety and subsequently these dimensions are not based on perceptions of negative consequences associated with speaking up. The results also show that neurosis is positively related to deviate silence and diffident silence, which is supporting Hypotheses 3a and 3b, respectively. A series of hierarchical multiple regression then analyses were performed to test Hypothesis 4 (see Table 7). Demographic variables, psychological safety, neurosis, and extraversion as control variables, together, entered in Model 1 as the

starting line, described for 10 percent of the variance in voice behavior reported by respondents' management model. After all of the control variables, each of silence motivation separately had been entered In Model 2. As Table 7 demonstrates, each relational, protective, and inefficient, motivation seems to have a significant incremental increase in

voice behavior over the control variables. Not the deviate or the diffident silence motivation designates an incremental increase in voice behavior over the control variables. Support for Hypothesis 4 was also provided.

Table 6. Study 4: Descriptive statistics and correlations.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Gender	0.41	0.47											
Age	34.64	12.97	.05										
Organizational period	4.76	4.80	.11	.87**									
Deviate silence	2.00	1.21	_.12	.07	(.93)								
Relative silence	3.36	1.45	.13	.05	.03	(.92)							
Protective silence	3.74	1.43	.04	.04	_.03	.25**	(.91)						
Diffident silence	3.01	1.08	_.06	.05	.04	.35**	.46**	(.84)					
Inefficient silence	3.66	1.32	.06	.07	.07	.14	.23**	34**	(.86)				
Voice behavior	4.11	0.96	.05	.24**	.25**	_.03	_.29**	_.29**	_.22**	(.65)			
Psychological safety	4.08	0.93	_.03	_.02	_.02	_.04	_.29**	_.37**	_.24**	_.03	(.68)		
Neurosis	3.51	1.36	.09	.02	.02	.17*	.21**	.22**	.23**	.12	.10	(.85)	
extroversion	4.54	1.33	.03	_.04	_.03	_.01	_.10	_.08	_.17*	_.02	_.05	.27**	(.85)

Alpha reliabilities are shown on the diagonal in parentheses. N= 380.

*p<.05; **p<.01.

Table 7. Study 4: Silence motivtion as predictors of voice behavior.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
Control variables							
Gender	_0.01	_0.01	0.02	0.01	_0.01	0.01	_0.01
Age	_0.01	_0.01	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02
Extroversion	0.22**	0.22**	0.21**	0.23**	0.23**	0.24**	0.24**
Organizational period	0.27	0.27	0.22	0.21	0.27	0.26	0.24
Psychological safety	0.17*	0.17*	0.11	0.06	0.13	0.15*	0.17*
Neurosis	_0.08	_0.08	_0.01	0.01	_0.42	_0.05	_0.06
Silence motives							
Deviate silence		_0.02					

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

Relative silence			_0.25**				
Protective silence				_0.26**			
Diffident silence					_0.14		
Inefficient silence						_0.18**	
R2	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.17
ΔR2		0.00	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.03
F	5.98**	5.12**	6.94**	6.97**	5.67**	6.52**	6.27**
ΔF		0.02	10.78**	10.94**	3.34	8.17**	6.67**

Standardized regression coefficients are reported.

Model 1 is the starting line model for Models 2 through 7.

N= 380

*p<.05;

**p<.01.

Summary of Study 4

This study tested the construct validity of the employee silence which developed in the previous studies and to show the value of examining the dimensions of silence as clear concept. Therefore, more work is needed in both, but this study does provide evidence that as expected in relation to voice behavior, psychological safety, neurosis, and extraversion. The findings that four silence motivation are related to voice propose that they have predictive validity with regard to speaking up behaviors. The findings that four silence motivation predict voice behavior when controlling for variables before linked to voice further demonstrates the incremental value in examining silence motivation. Therefore in examining part of the value of silence motivation is that employees may experience different motivation for silence, which are not reflected in estimation of voice behavior. In this regard, the findings of this research supported that employees experience clear motivation for silence as shown by the means, standard deviations, and alpha reliabilities in Table 6. In addition, the moderate of the relationships between the silence motivation and voice behavior propose that employees may experiences motivation for remaining silent, which are not manifest in observations of voice.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In this research employees' willingness to speak up about important issues at work which is related to important individual, team, and organizational outcomes (Morrison, 2011). However, still we do not know about situations where employees have something significant to say, but are forced to remain silent (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). In addition there are some reasons which include (i) silence is essentially equivalent to an absence of voice behavior, (ii) research that has focused on silence which has been conceptual or qualitative, and (iii) previous research has focused on employees to avoid the risks related with speaking up to the prevention of other motivation for silence. Regarding the variety of voice- and silence-related concept before developed (Brinsfield et al., 2009; Morrison, 2011), it is important to found the value in studying employee silence motivation as clear concept. Although more work is needed to confirm this, the research shows evidence that the investigation of silence motivation is justify. Previous research on employee voice- and silence have focused on, and operationalized, the behavioral aspects of the phenomena (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). However, the ambiguous nature of silence, measuring voice or silence behavior and deriving the nature and expans of intended silence are insufficient. In addition, many other concept have been developed and studied, however, silence motivation appear conceptually clear from these existing concept. Whereas previous research on employee silence has focused on silence in response to perceived risks related with speaking up, this research shows that motivation for silence other than fear of consequences. In fact, items loading on protective silence described for total response in Study 1. It is clear that if we want to understand the scope of silence in organizations, we have to focus on other motivation in addition to risk avoidance. Practitioners also rise to benefit from the development of measures of clear silence motivation. Most managers say that they do not want employees to be willing to

International Journal of Research In Social Sciences

speak up about important issues (Bennis, Goleman, & O'Toole, 2008), but the tools available for managers to estimate intended silence in the workplace have been limited. The ability to reliably measure of the various motivation for silence will provide managers with important perception regarding the nature and expans of workers' unwillingness to speak up. In turn this will enable more targeted and effective strategies for managing silence in the workplace. This is important regarding the invisible nature of silence and that because managers may believe that they are hearing more than they actually are.

LIMITATIONS

These studies make several contributions; there are several limitations that may weaken the validity of the results. This research used a mixed-methods design, employing both qualitative and quantitative techniques. The qualitative views of this study provided a broader understanding of employee silence than would have been possible from a limited number of deductively pre-decided questions. Nevertheless this benefit, this technique does have its difficulty. As the data gathered could be interpreted and categorized in a variety of different ways. In this research there are important steps. First, to provided detailed documentation of the data gathering and analyses. Second, to calculated ratings of agreement and found them to be satisfactory for this type of research. And finally, the diversity of the respondents and much number of silence reasons reported in Study 1 (n = 3370) appears to have afforded a completely list of silence reason models. Pinder and Harlos (2001) argued that one of the difficulties related with studying employee silence was coming to clutches with what constitutes the boundaries of the construct itself (p. 332). Although they made this statement over a decade ago, (Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). Studies 1 and 2 were intended with respect to the boundary restrictions imposed as the objective was to inductively examine the content field of employee silence and understanding of the implications of two important boundary restrictions, (i) the type of issue, situation, or concern to which one is remaining silent, and (ii) the target of silence. Because the silence reason models used to create the scale items were derived within this conceptual space, it is not clear if different models would have appeared if specific boundary restrictions had been imposed. Therefore broad approach led to a more comprehensive list of models, but the relative frequencies of event would vary if boundary restrictions were imposed. In addition, as shown in Study 3, when the measures derived in this context were adapted to more specific boundary restrictions regarding the nature of the silence event (unfair or unethical situation) and operational problem or opportunity for improvement, the fit statistics were similar thourghout these scenarios to suggest practical equivalence. Another important limitation involves all the variables used in this study, with the exception of management' ratings of voice behavior. This was unavoidable with silence motivation as they are can be known by the person who is experiencing them. This is also the case with extraversion, neurosis, and individual perception of psychological safety. Therefore, it is not clear to what expans the consequent relationships were impacted by common-method bias (Campbell & Fiske, 1959).

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH.

This research, not only confirmed silence motivation before compliance in the literature but also found evidence for motivation not before examined in the employee silence research. It is clear that further research is necessary, additional qualitative research in a variety of contexts to certify the findings. In addition, this research adopted a field relative to employee silence and then narrowed it relative to the type of event an employee is remaining silent in response to (i.e., an idea for improvement), and the target of silence (i.e., top management, management). However, more work is needed, which examines the validity of these silence motivation thourghout different types of events and other types of targets. In addition, more research that builds on the idea of a climate of silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005) promises to be informative. In addition, this research assumes a face-to-face context, but as previous research has found, peoples' communicative behaviors may be affected by the type of communication medium (Kiesler & Sproull, 1992).

Studying the motivation for employee silence and extends previous theoretical and empirical work on employee silence and voice by bringing a new perspective to this existing research. Whereas previous research has tested the reasons for, and effects of, voice-related behaviors, the direct test of silence motivation promises our understanding of situations where employees have something to say, but remain silent. Most important, practitioners stand to benefit from this line of inquiry because existing measures of voice do not estimate the nature or expans of intentional silence. According to evidence

regarding the role of "failures to communicate" in such diverse events (Arvedlund, 2009) and the abuses (Bennis et al., 2008), there is little doubt that organizations of all types could benefit from better understanding the nature and expans of intended silence in the workplace. In Study 4, the relationships between psychological safety, employee voice behavior, and the dimensions of employee silence examined. However, because of methodological limitations, this study was unable to found causality. Moss and Martinko (1998) suggests that some of the factors related with employee silence can be managed in a laboratory setting. Detert and Edmondson (2011) stated that, psychological safety has been located as a mediator between various previous and voice behavior. Regarding that psychological safety plays in employee voice and silence, more work is needed, which examines how different aspects of psychological safety (West, 1990) influence silence motivation and related outcomes. Also in Study 4, the dependent variable of interest was management'estimation of employee voice behavior. As before discussed, the different silence motivation may be differentially related to other individual and organizational outcomes. For example, in organizational cultures, protective silence may be more strongly related to performance outcomes, whereas in less threatening cultures, other forms of silence may be more relevant. In addition, future research that examines how the different motivation interact to shape other performance and psychological outcomes may be informative. Finally, it is recognized, that employees should not speak up about all issues at all times. As Milliken and Morrison (2003) observed, such organizations would be disordered. Indeed, a certain amount of silence is quite functional. Similarly, Van Dyne et al. (2003) argued that silence may be based on pro-social motivation, but there has been no empirical examination of this form of silence. In this study, silence based on pro-social motivation did not appear from the inductive investigation in Study 1. This may be due to declining assumptions related with silence in the workplace, which remove respondents from thinking about this type of silence. This may be due to the expectation of benefits related with performing pro-social behaviors (Zahavi, 2000) because of the hidden nature of silence, people would not expect this type of pro-social behavior to result in the related benefits.Therefore, more research focusing on the pro-social aspects of silence is needed.

REFERENCES

1. Arbuckle, J. L. (1997). Amos users' guide (Version 3.6). Chicago, IL: Small Waters Corporation.

2. Arvedlund, E. (2009). Too good to be true: The rise and fall of Bernie Madoff. New York, NY: Penguin Publishing.

3. Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24, 45–68.

4. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1–26.

5. Bennis, W., Goleman, D., & O'Toole, J. (2008). Transparency: How leaders create a culture of candor. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

6. Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indices in structural models. Psychological Bulletin, 107, 238–246.

7. Brinsfield, C. T., Edwards, M. S., & Greenberg, J. (2009). Voice and silence in organizations: Historical review and current conceptualizations. In J. Greenberg, & M. S. Edwards (Eds.), Voice and silence in organizations (pp. 3–33). Bingley: Emerald Group.

8. Brown, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen, & J. S. Long (Eds.), Testing structural equation models (pp. 136–162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

9. Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81–105.

10. Clapham, S., & Cooper, R. (2005). Factors of employees' effective voice in corporate goverance. Journal of Management and Governance, 9, 287–313. doi: 10.1007/s10997-005-7421-3

11. Colbert, A. E., Mount, M. K., Harter, J. K., Witt, L. A., & Barrick, M. R. (2004). Interactive effects of personality and perceptions of the work situation on workplace deviance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 599–609.

12. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct

validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 386–400.

13. Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. Psychological Bulletin, 52, 281–302.

14. Cullen, M. J., & Ones, D. S. (2001). The role of conscientiousness and neuroticism in predicting police corruption. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

15. Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. Academy of Management Journal, 54, 461–488.

16. Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior inwork teams. Administrative ScienceQuarterly, 44, 350–383.

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

18. Edwards, M. S., & Greenberg, J. (2009). Sounding off on voice and silence. In J. Greenberg, & M. S. Edwards (Eds.), Voice and silence in organizations (pp. 275–291). Bingley: Emerald Group.

19. Fleiss, J. L. (1971). Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. Psychological Bulletin, 76, 378–382.

20. Fleiss, J. L., Levin, B., & Paik, M. C. (2004). Statistical methods for rates and proportions (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

21. Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11, 30–42.

22. Hinkin, T. T. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questions. Organizational Research Methods, 1, 104–121.

23. Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). LISREL 8: User's reference guide. Chicago, IL: SPSS.

24. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of selfconcordance and goal attainment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 257–268.

25. Kiesler, S., & Sproull, L. (1992). Group decision making and communication technology. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 52, 96–123.

26. Langford, P. H. (2003). A one-minute measure of the Big Five? Evaluating and abridging Shafer's (1999a) Big Five markers. Personality and Individual Differences, 35, 1127–1140.

27. LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 853–868.

28. LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (2001). Voice and cooperative behavior as contrasting forms of contextual performance: Evidence of differential relationships with Big Five personality characteristics and cognitive ability. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86, 326–336.

29. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

30. Milliken, F. J., & Morrison, E. W. (2003). Shades of silence: Emerging themes and future directions for research on silence in organizations. Journal of Management Studies, 40, 1563–1568.

31. Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. Journal of Management Studies, 40, 1453–1476.

32. Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. The Academy of Management Annals, 5, 373–412.

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

34. 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, 183–191.

35. Moss, S. E., & Martinko, M. J. (1998). The effects of performance attributions and outcome dependence on leader feedback behavior following poor subordinate

performance. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, 259–274.

36. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

37. Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as response to perceived injustice. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), Research in personnel and human resources management (Vol. 20, pp. 331–369). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

38. Preacher, K. J., & MacCallum, R. C. (2002). Exploratory factor analysis in behavior genetics research: Factor recovery with small sample sizes. Behavior Genetics, 32, 153–161.

39. Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organizational behavior. In B. M. Staw, & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 3–43). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

40. Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate. Personnel Psychology, 61, 37–68.

41. Thorngate, W. (1976). "In general" vs. "it depends": Some comments on the Gergen-Schlenker debate. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 2, 404–410.

42. Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: An empirical investigation. Employee Relations, 27, 441–458.

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

44. Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. Journal of Management Studies, 40, 1359–1392.

45. West, M. A. (1990). The social psychology of innovation in groups. In M. A. West, & J. L. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies (pp. 309–333). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

46. Zahavi, A. (2000). Altruism: The unrecognized selfish traits. Journal of Consciousness Studies, 7, 253–256.