LITERATURE REVIEW OF EMPLOYEE SILENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Merve YETİM*[1]

---

*merveyetim2@gmail.com; İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi "İngilizce İşletme Tezli" Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Özet

Örgütsel sessizlik, örgütte önemli bir durum karşısında gerekli tepkiyi göstermeyen bir tutumdur. Çalışanlar şirketteki problemlerle ilgili düşüncelerini ifade etmekten kaçınırlar. (Henriksen ve Dayton, 2006). Örgütsel sessizliğin hakim olduğu şirkette sağlıklı ve açık iletişim eksikliği görülür.

Örgütsel bağlılık kavramı, örgütsel iletişim kavramına göre tanımlanabilir, daha açık bir şekilde belirtmek gerekirse örgütsel iletişimin hareketi ile açıklanabilir.

Günümüz rekabetçi piyasa koşullarında, örgütsel iletişim kilit rol oynar. Şirketin sürekliliği ve çalışan mutluluğu için de oldukça önemlidir. Bu bağlamda örgütsel sessizliğin örgütsel bağlılıkla yakından ilgili olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Bu makalenin ana tartışma konusu, çalışan sessizliği ile örgütsel bağlılıktır. Örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sessizlik kavramları ayrı ayrı açıklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel sessizlik, örgütsel bağlılık, duygusal bağlılık, çalışan sesi, kabullenici sessizlik, korunmacı sessizlik, korumacı sessizlik, duygusal bağlılık, devam bağlılığı, normatif bağlılık

Abstract

Organizational silence is an attitude that does not show necessary reactions against an important situation in the organization, employee don't say their opinion about organizational issues. (Henriksenve Dayton, 2006). It clearly seems that there is failure in open communication or appropriate communication within the organization.

The concept of organizational commitment can be defined according to the concept of organizational communication, more precisely it can be explained by the movement of organizational communication.

Organizational communication plays a key role in the competitive market, which is very important for the continuity of the company and employee happiness. In this context, it is thought that organizational silence affects organizational commitment.

The main discussion of the article is significant to explain these two terms separately.

Keywords: Organizational silence, organizational commitment, affective commitment, employee voice, acquiescent silence, defensive silence, prosocial silence, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment

Introduction

In this article, employee silence and organizational commitment will be explained. First, what employee silence means and in what situations it manifests itself will be touched upon. After that, the reasons behind employee and organizational silence will be analyzed in a detailed way. Then, the types of employee silence will be clarified to better understand the distinction among its types. Mainly, acquiescent silence, defensive silence, prosocial silence and protective silence will be my focus points throughout the review of literature.

Organizational commitment as well as employee silence itself will be interpreted with the help of definitions searched in academic articles. The types of organizational commitment will also be analyzed in this part. As to its types, affective commitment or emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment are mainly the ones that will be discussed.

After the employee silence and organizational commitment are described, interpreted and discussed. The relationship between these two terms will also be clarified.

1. ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE

Employees are regarded as major sources of change, creativity, learning, and innovation. These mentioned factors are the ones that are critical factors to the success of organizations. However, many employees may show unwillingness and recessive manners by choosing not to voice their opinions and talk about their concerns regarding the matters in their organizations. It can basically be called as employee silence. (Neill, 2009).

Employee silence is starting at the individual workplace, and this individuality can spread among members of the group making most people reluctant to talk. Similarly, Ellis and Van Dyne (2009) stated that the silent behavior of an individual not sharing his ideas could affect other individuals in time, and that he could spread to the full extent of the organization in the course of time and thus harm the workplace culture. It is also seen that these two concepts are frequently used in place of each other, as in the literature as "working silence" and "organizational silence" (Brinsfield, 2009 ; Park and Keil, 2009).

I believe that not only employee silence as an individual but also the silence as a whole in an organization should also be discussed since the individual silence can easily be turned into the organizational one within time if necessary precautions are not taken. Organizational silence

is structured on the definition and structure of organizational silence, its causes and its consequences.

Organizational silence is deliberately exempt from the individual's thought to change, his deviant, cognitive, and cognitive ideas of realizing their work and their organization (Pinder and Harlos, 2001) . Organizational silence is an attitude that does not show the necessary reaction in the face of an important situation in the organization, little or nothing to say (Henriksenve Dayton, 2006).

According to Pinder and Harlos (2001), attention must be paid to the conceptualization of a state of silence as a phenomenon of organizational silence, in which the individual is intentionally, actively and purposefully silent.

Dyne, Ang, and Botero (2003) emphasize that organizational silence is multidimensional. It has been classified as acceptance, defensive, and protective silence, classified as acceptance, fear / defense, and protection of relativism, not to explain individual thoughts or knowledge about the organization.

The phenomenon of employee silence is characterized as "the intentional withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individuals behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his/her organizational circumstance to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress" (Pinder and Harlos, 2001).

Staying mute can be fitted into different types of silence. Employees who do not feel secure to raise any objections to an event or to a situation can also show reluctance to share and express their ideas, in turn, cause employee silence.

Not only turning a blind eye to a situation but also withholding information can also be types of organizational silence. If employees do not feel secure enough to share their ideas and raise any objection to current situation, we should take employee silence into consideration for the sake of companies' or firms' neat and ordinate organizational system.

> According to Dover, workers in the formation of silence climate the reasons can be listed as follows:
> - When an opinion on any subject is reported, it can be perceived as propaganda
> - Loss of credibility among employees when spoken status
> - Feeling a risk in the name of position

- Employment of employees in the organization as the head of the union concerns

As organizations become a culture, occupations do not express their opinions, say truth, and think their ideas are worthless because of the climate they perceive.

After defining employee silence with the light of research, deeply analyzing the reasons behind employee silence and discussing the case study now I want to discuss its types in this part. The types of employee silence can be categorized in accordance with the rationale behind them. In this part I will define and explain three main types of employee silence. Namely, acquiescent silence, defensive silence and prosocial silence.

1.1. Acquıescent Sılence

The first type is referred as acquiescent silence and it can be defined as the silent situation of the employees in which they are unaware of the fact that they have the options and alternatives not to remain silent and express themselves. (Vakola&Dimitrias, 2005).

It is one the types of silence of the employee's to say their ideas, thoughts and suggestions clearly, just because they believe that their ideas are no worth making the difference is meaningless and unnecessary. Therefore, accepting silence involves passive behavior. This tendency to disengagement from the organizational processes that work as a result of passive behavior. For this reason, accepting silence leads to resignation behavior in relation to the working organization. An apathy (withdrawal from the organizational community, actions and procedures) is evolving as the thought of what is said in the employees is prevalent. For this reason, employees are unconditionally folding all organizational situations and ignoring alternative solutions. This behavior of silence consists of some kind of unresponsiveness to change and development (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

1.2. Defensıve Sılence

According to Morrison and Milliken (2000), it can be defined as "the hiding of information, ideas and ideas for employee self-protection". Employees in silence for defensive purposes prefer to remain silent as a personal strategy by being proactive in order to use the alternative in their favor in the future. This silence is essentially different from the accepted silence, and it acts more actively with the accepting silence. On the basis of defensive silence there is a fear of suggestion or conversation for change (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

1.3. Prosocıal Sılence

It is also expressed as silence for the benefit of the organization. This silence is due to self-sacrifice and co-operation, hiding ideas, knowledge and thoughts about work in order to benefit the organization or other colleagues (Podsakoz et al., 2000)

2.   ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

The concept of organizational commitment can be defined according to the concept of organizational communication, more precisely it can be explained by the movement of organizational communication. Throughout the communication process both within and outside the organization, the employees' associative commitment is realized. The ability of organizations to live their lives requires that all employees work in a harmonious and cooperative team, as well as those who fulfill their duties and responsibilities. The necessary environment must be created in order for them to be realized within the organization. In short, expecting high performance from employees can only be achieved through their motivation for production at the desired level. This will happen with the development of loyalty.

Loyalty; there is a sense of being social everywhere. In general terms loyalty; "A person, a thought, a corporation, or a larger entity than we have to demonstrate our commitment to something we see and do an obligation we have "(Desert, 2004). Organizational commitment is " the power of the bond that the worker feels against the working weaver "

"Loyalty attitude towards loyalty" (Bayram, 2005). Meyer and Allen (1991) classify organizational commitment under three headings. These; emotional, continuance, and normative commitment. Emotional commitment concept is related to identification. Dependency on attendance; dependency and exchange costs (Fullerton, 2003). Less alternatives, continued commitment positive effects (Balıkçıoğlu and Altay, 2014: 135, Kaplan 2010). Normative loyalty is about feeling the necessity of finding an organization (Kaplan, 2010).

In summary; as employees want to remain in business under emotional commitment, because they need to be covered by continuing commitment and in normative commitment

(Meyer et al., 1999). Different organizational commitment can be taken as a key variable even if there are classifications and perspectives. In this study, sub-dimensions were examined without being overlooked. Information on the scale used is given in the relevant section.

There are three different types of commitment, dedication, which employees have to deal with. Organizational commitment is shown by employees as a result even if different kinds of concepts exist. These three types of organizational commitment are; affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

2.1. Affectıve Commıtment

Emotional attachment is defined as an emotional or psychological attachment to the organization. Commitment to continuing means that there is a lot of responsibility on the part of the person, so it is necessary to feel obliged to continue to work, thinking that leaving the job will cause great confusion. Normative commitment stems from the fact that the occupation considers it necessary to stay at an organization due to personal commitment or loyalty.

The best form of employee's organizational commitment is emotional attachment. "Emotional attachment emerges from a compromise between individual and organizational values that empowers people to connect emotionally and emotionally and to be content with being a member of this organization. An emotionally committed employee performs above its normal performance and tries to fulfill more of its responsibility and duty, it will not bother.

Emotional commitment; refers to the emotional attachment of the employee to the identity and organization.

If the employee has a strong emotional attachment, he or she continues to work with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). It is the identification of employees with organizations and activities within organizations and they are sincerely attached to them. The employee is emotionally connected to the emotionally as he feels that his values and associations overlap with each other (Demirel, 2009). Emotional commitment, unlike other attachment dimensions, has a strong relationship consistent with a number of important organizational variables. The life of this dimension is doubled as a structure when compared to other dimensions of attachment. The use of emotional commitment in predicting organizational outcomes implies that more empirical and theoretical attention should be given to the dimensions of the ancestral dependence than any other type of commitment (Kell &

Motowidlo, 2012). Emotional attachment is primarily driven by positive work experiences such as job satisfaction and organizational justice, and is associated with desired outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior and low level regressive behavior at high levels, absenteeism and lateness (Wasti, 2002).

2.2. Contınuance Commıtment

In the form of continuous commitment, the employee will not want to leave the organization because of the investments he or she has made since the beginning of the organization. It feels like a necessity to stay in the organization thinking about the time and effort that it takes for the organization. For this reason, employees who do not leave the organization may exhibit negative attitudes and become a source of trouble for the managers. In short, he prefers not to leave the organization in order to prevent financial losses that may be working. Continued commitment; indicates the awareness of the cost relationship with separation from the organization. It continues to work because it is in need of organizational work primarily on continuity (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). It has two basic backgrounds: continuity, lack of business alternatives and negative side effects. The negative side here is everything that increases the costs of giving up such as time, money, and investment. Attendance refers to the need to stay organized and does not relate to positive organizational or individual outputs (Wasti, 2002).

Employees will have a much higher commitment to their current employer if they believe there are few job alternatives suitable for them (Kaya, 2007). In normative loyalty; the continuity of work is reflected as an emotional requirement. If an employee has a sense of normative commitment at a high level, continuing with the organization is a requirement for it (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). As a result of the socialization experiences that emphasize that it is appropriate to remain loyal to the employer, the occupation is expressed as a sense of responsibility based on honesty, which develops and remains in the organization as moral and correct (Kaya, 2007).

2.3. Normatıve Commıtment

In normative organizational loyalty, it is also the duty of self-organization and loyalty. The organization is an incentive to encourage culture devotion and loyalty. In short, the culture of associations tries to establish this commitment itself and requires employees to internalize the cultures, mission, goal, and policy. One has begun to see working in the organization as a task

for him. These people think they are obliged to the employers. A sense of gratitude remains in the end organization. This is because employers have value judgments as to whether to hire them at the time they really need them, or to stay with their employers as the right thing. Normative commitment is not as strong as emotional attachment, but its development from the norms of organizational commitment developed prior to entry (through familial and cultural socialization) or after entry (through organizational socialization) is controversial and emerges as a predictor of positive outputs (Wasti, 2002).

Emotional commitment, normative commitment, and continuous commitment allow employees to become attached to their organizations for different reasons. Since employees with emotional commitment want normative commitment, they feel obliged to work, and employees who are constantly committed feel in their jobs as they need them. When we think about it in this context, it does not seem very accurate to think that any kind of commitment is useful for the organization. Because, while considering some of their own interests working in some types of loyalty, it is thought to be an association. An employee who continues to work for the retirement of an employee with the benefit of organization will not be able to show the efficiency only if he or she continues to stay in the organization for his own benefit.

When the literature on organizational silence is examined, it is seen that the concept of organizational silence has entered the literature in the 2000s with the present meaning. It has been put forth in researches that the organizational silence, which took place in the domestic literature, has negative effects on both occupations and organizations.

When it comes to the relationship between employee silence along with the organizational silence and organizational commitment, we can say that there is a relationship between the terms since they affect each other in terms of job motivation, satisfaction or success.

Generally, there is a negative, medium, and statistically significant relationship between organizational silence and organizational commitment. In other words, there is a statistically significant relationship between job silence and organizational commitment. In this context, as the organizational silence increases, the decrease in organizational commitment and the increase in organizational commitment increase as the organizational silence decreases.

Conclusıon

The main objective of this paper is to research of literature review of organizational silence and organizational commitment. Although there is an increasing awareness about silence in organizations.

When the literature on organizational silence is examined, it is seen that the concept of organizational silence has entered the literature in the 2000s with the present meaning. It has been put forth in researches that the organizational silence, which took place in the domestic literature, has negative effects on both occupations and organizations.

When it comes to the relationship between employee silence along with the organizational silence and organizational commitment, we can say that there is a relationship between the terms since they affect each other in terms of job motivation, satisfaction or success.

Generally, there is a negative, medium, and statistically significant relationship between Organizational silence and organizational commitment. In other words, there is a statistically significant relationship between job silence and organizational commitment. In this context, as the organizational silence increases, the decrease in organizational commitment and the increase in organizational commitment increase as the organizational silence decreases.

REFERENCES

Balıkçıoğlu, S. ve Altay, H. (2014). Determining the relationship between the attitudes of organizational cynicism and commitment of the employees in hospitality businesses. AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 14(2), 133-157

Bayram, L. (2005). Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık. Sayıştaş Dergisi, 59,125-139.

Brinsfield, C.T., Edwards, M.S. & Greenberg, J. (2009). Voice and silence in organizations historical review and current conceptualizations. UK: Emerald Group

Demirel, Y. (2009). Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Üretkenlik Karşıtı Davranışlar Arasındaki İlişkiye Kavramsal Yaklaşım. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, Sosyal bilimler Dergisi, Yıl 8, Sayı 15, Bahar.

Fullerton, G. (2003). When does commitment lead to loyalty? Journal of Service Research, 5, 333-344.

Henriksen, K., & Dayton, E. (2006). Organizational silence and hidden threats to patient safety. Health Services Research, 41(4p2), 1539-1554.

Kell, H. J., S. J. Motowidlo (2012), ''Deconstructing Organizational Commitment: Associations Among its Affective and Cognitive Components, Personality Antecedents, and Behavioral Outcomes'', Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42, 1, 213-251.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1 (1), 61-89.

Morrison, E.W. & Milliken F.J. (2000). Organizational silence a barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. The Academy of Management Review, 25(4), 709- 722.

Pinder, C. C., &Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 20, 331-369.

Podsakoz, P.M, MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., Bachrach, D. G., (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviour: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future reserch. In Journal of Management, vol. 26., no. 3, 513-563.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. Journal of Management Studies, 40(6), pp. 1359-1392.

Vakola, M., & Dimitrias B. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: An empirical investigation. Employee Relations, 27(5), 441-458.

Wasti, A. S. (2002). Journal of Management. 28(4), 544–566