JPNU
scientific journal

ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE: DIMENSIONS, DETERMINANTS, AND IMPACT ON MANAGEMENT - AN ANALYTICAL STUDY

SLIMANE TICHTICH MOHAMMED LAMINE, KHAIAT AMIRA

Abstract. Organizational silence is a significant problem that hinders efficient communication, diminishes employee involvement, and has a detrimental impact on overall organizational performance. This study examines the different aspects of organizational silence, including defensive, acquiescent, and social quiet, and how each of these affects organizational outcomes in unique ways. The study examines how various human elements, such as age, gender, and educational qualifications, as well as organizational aspects, such as culture, knowledge management, and internal entrepreneurial settings, affect the occurrence of silence within businesses. Through an extensive examination of relevant literature and careful analysis of existing empirical studies, the research affirms that organizational silence has a substantial negative impact on creativity, work satisfaction, and productivity. The study also emphasizes the harmful consequences of an opaque, fear-driven company culture in promoting quiet. On the other hand, research has demonstrated that an organizational atmosphere that is supportive and transparent can effectively decrease instances of silence among employees. This, in turn, leads to increased employee participation and facilitates the development of innovative ideas. The results have practical consequences for leaders in organizations and politicians, highlighting the importance of developing transparent channels of communication and a culture that promotes inclusivity, where employees feel comfortable expressing their thoughts without any negative consequences. Consequently, this is essential for fostering innovation, enhancing decision-making procedures, and attaining long-term strategic objectives. The study provides useful insights for businesses aiming to comprehend and alleviate the adverse consequences of organizational silence, ultimately leading to improved organizational effectiveness and performance.

Keywords*:* acquiescent silence, defensive silence, organizational silence, social silence, management, organizational Performance.

JEL Classification: D23, D63, M54

1. INTRODUCTION

The idea of organizational silence, which is relatively recent in the field of social sciences, has attracted considerable interest from researchers because of its substantial detrimental effect on the flow of work inside an organization. Organizational silence is acknowledged as a harmful phenomena that obstructs efficient communication and undermines the quality of interactions and relationships among employees. The absence of communication in this context indicates a situation where people are hesitant or afraid to voice their thoughts or take part in decision-making, resulting in limited chances for employee involvement and productivity (Abdulrazzaq Aboud & Nasser Hussein, 2016, p. 245).

The organizational culture has a significant impact on the degree of quiet seen inside a business. The absence of recognition, disciplinary reactions to errors, and the marginalization of staff in decision-

making processes cultivate an environment in which employees abstain from assuming accountability and opt to remain silent (Kussin & Bundtzen, 2021, p. 41).

This study aims to achieve several main objectives:

- Analyze the various dimensions of organizational silence and evaluate its impact on overall organizational performance.

- Identify the factors that contribute to the emergence of organizational silence, whether related to the organizational environment or individual factors among employees.

- Provide recommendations that contribute to building a work environment characterized by openness and effective communication, thereby enhancing participation and productivity among employees.

- Precisely clarify the concept of organizational silence, focusing on the factors that drive it and its effects on both organizational and individual levels.

- Pave the way for future research focusing on a deeper understanding of organizational silence and its multiple dimensions.

Effective interactions within any organization depend on individuals' capacity to articulate their viewpoints and ideas without apprehension of consequences. Nevertheless, the phenomenon of organizational silence poses a substantial obstacle in this particular situation. It is the act of individuals being hesitant to express their concerns or thoughts because they are afraid of facing negative consequences or because they believe that speaking up will not make a difference. This tendency is a result of adverse interactions and previous experiences that hinder the act of openly expressing oneself.

Organizational silence hinders organizational operations and decreases overall performance efficiency by necessitating extra supervision and decreasing good employee interactions. In situations characterized by organizational silence, personnel refrain from openly and transparently exchanging information, which hinders the ability to make prompt and efficient decisions.

Conversely, a workplace that encourages openness and open communication fosters creativity and innovation, hence expediting the attainment of company objectives. The lack of such a setting can result in worsening internal relationships and present substantial obstacles to the stability of the organization, as defensive behaviors among personnel escalate, impeding growth and achievement.

Hence, this study aims to precisely elucidate the notion of organizational silence, including its determinants and consequences at both the organizational and individual levels. This will pave the way for future investigations in this field. The study is directed by the subsequent main research inquiry: What factors contribute to and what are the consequences of organizational silence? This topic is additionally subdivided into the subsequent sub-questions:

- What factors contribute to organizational silence?
- What are the consequences of corporate silence?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of silence is relatively modern, first introduced by Albert Hirchmann in 1970. Hirchmann developed a model of workers' reactions to mistreatment by their superiors, identifying three types of reactions: withdrawal, protest and complaint, and organizational silence through acceptance of injustice (Berkano, 2018, p. 265).

Several definitions of organizational silence have been provided in the literature. (Adeoye, Egbuta, & Ayeni, 2020, p. 40) define it as "the deliberate intention of employees to remain indifferent due to unresolved workplace issues, withholding ideas, knowledge, or opinions capable of improving organizational performance." This definition highlights organizational silence as an intentional behavior by employees, encompassing not just silence about wrongdoings but also silence about beneficial ideas and opinions.

Houari and Ben Ahmed (2019, p. 153) describe organizational silence as "deliberate behavior

towards work issues and anything related to policies and job problems, by not disclosing them due to fear of negative reactions from superiors such as threats and sanctions." This definition emphasizes the main reasons driving employees to adopt organizational silence: fear of punishment by superiors, whether in the form of threats or material sanctions like salary deductions or denied promotions, leading employees to adopt a defensive stance through organizational silence.

Mokhamra (2020, p. 88) adds that it is "avoiding talking about work-related matters for fear of negative interpretation, which affects relationships with colleagues and managers at work."

According to Galit (2020, p. 436), organizational silence "does not arise from a vacuum, but due to interactions that contributed to a sensitization process, making employees perceive the futility of speaking out as their voice did not make a difference." This definition suggests that employees succumb to the status quo based on past interactions, believing that expressing their opinions is as ineffective as not expressing them, thus preferring organizational silence as acquiescence.

Mousa Ismail (2018, p. 2) states that "there are many instances where silence is required when dealing with confidential information that should be withheld from others." This definition identifies a positive form of organizational silence aimed at protecting the organization's confidential information, known as social silence.

The operational definition of organizational silence adopted in this study is: "the deliberate withholding of opinions and suggestions related to work, where the employee adopts either a defensive stance due to fear of punishment or a submissive stance due to acceptance of the status quo. Silence can also be positive by protecting the secrets of colleagues and the organization."

Most previous studies agree that organizational silence has three dimension. The first dimension is the defensive silence. Beheshtifar, Borhani, and Moghadam (2012, p. 279) define defensive silence as "a deliberate behavior aimed at self-protection from external threats, considered defensive as it involves awareness or consideration of available alternatives due to the fear that expressing opinions and ideas entails personal risk." According to this definition, defensive silence is a proactive behavior where employees withhold information to avoid sole responsibility for a problem, and conceal personal mistakes to avoid accountability or even job loss.

Jongsung and Sung-Hoon (2021, p. 2135) describe it as "a self-protective stance caused by multiple fears, including the fear of forming a negative image, the fear of deteriorating relationships within the organization, and finally, the fear of reprimand and punishment from supervisors." This perspective sees defensive silence as a shield employees use to protect themselves from any adverse reactions from others. This is corroborated by Naroura and T. (2020, p. 503), who see it as "a defensive mechanism aimed at avoiding open contradiction with others." Employees do not wish to have conflicts with their colleagues and strive to maintain a calm and stable work environment, keeping their opinions and ideas to themselves.

Based on the previous definitions, defensive silence can be operationally defined as "a defensive mechanism and conscious behavior, based on considering available alternatives by withholding ideas, information, and opinions related to change and work improvement, and not reporting personal mistakes due to fear of criticism or harming personal interests or to avoid problems."

The second dimension is the acquiescent silence. Al-Dhafri and Al-Saeedi (2020, pp. 367-377) define it as "a state of passivity where employees do not share their knowledge and ideas due to submission and lack of interest in an environment characterized by fear and oppression, where ideas are limited to those of upper management." According to this definition, acquiescent silence is directly related to an unencouraging work environment marked by centralized decision-making, causing employees to acquiesce and accept the status quo, keeping their ideas and suggestions to themselves. It can also be said that an employee's past experiences or even witnessing colleagues' experiences lead them to adopt this type of silence as a safety zone. This is relatively different from Al-Salibi's (2019, p. 20) definition, who views it as "a free and passive behavior resulting from indifference and despair, not due to fear or knowledge gap." According to Al-Salibi, silence is a conscious and passive decision made by the

employee out of their own will, not driven by fear but by submission to the organizational circumstances they have encountered. Saeed Khalil (2019, p. 13) sees acquiescent silence as "employees not communicating effectively with their supervisors and managers despite having ideas and suggestions beneficial to the organization." This definition suggests that the employee does not effectively communicate with their superiors even if they have proposals and plans to improve performance and benefit the organization.

Based on these definitions, acquiescent silence can be operationally defined as "a passive stance taken by the employee, refraining from sharing their opinions and suggestions with the department head, even if they have plans to improve work processes, due to submission to the status quo, having become certain that they will be met with indifference and their opinion will not make a difference."

The third dimension is the social silence. Naroura and T. (2020, p. 503) define social silence as "the employee's behavior of withholding and concealing their opinions, ideas, and work-related information to provide benefits for the organization or other employees." This definition suggests two aspects: first, the employee maintains professional confidentiality, withholding work-related information to protect the organization they belong to, and second, protecting their colleagues' interests, whether by preserving their reputation or avoiding harm to their interests.

According to (Albanawi, 2017, p. 6), "this type of silence does not arise due to any pressure; in the context of social silence, employees show a great willingness to cooperate and not to share information related to the organization, achieving benefits for the organization and others alike." In her view, this type of silence differs from defensive silence and acquiescent silence in that it is a free decision and is adhered to by the employee of their own free will. There is no need to weigh alternatives, and the employee commits to it out of altruism and cooperation with colleagues. Additionally, (Mohsen Abd, 2019, p. 280) noted that "it is a purposeful and deliberate behavior to achieve the goals of others." According to this definition, social silence is a positive behavior that employees undertake to achieve an objective that benefits both the organization and colleagues.

Based on the previous definitions, social silence can be operationally defined as the withholding of work-related information, a positive behavior undertaken by the employee without being subjected to any type of pressure, unlike social silence and acquiescent silence. Social silence is a proactive behavior directed towards others, aiming to protect the organization first and also the employees, motivated by cooperation and altruism.

Most studies agree that the determinants of organizational silence are divided into individual and organizational determinants. The study by (Girgin & Gümüşeli, 2021, p. 863) began with the hypothesis that "there are differences in the levels of organizational silence among high school teachers attributable to the gender variable, and it was found that the effect of gender on the perception of organizational silence does not differ between genders in all its dimensions." This finding aligns with the Arabic study by (Maarouf, 2019, p. 163), which concluded that "there are no differences in the level of silence among faculty members attributable to the gender variable," as well as the study by (Al-Dhafari & Al-Saidi, 2020, p. 389), which found "no statistically significant differences between the mean levels of organizational silence among employees in schools in the Sultanate of Oman in terms of gender." It was explained that both males and females are subject to the same conditions and regulatory frameworks. However, (Al-Khattatna, 2009, p. 87) found that "there are statistically significant differences in the perceptions of respondents towards organizational silence in Jordanian public institutions attributable to the social gender variable, with the differences favoring females."

Regarding the age variable, a number of studies, such as the study by (Al-Khattatna, 2009, p. 84), found that younger individuals are more committed to silence, whereas advancing age provides the employee with experience and makes them more prepared to deal with various organizational situations.

The study by (Maarouf, 2019, p. 164) started from the hypothesis that there are differences in the level of organizational silence among faculty members attributable to the seniority variable, but this was

not confirmed, "there are no differences in the level of organizational silence among faculty members attributable to the seniority variable." Similar results were found in the study by (Boumnaghar & Wadi, 2016, p. 233), which found no differences in the level of organizational silence attributable to the seniority variable.

In a study conducted by (Girgin & Gümüşeli, 2021, p. 865) on "the perceptions of vocational school teachers regarding organizational silence, it was found that there are statistically significant differences between the levels of defensive silence among high school vocational teachers with bachelor's degrees and those with graduate degrees, favoring teachers with bachelor's degrees." Teachers with bachelor's degrees exhibit a higher level of defensive silence compared to those with graduate degrees, which was explained by the fact that those with higher degrees are more successful in self-expression, whereas bachelor's degree holders believe they cause disruption by voicing their opinions. Similar findings were observed in the study by (Al-Khattatna, 2009, p. 84), which concluded that there are statistically significant differences for the educational qualification variable in the perceptions of respondents towards organizational silence in Jordanian public institutions.

Access to sufficient and accurate information and the ease of accessing it removes barriers and facilitates communication. Dealing with honesty and respect allows for freedom of expression. While the decrease in distributive justice did not affect their self-esteem and the importance of sharing ideas and opinions, they believe that their voice will eventually bring about change (Al-Dhafari & Al-Saidi, 2020, p. 397). The employee's appreciation of inputs and outputs is relative; the results appear over time, and this does not prevent them from expressing their opinion.

"The prevailing culture in the organization affects the level of organizational silence. Lack of appreciation, preventing mistakes, and excluding employees from participating in company decisions lead to a culture where employees do not take responsibility" (Kussin & Bundtzen, 2021, p. 41). Employees prefer to remain in their comfort zone and not express their opinions. Additionally, a culture of fear or lack of trust within the organization leads to increased organizational silence. A Korean study conducted by (Jongsung & Sung-Hoon, 2021, p. 2160) found that "defensive silence and positive social silence increase with the organization's reliance on rational culture." According to them, practical relationships that do not consider the feelings and needs of the faculty make them refrain from expressing their opinions, hindering the university's development. Faculty members may even spread negative information about their organization.

Many studies have linked an institution's ability to adapt to changes in the work environment with organizational silence (Al-Rumidi, 2021, p. 15). The main hypothesis was that "strong organizational health in colleges and institutes of tourism and hospitality leads to a decrease in the level of organizational silence among faculty and supporting staff." The study found an "inverse relationship between organizational health and organizational silence; strong organizational health within colleges and institutes of tourism and hospitality leads to a 39.1% decrease in the level of organizational silence." Faculty members tend to talk about issues and violations within the colleges or institutes and offer suggestions for improving performance.

According to (Khedr Youssef, 2020, pp. 26-27), "the entrepreneurial environment is based on innovation and creativity in activities practiced within the organization to develop products, services, structures, processes, technologies, orientations, and foundations that it adopts in developing new trends." The study aimed to determine the nature of the relationship between the internal entrepreneurial environment and the reduction of organizational silence elements in the surveyed university, as well as to assess the level of the impact relationship between the internal entrepreneurial environment and the reduction of organizational silence elements. It was found that there is a significant correlation between the internal entrepreneurial environment and the reduction of organizational silence elements at the overall level in the surveyed university, and also a significant impact relationship between the internal entrepreneurial environment and the reduction of organizational silence elements in the surveyed university.

Knowledge management enablers and organizational silence are two variables that operate in opposing directions. Knowledge management enablers promote openness, communication, and knowledge sharing, aiming to store, share, analyze, and distribute knowledge within the organization to enhance effectiveness and efficiency in achieving goals. In contrast, "the causes of organizational silence instill silence among employees regarding what happens within the organization, including events and inaccurate policies" (Ali Abdullah & Hassan Ramadan, 2019, p. 112). This study categorized knowledge management enablers into five categories: knowledge vision, which refers to the shared vision of the organization; conversation management, which involves knowledge sharing; empowering knowledge creators; encouraging environment; and knowledge transformation. The study found an inverse relationship between the increase in knowledge management enablers and the causes of organizational silence, and highlighted the role of knowledge vision in mitigating the negative impact of the causes of organizational silence.

According to (Baissa & Bourmana, 2021, p. 203), "modern communication technologies are those means and equipment that contribute to the transmission and exchange of information and data between people, regardless of their levels and in various fields, with the aim of raising the economic, social, and cultural level of societies." Their study aimed to test the correlation between modern communication technologies and organizational silence among employees of the Institute of Economic Sciences, Management Sciences, and Commercial Sciences. The study concluded that modern communication technologies have an indirect effect on resisting organizational silence. The employees' meeting in a single electronic network removes the fear of the manager, as the indirect interaction allows them to freely express their opinions. Additionally, the manager may use employees' ideas without seeking their opinions since they have become the property of the company, which makes the impact of modern communication technologies less apparent.

(Abdul Razak Aboud & Nasser Hussein, 2016, p. 245) found an inverse relationship between the causes of organizational silence (administrative and organizational causes, lack of experience, work-related fears, social isolation, and fear of insistence in relationships) and indicators related to employee performance (job satisfaction, creativity, productivity). Fear of discussing issues with supervisors and colleagues negatively impacts productivity.

In a study conducted by (Al-Salibi, 2019, p. 98) on the role of organizational silence in the creative behavior of the Coast Guard personnel, a sample of 247 personnel was selected. The study aimed to identify the level of organizational silence in the Coast Guard, the level of creative behavior among its personnel, and the role of organizational silence in creative behavior. The study found a "statistically significant inverse relationship between organizational silence and creative behavior among Coast Guard personnel." This is attributed to the fact that organizational silence creates an environment characterized by isolation, negativity, and routine task completion, lacking encouragement and innovation.

(Murad Oja, 2019, p. 564) conducted a study on "organizational silence and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior," using defensive silence, acquiescent silence, and social silence as dimensions of organizational silence, and altruism, civility, sportsmanship, and conscience as dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior. The study concluded that "organizational silence affects organizational citizenship behavior." Dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, such as altruism and civility, require providing help and advice to colleagues without being asked. Organizational silence impedes this process, as the employee's state of isolation and fear of potential issues prevents them from offering such assistance. This was confirmed by (Amin Ahmed, 2017, p. 29), who found that "both acquiescent silence and defensive silence negatively impact organizational citizenship behavior. Employees adhering to acquiescent and defensive silence do not engage in organizational citizenship behaviors, such as providing assistance to colleagues, caring for equipment, and continually complaining about work burdens."

According to (Ibrahim Mousa, 2017, p. 151), organizational memory is a metaphorical concept akin

to human and computer memory, referring to the organization's repository of knowledge including data, information, and various experiences. The study aimed to examine the impact of permanent employees' silence in the Drinking Water and Sanitation Company in Menoufia Governorate on the company's organizational memory, considering dimensions such as organizational memory level, organizational memory dissemination, organizational memory content, organizational memory form, and organizational memory formation. The study found a strong inverse relationship (67%) with statistical significance between the variables of employees' permanent silence and their attitudes towards organizational memory across all dimensions. The researcher attributed this to employees avoiding offering their suggestions and opinions, and withholding work-related issues, which negatively impacts the exchange of experiences and information, thus reducing the company's knowledge base or what is known as organizational memory (Ibrahim Mousa, 2017, p. 161).

(Mousa Ismail, 2018, p. 38) explored the determinants of organizational silence and its impact on burnout among supporting staff at Sadat City University. The study found a strong positive correlation with statistical significance between the determinants of organizational silence and emotional exhaustion. Conversely, there was a strong negative correlation with statistical significance between organizational silence and the following determinants: communication skills and support from senior management. Additionally, there was a strong positive correlation with statistical significance between organizational silence and emotional numbness, as well as a strong negative correlation with communication skills and support from senior management. The same pattern was observed with the dimension of diminished personal accomplishment, showing a strong positive correlation with organizational silence and a strong negative correlation with communication skills and support from senior management.

(Alwan Al-Tai & Ali Sakr, 2020, p. 81) found a statistically significant correlation between organizational silence and the core capabilities of positive organizational behavior. According to their view, this reflects the sample's lack of concern with reducing organizational silence, which should ideally enhance the core capabilities of positive organizational behavior such as efficiency, optimism, hope, and resilience.

3. DISCUSSION

The concept of organizational silence has evolved significantly since its introduction in 1970. This study identified several dimensions and determinants of organizational silence, reflecting its complexity. Organizational silence can be defined as the deliberate withholding of opinions, ideas, and suggestions related to work. It includes behaviors ranging from defensive silence, where employees remain silent to protect themselves from perceived threats, to acquiescent silence, where employees refrain from speaking up due to a sense of futility or resignation.

Defensive silence is characterized by employees' conscious decision to withhold information to avoid potential negative consequences, such as criticism or job loss. Acquiescent silence, on the other hand, is more passive and results from employees' belief that their input will not be valued or make a difference. This form of silence is often influenced by a work environment marked by centralized decision-making and lack of encouragement for employee participation.

Social silence represents a positive dimension, where employees withhold information to protect the organization or their colleagues. This type of silence is driven by a sense of loyalty and cooperation and is not influenced by fear or resignation.

The study also explored the determinants of organizational silence, categorized into individual and organizational factors. Individual determinants include gender, age, seniority, and educational qualification. Previous studies have shown mixed results regarding the impact of gender on organizational silence. Age has been found to influence organizational silence, with younger employees being more prone to silence due to lack of experience, while older employees are more likely to speak up

due to their accumulated experience and confidence.

Seniority and educational qualification also shape organizational silence. Employees with higher educational qualifications tend to exhibit lower levels of defensive silence as they feel more confident in expressing their opinions. Conversely, those with less education might feel more vulnerable and thus remain silent.

Organizational factors such as culture, the internal entrepreneurial environment, and knowledge management enablers significantly influence organizational silence. A supportive and transparent organizational culture reduces silence, while a culture of fear and lack of trust fosters it. Overall, the study highlights the complex interplay of individual and organizational factors in shaping organizational silence.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to investigate the complex phenomena of organizational quiet and its influence on organizational performance. The main goal was to identify and examine the several aspects of corporate quiet, including defensive, acquiescent, and social silence, and to comprehend how these aspects impact communication, employee engagement, and overall organizational results. The research effectively accomplished its purpose by conducting a thorough examination of current literature and empirical investigations. It provided a detailed understanding of how both organizational and human factors contribute to the occurrence of silence inside companies.

The study revealed that defensive silence, which is generally motivated by the fear of adverse outcomes, and acquiescent silence, which arises from a feeling of hopelessness or resignation, have a substantial detrimental impact on creativity, innovation, and job satisfaction. The absence of social communication, although sometimes beneficial in safeguarding confidential information within an organization, can also foster a climate of secrecy that obstructs openness and open exchange of information. These findings highlight the intricate nature of corporate quiet and its extensive impact on organizational well-being.

This research makes a noteworthy addition by identifying organizational culture and internal entrepreneurial ecosystems as crucial factors that determine quiet. An corporate culture that lacks transparency, discourages open communication, and instills fear among employees worsens silence, resulting in reduced organizational effectiveness. In contrast, organizational settings that encourage the exchange of knowledge, facilitate employee participation, and cultivate trust have the ability to reduce the adverse effects of silence, hence improving overall organizational performance.

The study's scientific significance rests in its meticulous analysis of the methods by which organizational quiet functions, establishing a basis for future research. Essentially, the findings provide practical and useful information for leaders in organizations. They highlight the need of developing a culture that promotes support, openness, and active engagement.

Nevertheless, the study does possess certain constraints. The study mostly depends on pre-existing literature, which may not completely encompass the present dynamics of organizational silence in various sectors and cultural situations. Future study should focus on conducting empirical tests to examine the postulated correlations in other organizational settings, taking into account the impact of diverse cultural and sectoral characteristics.

In the future, it is important to conduct additional study on the connection between organizational silence and the latest developments in remote work and digital communication. These advancements are expected to bring new aspects to the phenomena that should be investigated. Furthermore, doing research on the impact of different leadership styles on organizational silence could offer a more profound understanding of effective management techniques.

To summarize, although this work has provided insights into the complex dynamics of organizational silence, further investigation is necessary to comprehensively comprehend and tackle this

widespread problem in modern organizational settings.

REFERENCES

[1] Moussa, A. I. (2017, December). The impact of employee silence level on organizational memory: An applied study on the Water and Sanitation Company in Menoufia Governorate. *University of Sharjah Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 14(2), 137–172. https://spu.sharjah.ac.ae/index.php/HSS/article/view/3228

[2] Ahmed, A. (2017). The effect of organizational silence on organizational citizenship behavior: An applied study on general staff in the education sector at Mansoura University. *Mansoura University Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 37(2), 158–208. https://caf.journals.ekb.eg/article_126499_8e0ec170b7f94ed95e3b0958958b2973.pdf

[3] Ismail, A. F. M. (2018). Determinants of organizational silence and its impact on burnout among supporting staff members at Sadat City University. *Contemporary Commercial Studies Journal*, 4, 1–51. https://doi.org/10.21608/csj.2018.90439

[4] Oujah, A. M. (2019). Organizational silence and its impact on organizational citizenship behavior: An analytical study at the Technical Institute, Kufa. *University of the Middle Euphrates*, 53, 561–598. https://doi.org/10.36322/jksc.v1i53.5030

[5] Abdul, A. M. (2019). The role of ethical leadership in reducing organizational silence: An exploratory study of the views of a sample of employees at the Anbar Water Directorate. *Tikrit University Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 15(48), 262–286. https://mseg.journals.ekb.eg/article_149468_553ed5b85784b61d5ff27fc6e2de3315.pdf

[6] Al-Roumeidi, B. S. (2021). The impact of organizational health on organizational silence in tourism education institutions. *Journal of Tourism and Hotels*, 5(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.21608/mfth.2021.205335

[7] Beheshtifar, M., Borhani, H., & Moghadam, M. (2012). Destructive role of employee silence in organizational success. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(11), 275–282. http://surl.li/ycauqw

[8] Nasira, B. (2018). Organizational silence and its causes. *Revue des Etudes Economiques Approfondies*, 3(1), 263–290. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/542/3/1/76727

[9] Naraoura, B., & Ahmed, T. (2020). The impact of organizational silence on dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior in the economic institution: A field study at the National Social Security Fund Agency for Wage Workers in El-Oued. *Knowledge Groups Journal*, 6(2), 497–513. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/347/6/2/132950

[10] Al-Tai, F. A., & Saker, A. A. (2020). The impact of organizational silence on the core capabilities of positive organizational behavior: An analytical study of the views of a sample of members of the Karbala Police Directorate. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 6(21), 53–93. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/pdf/d02d97242ed6a3a6

[11] Girgin, S., & Gümüşeli, A. (2021). Vocational high school teachers' perceptions of organizational silence. *Independent Journal of Management & Production (IJM&P*, 12(4), 858–873. https://doi.org/10.14807/ijmp.v12i4.1347

[12] Baissa, H., & Bourmane, A. (2021). Modern communication technologies and their impact on overcoming organizational silence among employees of Algerian higher education institutions: A case study of the Institute of Economic Sciences and Management at the University of Tipaza. *Journal of Creativity*, 11(1), 199–215. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/269/11/1/156993

[13] Abdullah, H. A., & Ramadan, A. F. H. (2019). The effect of knowledge management enablers on reducing organizational silence causes. *Tikrit University Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 15(46), 110–129. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/pdf/9fe66645ff99be3c

[14] Jongsung, K., & Sung-Hoon, K. (2021). The effect of university organizational culture on organizational silence and faculty–student interaction. *Management Science Letters*, 11, 2151–2162. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2021.2.013

[15] Mukhamara, K. K. (2020). Organizational silence behavior and ways to overcome it among secondary school teachers in Jerusalem Municipality: Their perspective. *Al-Hikma Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 7(4), 83–107.

[16] Kussin, L., & Bundtzen, H. (2021). How error prevention and organizational silence influences managers' self-perception: A repertory grid study. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 5(1), 31–44. https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5(1).31-44.2021

[17] Howari, M., & Ahmed, M. B. (2019). Measuring the level of organizational silence among faculty members: A field study at Ahmed Zabana University Center - Ghardaia. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Studies*, 12(3), 150–166. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/117/12/3/102089

[18] Al-Banawi, M. (2017, March). The relationship between organizational silence and burnout: An applied study on medical doctors in Zagazig University Hospitals. *Scientific Journal of Commerce and Finance, Faculty of Commerce, Tanta University*, 1. https://caf.journals.ekb.eg/article_126472_839cb8d2781f1967c11e11e5d8c7b518.pdf

[19] Boumengar, M., & Wadi, A. (2016). The phenomenon of organizational silence in Algerian public institutions. *Economic Perspectives Journal*, 6, 221–235. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/126/6/10/39909

[20] Adeoye, O. S., Egbuta, U. E., & Ayeni, D. (2020). Toxic leadership and organizational silence: An appraisal of selected faith-based organisations in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 1(67), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.7176/JRDM/67-05

[21] Al-Suleibi, R. S. A. (2019). The role of organizational silence in creative behavior among the members of the marine police (Master's thesis). Academy of Management and Political Studies, Palestine.

[22] Al-Khatatneh, R. M. A. (2009). The effect of organizational silence on organizational trust among employees in Jordanian public institutions (Master's thesis). Mu'tah University, Jordan.

[23] Al-Zufri, S. B., & Al-Saidiya, D. K. (2020, March). Organizational silence and its relationship with organizational justice among employees in the Sultanate of Oman. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 21(1), 273–401. http://doi.org/10.12785/jeps/210111

[24] Youssef, S. K. (2020). The internal entrepreneurial environment and its role in reducing organizational silence factors: An analytical study of the views of a sample of leaders at Al-Hamdaniya University. *Al-Muthanna Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 10(3), 23–44. https://muthjaes.mu.edu.iq/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/2-30.pdf

[25] Ghalit, S. (2020). Organizational silence in Algerian institutions: The case of educational institutions. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 431–451. https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/39/7/1/146783

[26] Aboud, Z. A., & Hussein, D. N. (2016). Causes of organizational silence and its impact on employee performance. *Journal of Babylon University: Pure and Applied Sciences*, 24(1), 233–259. https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/5d3fefdee1dd10ee

Slimane Tichtich Mohamed Lamine, Doctor of Sociology in the Social Sciences Department, University of Souk Ahras, Algeria;
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0315-0066
Amira Khaiat, Doctor of Sociology, University of Guelma in Algeria, Algeria;
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-5401-6475
Address: Slimane Tichtich Mohamed Lamine, Amira Khaiat, Univesity of Souk Ahras, Faculty of Social and human Sciences, Souk Ahras, BP41000, Algeria.
E-mail: m.slimanetichtich@univ-soukahras.dz, khaiat.mira21@gmail.com

———————————————

Сліман Тіхтіч Мохамед Ламін, Аміра Хаят. Організаційне мовчання: виміри, детермінанти та вплив на менеджмент – аналітичне дослідження. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, **11** (4) (2024), 26-36.

Організаційне мовчання є значною проблемою, яка перешкоджає ефективній комунікації, знижує залученість співробітників і негативно впливає на загальну ефективність організації. Це дослідження розглядає різні аспекти організаційного мовчання, зокрема захисне, покірне та соціальне мовчання, і те, як кожен із цих аспектів по-різному впливає на результати діяльності організації. У дослідженні аналізується, як різні людські фактори, такі як вік, стать і рівень освіти, а також організаційні аспекти, такі як культура, управління знаннями та внутрішні підприємницькі умови, впливають на виникнення мовчання в

організаціях. Завдяки всебічному огляду відповідної літератури та ретельному аналізу існуючих емпіричних досліджень, дослідження підтверджує, що організаційне мовчання має значний негативний вплив на креативність, задоволеність роботою та продуктивність. У дослідженні також підкреслюються шкідливі наслідки непрозорої культури компанії, заснованої на страху, яка сприяє мовчанню. З іншого боку, дослідження показало, що підтримуюча та прозора організаційна атмосфера може ефективно зменшити випадки мовчання серед співробітників. Це, у свою чергу, призводить до підвищення участі співробітників і сприяє розвитку інноваційних ідей. Результати мають практичне значення для лідерів організацій та політиків, підкреслюючи важливість розвитку прозорих каналів комунікації та культури, що сприяє інклюзивності, де співробітники можуть вільно висловлювати свої думки без негативних наслідків. Відповідно, це є важливим для стимулювання інновацій, вдосконалення процесів прийняття рішень і досягнення довгострокових стратегічних цілей. Дослідження надає корисні висновки для бізнесів, які прагнуть зрозуміти та пом'якшити негативні наслідки організаційного мовчання, що в кінцевому підсумку призводить до покращення ефективності та продуктивності організаці.

Ключові слова: покірне мовчання, захисне мовчання, організаційне мовчання, соціальне мовчання, управління, організаційна ефективність.