ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE AND TEAM EFFECTIVE OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN PORT HARCOURT, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA

Bilikisu Ize KENNETH
Department of Business Administration
Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria
&
Felix O. OLODA PhD
Department of Business Administration
Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper examined the relationship between Organizational silence and Team effectiveness of deposit money banks in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The study adopted survey design, and data were collected from 300 employees across selected deposit money banks using questionnaire. The Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient statistical tool was employed to test the hypotheses. Findings from this study revealed positive and significant relationships between the two dimensions of organizational silence (acquiescence and self- defense) and the three measures of team effectiveness (collaboration, creativity and productivity). The study recommends that: Organizations need to ensure that both managers and employees have the necessary support to be creative and understand how to use it in their particular job situation. Managers of firms should put in place meaningful and consistent organizational support for creativity. Ensure that managers understand how organizational support converts into individual employee creative job expectations and that they can effectively translate these expectations for their employees. Have the manager work on establishing a trusting relationship beginning in the creativity preparation phase through how they assist the employee in preparing and then throughout the execution phase by playing close attention to the tone and content of their interactions with the employee. Help employees to interpret and apply the organizational expectations and support features to their own job by having them articulate what they expect creatively, what they think the creative expectations and opportunities are of their job and how they believe it will add the most value. Individually tailor the organizational supports that the employee most needs based on their reported creative preparation needs. Individual needs could vary from learning how they can establish more autonomy, establishing parameters for more dedicated creative work time or coaching on how to balance work priorities.

Introduction

Teams provide diversity in knowledge, attitudes, skills and experience, whose integration makes it possible to offer rapid, flexible and innovative responses to problems and challenges, promoting performance and improving the satisfaction of those making up the team. This is the result of what has been called the wisdom of crowds: increased capacity for achieving various types of performance made possible by the interaction of team members (Salas, Rosen, Burke & Goodwin, 2009). Thus, the success of organizations and the overall production of knowledge depend to a large extent on the effectiveness of teams (Wuchty, Jones & Uzzi, 2007). However, teams do not always act in this way, and sometimes fail to achieve the high performance expected of them (Sims, Salas & Burke, 2005). In fact, everyday experience tells us that in many cases teams, far from being mechanisms for capitalizing effectively and satisfactorily on collective effort, turn into black holes that relentlessly consume the physical, mental and emotional energies of their members. This tends to involve their wasting a great deal of effort to attain their goals – if indeed those goals are even met at all. Therefore, the challenge for research and intervention involves the effective integration of the contributions of qualified and expert people which can provide added value to the organization. Nor must we overlook the important role of the design of the organizational context in which teams exist, which should facilitate the creation of structures and lines of support, communication, consultation, feedbacks and rewards that complement the internal functioning of the team (Hackman, 2005).

The concept of silence is attributed negative meanings included introversion, introvert behaviors in psychology and inaction and intimidation of society in sociology; whereas in ethics and philosophy, it is associated with positive meanings such as keeping secrets and mediation (Afşar, 2021). In literatures, it is observed that the concepts of employee silence and organizational silence are used interchangeably for employee's silence (Park & Keil, 2020). This study considers both concepts in the same meaning as organizational silence. Morrison and Milliken (2021) define organizational silence as conscious choice of employees about not expressing their knowledge and ideas concerning organizational problems. According to another definition, organizational silence is the denial of an individual's behavioral, mental and emotional genuine expressions from others, who are capable of altering or fixing the situation (Pinder & Harlos, 2021). According to Bagheri, Zarei and Aeen (2020), organizational silence is the situation in which employees willingly or unwillingly keep information that might be useful for the organization.

Employees might fall into silence not to be the troubled person within the organization, not to be embarrassed against their friends and due to the possibility, that their opinions are not supported by others (Durak, 2020). Bowen and Blackmon (2021) also state that employees, who consider that their opinions are not backed by others, choose to remain silent. The reason for expression of opinions at the workplace is to acquire superiority in sharing of several resources and to influence the way of work upon one's request. Thoughts concerning the share of resources and the way of doing work can occasionally cause conflicts. Employees might prefer to be silent to avoid such a conflict.Studies abound in the area of organizational silence and team effectiveness, but very few of these studies paid attention to the uniqueness

of the Nigerian business environment which is what this work sets out to do by investigating the relationship between organizational silence and team effectiveness in the Nigerian banking industry.

Statement of Problem

As "a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they are mutually accountable." (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993).In today's society, there have been so much emphasis on pride and personal achievement at work place; where by the concept of teamwork seems to be overlooked by managers and employees, due to this management sees less essence of teamwork as a major tool of performance which has led them to poor performance and productivity in the industry market. Therefore, the study seeks to identify the impact teamwork has on organizational performance.Organizational silence is probably more serious than many people would assume. Unlike the past, that it would easily be ignored, that option is not viable now with the current levels of competition. Doing business in whichever part of the world is becoming increasingly expensive and organizations are better off promptly addressing issues like organizational silence that affect their productivity. Other than these, employees are now exposed to new forms of behaviors advanced by changes in technology, globalization, as well as other drivers of ethical behavior, which increases risks involved in doing business (Byars & Rue, 2006; Price, 2020). The studies done on organizational silence are still very few because it's a young topic, only introduced in 2000. Most of these studies have focused on studying junior employees and how they voice 'up the hierarchy' (Morrison& Milliken, 2021). These only addresses silence in a section of the organization and not the whole organization. The studies have also pursued a general approach looking for factors influencing behavior and then using the findings to draw conclusion on organizational silence (Detert & Burris, 2019; Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2021; Morrison & Milliken, 2021; Premeaux & Bedeian, 2021). According to Morrison and Milliken. (2021), not much research on silence behavior has been done that is specific to different work groups. In addition, they claim that there is need for more fine analysis of voice behavior, probably on different individuals from different cultures.

Significance of study

This paper would be of great significance to modern day managers, considering that managers today pay more attention on team building and team effectiveness more than ever before. Managers today are concerned on how to get the best from every employee and also building team participation and getting the members to participate in decision making. Managers find it more difficult to deal with silent team members than members that are outspoken, so this work will provide insight into how modern-day managers can deal with the issues of organizational silence among members of their organization.The paperwill also be of great benefit to policy makers and organizational structure designers, Human resource managers especially in the banking industry. It would provide a guideline on how to fit employees in teams and how best to ensure their involvement and participation in organizational decision making.This paper will also be of great significance to the body of

knowledge in management especially as it regards organizational silence and team effectiveness in the banking industry. This paper establishes a relationship between the two variables, organizational silence and team effectiveness. It also looks at the effect of the moderating variable, organizational structure and design.The paperserves as a benefit to future researchers who will be carrying out studies in the area of organizational silence and team effectiveness as it will serve as a reference point.

Review of Literature

Organizational Silence

Organizational Silence denotes circumstances where employees hold back potentially valuable information from the organization of which they are a part. Van Dyne et al. (2021) describes silence as an employee's incentive to hold back or articulate proposals, information and views regarding work-associated developments. Silence is a communicative option that employees may choose to assume. Tangirala and Ramanujam (2018) asserts that the silence could be deliberate or unintended; information can be consciously held back by employees. Organizational silence involves a collective belief among employees that speaking up is imprudent. Employees learn that when they disclose information about subjects or difficulties, the organization garners all the advantages while they bear the costs. The employees are unwilling to talk about the issues that can be understood erroneously by the managers and perceived as a threat. Nevertheless, as Milliken (2000) observes they are not oblivious of the problems and they converse about it among themselves when they are alone only, they are unable to speak the truth to their supervisors and they feel obliged to stay silent. Organizational silence is not an individual behaviour; it is multiplied all over the organization. In reality it involves a broad-spectrum mind-set of employees; still, it has consequences for new organization members. Talking is discarded by employees due to precedence of negative incidents by those who have been in the organization for many years. New entrants follow the instance of the experienced employees and decide to stay silent to avoid damage. Aktan (2006) observes that employees suppose that there is no prospect of change in the unwanted organizational situations and consequently repudiate taking action; lose their self-assurance and suffer inadequacy and powerlessness. Aylsworth (2008) affirms that instead of defiance, they concede and normalize the unwanted organizational conditions. Van Dyne et al. (2021) introduced three types of silence as - acquiescent silence, defensive silence, and pro-social silence. Acquiescent Silence involves keeping back important ideas, information, or opinions, because of resignation. It implies disengaged behaviour that is more passive than active and is motivated by resignation, obedience and accent to anything.

Defensive Silence is holding back important ideas, information, or opinions as a method of self- protection, arising from fear. It is deliberate and practical behaviour aimed at self-protection from external threats. Van Dyne, et al. (2021) observes that contrary to Acquiescent Silence, it is more hands-on and entails consciousness and reflection of choices, added to a cognizant resolution to hold back ideas, information, and opinions as the best personal plan at the moment. Pinder and Harlos (2021) refer to quiescent silence as deliberate omission based on personal fear of the consequences of speaking up. It is motivated by self-

protection. Pro-social Silence entails withholding work-related ideas, information, or opinions with the aim of profiting other people or the organization arising from altruism or cooperative motives. Van Dyne, et al. (2021) affirms that it is optional behaviour based on consciousness and reflection on choices and the cognizant resolution to withhold ideas, information, and opinions. It is motivated by concern for others, being interested in others and creating opportunities for collaboration.

Reasons for Organizational Silence

There are several explanations for the start of employee silence in an organization some of which are individual and institutional reasons. While individual reasons have to do with personality traits, institutional attributes are fashioned in agreement with the value of associations initiated inside the institution. Van Dyn et al. (2021) asserts that the employees in the organizational silence climate work place have either personal or shared opinions which could be advantageous for the organization but they choose to remain silent, or believe they are constrained to stay silent rather than articulating them. The choice of remaining silent by most organization members, as regards organizational issues, may modify silence into a collective behaviour. A significant basis for employee silence in the organization involves the social culture. A culture of injustice in organizations, (whether distributive, procedural, or interaction), could result in organizational silence. Where the organizational model is characterized by an unjust environment for instance involving extreme managerial control, conflict repression, unclear reporting arrangements, and badly executed performance assessments, employees will prefer not to exercise voice and will consequently loose the advantages obtainable to those that articulate views and thoughts.

The behaviour of managers can also be a predictor of organizational silence. Managers convey by their words and actions, indications that employees construe as reasons to shun or even dread speaking up. The silencing actions of managers are entrenched in convictions they hold about employees and the nature of management. Both Morrison (2000) and Milliken (2000) observe that the managers are inclined to shun any information that may imply limitations on their part. The dread of getting negative feedback from subordinates who they describe as dishonest and egocentric, compel managers to build a climate of silence. Milliken (2021) categorizes three of the tacit convictions managers embrace that can result in silence: employees are self-involved and dishonest; top management as opposed to employees, constantly have superior knowledge regarding subjects of organizational significance and divergence and opposition must be shunned since unison, conformity, and accord are indications of organizational health. These convictions are visible in behaviours and develop into self-accomplishing forecasts. Managers either deliberately or inadvertently behave in manners that put off employees from approaching them with insightful information where they consider that employees are self-engrossed and unreliable. Employees who experience exclusion from the decision-making procedure and are incapable of articulating their outlooks could react not only by developing reduced confidence in their managers but also having reduced organization loyalty. Employees, who oppose the climate, are perceived as trouble makers by the management and have to face the consequences of not keeping silent such as getting fired. Donaghey, et al., (2022) suggests that the turnover rate of talking people is

more than the silent ones therefore to defend the position in work life and to evade negative consequences of speaking up, the employees maintain the silent. A palpable basis of employee silence is regular pessimistic response from managers. Employee silence develops in an organization when managers shoot down proposals offered by employees. Eventually employees begin to believe that whenever they offer a suggestion it will either not be considered or will be rebuffed; these consequences in dissenting voice, which adds to employee silence.

Consequences of Organization Silence

Employee silence has tremendous damaging effects both on the employees and the organizations. At the organizational level, Donaghey et al (2022) affirms that it frequently results in soaring degrees of dissatisfaction among employees, which is evidenced by absenteeism and turnover and possibly other unwanted behaviours. Organizations sustain financial looses and also perform badly because of apathetic employees, however, managers are inclined to respond to the discovery of key financial losses in organizations, by attempting to recuperate from the loss, neglecting the reality that employees have grown to be apathetic due to not tackling employee silence. Maki-Penttila (2021) observes that employee silence kills originality and propagates badly planned schemes that result in flawed products, low morale and a damaged bottom line. Communication is significant in organization accomplishment and where employee silence arises; communication suffers and consequently the general functioning of the organization is hurt. Joinson (2018) identifies negative effects of employee silence like financial losses to the organization and adds that invariably, silence within organizations results in several employees being extremely apathetic to their jobs, employers and quality of work. Employees are also affected by the silence. Employees sometimes develop stress depression and other health problems. Again, employee silence impinges on the personal happiness of employees, and makes them to encounter psychological challenges, and inability to see the prospect of change.

Breaking the silence

Organizations must reduce employee silence and increase employee commitment by ensuring that managers work hard to neutralize the natural human inclination to shun negative feedback and the messenger must not be shot. Also they must develop an open and trusting climate while engaging new top managers with established testimonies of working in the open. Moreover, employees that come forward with sensitive or risky information must be rewarded and formal systems where willing employees can articulate their opinions anonymously should be built. Ewing (1977) observes that managers need to build a secure place for employees to voice their worries devoid of experiences of coercion or intimidation from either internal or external situations. Furthermore, the need arises for employees to have elevated levels of satisfaction to facilitate confident identification with their organization. Tangirala and Ramanujam (2018) advocates the boosting of organizational satisfaction in the minds of the employees. In addition, managers can boost employee satisfaction in their occupations by giving productive responses on assignment completion and engaging in regular training to constantly improve performance. Employees must perceive that their

inputs are significant, and that their work is important arising from which, they will develop into dynamic team members and articulate their apprehensions unreservedly and without fright. This will make them have more confident identities with their organizations, consequently taking the whole thought of employee identity, communication and job satisfaction full circle.

Team Effectiveness

Over the last forty years, teams have come to be considered as a central element in the functioning of organizations. This has been facilitated, at least partly, by a series of studies reporting the positive relations between team-based working and the quality of products and services offered by an organization (Gibson, Porath, Benson & Lawler, 2020). However, it has been the pressures deriving from the need to develop new business models in dynamic, uncertain and complex environments and the need for innovation that have led to a demand to adapt work structures traditionally revolving around individuals and to adopt organizational designs geared to change and based on teams (Lawler & Worley, 2006; West & Markiewicz, 2020). And indeed, this trend has been observed in all types of employment context, both private and public, including in the military (Kozlowski & Ilgen, 2006).

Teams provide diversity in knowledge, attitudes, skills and experience, whose integration makes it possible to offer rapid, flexible and innovative responses to problems and challenges, promoting performance and improving the satisfaction of those making up the team. This is the result of what has been called the wisdom of crowds: increased capacity for achieving various types of performance made possible by the interaction of team members (Salas, Rosen, Burke & Goodwin, 2009). Thus, the success of organizations and the overall production of knowledge depend to a large extent on the effectiveness of teams (Wuchty, Jones & Uzzi, 2007).

However, teams do not always act in this way, and sometimes fail to achieve the high performance expected of them (Sims, Salas & Burke, 2020). In fact, everyday experience tells us that in many cases teams, far from being mechanisms for capitalizing effectively and satisfactorily on collective effort, turn into black holes that relentlessly consume the physical, mental and emotional energies of their members. This tends to involve their wasting a great deal of effort to attain their goals – if indeed those goals are even met at all. Therefore, the challenge for research and intervention involves the effective integration of the contributions of qualified and expert people which can provide added value to the organization. Nor must we overlook the important role of the design of the organizational context in which teams exist, which should facilitate the creation of structures and lines of support, communication, consultation, feedbacks and rewards that complement the internal functioning of the team (Aritzeta & Alcover, 2006; Hackman and Wageman, 2005).

Theoretical Review

Homans View of Social Structure

Homans' View of Social Structure Homans' (1961, 1964) primary purpose was the study of the "sub institutional" or "elementary" forms of behavior. Homans developed a theory of social behavior based primarily upon behavioral principles of analysis. He took as the domain of his explanatory framework (1961), "the actual social behavior of individuals in direct contact with one another." He refers to this behavior as elementary and clearly distinguishes it from behavior that can be defined as obedience to the norms of a society (including role-related behavior). Role-conforming behavior was institutionalized behavior, thus actual behavior was defined by Homans as sub institutional. For Homans, social structures emerge from elementary forms of behavior and change over time in response to changes in this behavior by aggregates. (He does not address in any detail the complex interplay between micro level processes and aggregate level outcomes.) He argued that the similar behaviors of enough people can alter existing social structures and institutions and even, under some conditions, replace them. "Sometimes the great rebellions and revolutions, cracking the institutional crust, bring out elementary social behavior hot and straight from the fissures" (Homans 1961). His analysis of social behavior endures as a classic in sociology precisely because his vision of the underpinnings of social structure and institutional forms is straight forward and is linked so clearly to the actions of individuals (i.e. to their responses to rewarding and punishing circumstances).

Blau's View of Social Structure.

While Homans' work is distinctly micro sociological in character, Blau's (1964) major treatise on exchange and power is an explicit statement of the micro-macro linkage problem, before micro-macro issues became a fashion-able topic in sociology in the 1980s (e.g. Alexander, Giesen, Munch, & Smelser 1987, Collins 1981, Cook & Shawn 2018, Huber 2021, etc). Blau's focus was the development of a theory of social structure and institutions based upon a sound micro foundation, a theory of social exchange. Two major features differentiate Blau's work from that of Homans. First, Blau did not base his theory of exchange upon behavioral principles; instead he introduced aspects of micro-economic reasoning into his analysis of distinctly social exchange. Second, recognizing that social structures have emergent properties, he ex-tended the theory beyond sub institutional phenomena.

Blau discusses processes like group formation, cohesion, social integration, opposition, conflict, and dissolution in terms of principles of social exchange. In his view various forms of social association generated by exchange processes over time come to constitute quite complex social structures (and substructures). The coordination of action in large collectivities is made possible by common values in the social system which mediates the necessary indirect exchanges. Thus, Blau's theory moves far beyond direct contact between individual actors, incorporating complex indirect exchange processes. Structural change in both small and large social structures is analyzed in terms of social forces like differentiation, integration, organization, and opposition. Blau and, subsequently, Emerson (1972a) both made power processes central to their analysis of the emergence of social structures and structural change.

Self-determination Theory

The various conceptual models within traditional humanistic psychology share a central tenet: the fundamental value of the actualization of human potential. Both Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers (Maslow, 1968; Rogers, 1961) developed optimistic theories that underscore the capacities, opportunities, and innate trajectory of human beings toward personal growth and psychological well-being. Self-determination theory (SDT), developed more recently, has refined and advanced the optimistic perspective of traditional humanistic psychology by placing importance on the centrality of the self as a causal agent in human functioning. It stands in sharp contrast with deterministic and reductionist paradigms favored by contemporary psychological science, such as applied behavior analysis and cognitive neuroscience (Sheldon, Joiner, Pettit, & Williams, 2021). However, research has shown that a positive life orientation in the absence of tangible accomplishment is linked to negative psychological, interpersonal, and real-world outcomes. This paradox has been described in the literature as the tendency in contemporary society to emphasize positive illusions. Positive illusions appear to make life more satisfying in the short term, but in fact lead to negative consequences in the long run (Schneider, 2020). For example, the emphasis on cultivating self-esteem in students in educational settings, which originated with the broader self-esteem movement (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2021) must be accompanied by real academic growth grounded in real academic achievement for psychologically beneficial outcomes to unfold. Of course, positive illusions can produce a sense of well-being in educational settings, but as Viktor Frankl (1969) noted, genuine and lasting well-being is the result of a "life well-lived". Thus, without real accomplishments there can be no eudaimonic well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2021).

Empirical Review

Owur, (2020) The general objective of this study was to determine organizational silence factors which affect the effectiveness of organizations in Kenya. This study used a descriptive research design to build a profile of organizational silence in Kenya. It used stratified random sampling to study 92 respondents out of the 1617 employees at Safaricom Call Center (SCC). Primary data was collected using a questionnaire. A detailed research procedure was then used to ensure credibility and accuracy of data obtained. On the effects of silence on employees, the study found that most employees were not interested in their jobs and neither did they trust organization as much as they did when they joined it. The study concluded that organizational silence was caused by the management beliefs as well as the organizational structure and culture.

Fapohunda, (2019) studied organizational silence: predictors and consequences among university academic staff Dominant forces in many organizations originate pervasive withholding of information on prospective problems or issues by employees. This study examines the major determinants and consequences of employee silence and offers ideas to surmount it. The sample was 321 academic staff of three universities in Lagos. Nigeria. The study found that most of the respondents had been in situations where they exhibited silence which covered different organizational issues and the most repeatedly cited motivations were

administrative beliefs, organizational practices and the fear of being labelled negatively, and subsequently damaging esteemed relationships. There was a significant relationship between organizational silence and emotional exhaustion; employee job dissatisfaction and apathy. However, the relationship between organizational silence and decreased individual achievement was not significant.

Uğur & Tarık (2019) investigated the relationship between organizational silence and burnout among academicians in Universities in Turkey. The aim of this research is to analyze the relationship between organizational silence and burnout levels of academicians. The study group consisted of 190 academicians, who work in 17 state universities that are located in 15 different provinces of Turkey. Data were collected through Causes of Faculty Members' Silence Scale and Maslach Burnout Inventory. The results of the study indicate that silence levels of academicians are medium and burnout levels are low. A positive correlation was identified between organizational silence and burnout levels. Multiple linear regression analysis demonstrates that silence scores were predicting emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. In order to reduce burnout to a minimum level in academy, university managers are offered to establish a culture, where academicians are allowed to express their opinions freely.

Methodology

Survey design was adopted for its descriptive nature, causal relations, and power to draw inferences from particular to general through the use of statistical control and appropriate test statistic.For this study, the population defines management and subordinate staff of deposit money banks in Bayelsa state. More specifically, we shall focus on staff with full employment in deposit money banks in Bayelsa state. Preliminary investigation shows that a total of four hundred and forty-one (441) management and subordinate staff are in the eighteen (17) deposit money banks. However, in recognition of the difficulty of studying all the banks, the researcher shall study a manageable sample size from the target population of selected banks. Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that involves the subjective selection of the sampling units based on the researcher's perceived feelings that they are true representatives of the population. Taking into accounts the different sizes of the firms, Bowley's formula was used to proportionately allocate the 302 cases to the 18 deposit money banks.

Methods of Data Analysis

This describes the statistical tools utilized in the analyses and interpretation of the questionnaire as regards the hypotheses. The Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient shall be employed to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaire. This choice is premised on the transformation of scales from ordinal (manifest properties) to interval (latent constructs) thus enabling the researcher examine the relationship between the dimensions of organizational silence (acquiescence and self-defense) and team effectiveness (collaboration, creativity and productivity). All Statistical analysis shall be carried out with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22.

Decision Criteria: for Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient is:

Reject null hypothesis if probability value (PV) is significant

Fail to reject null hypothesis if probability value (PV) is insignificant

Criteria	Decision
PV < 0.05	Reject the null hypothesis
PV ≥ 0.05	Accept the null hypothesis

The **Step-wise Regression Model** shall be employed in the test for the moderating effect of the contextual variable which is organizational culture on the relationship between organizational silence and team effectiveness.

Decision Criteria: for the step-wise regression model the decision is:

Reject null hypothesis if correlation coefficient of indirect effect is less than actual correlation coefficient of direct effect of the variables at a significant level of 0.05

Therefore, accept null hypothesis if regression correlation coefficient of R_2 is bigger or equals correlation coefficient of R_1 of the variables at a significant level.

Criteria	Decision
$R_1 > R_2$ at a $P < 0.05$	Reject the null hypothesis
$R_1 \leq R_2$ at a $P < 0.05$	Accept the null hypothesis

Results and Discussion

The population for the study targeted all bank employees in accessible bank in Port Harcourt, Bayelsa state. 302 questionnaires were distributed based on the estimated sample population, out of which, 302 (100.00%) copies were successfully retrieved; thereafter, the retrieved copies were examined for errors, missing data, blank questionnaire and double entries. After the cleaning process, only 300 (99.34%) of the questionnaire copies were considered useful and valid for inclusion in the study, while 2 questionnaires (0.66%) were observed to be invalidly filled.

Test of Hypotheses

A total of seven hypothesized bivariate associations were postulated in the study; all stated in the null form of no association. Data in this section is analyzed using the spearman rank order correlation coefficient at a 95% confidence interval. Analysis is based on a significant criterion of 0.05 for the acceptance ($p > 0.05$) or rejection ($p < 0.05$) of the null hypotheses.

Relationship between acquiescence and self-defense on collaboration.

Table 4.1: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.945	.270		3.498	.001
	Acquiescence	-.411	.031	-.364	-13.397	.000
	Self-defense	-.560	.024	-.638	-23.460	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Collaboration

From the underlying analysis the study observes that, acquiescence as a dimension of organizational silence shows a negative and significant relationship with the collaboration of employees. This shows that an increase in acquiescence of employees would lead to a corresponding decrease in the workplace collaboration of employees. Collaboration involves participants working together on the same task, rather than in parallel on separate portions of the task. Therefore, negative acquiescence affects interactivity. Another marker of true collaboration is the quality of interactions, especially the degree of interactivity and negotiability (Dillenbourg, 2019). Interactivity refers to the extent to which interactions influence participants' thinking. This finding goes in line with other literature (e.g., Javeline, 2019; Johnson, Shavitt, & Holbrook, 2011) who observed a negative relationship between acquiescence and collaboration.

Self-defense displays a negative and significant relationship with the collaboration of employees. This shows that, when leaders display acquiescence, this leads to lower workplace collaboration of employees. Gephart-Kish et al. (2010) suggested that defensive silence should be categorized with regard to the level of fear experienced by the employee (low-high) and to the amount of time employee has to take action (short-long). This is the result of what has been called the wisdom of crowds: increased capacity for achieving various types of performance made possible by the interaction of team members (Salas, Rosen, Burke & Goodwin, 2022). Thus, the success of organizations and the overall production of knowledge depend to a large extent on the effectiveness of teams (Wuchty, Jones & Uzzi, 2019). This finding results from employee fears. For example, an employee may experience a low level of fear when he reflects on going to talk to the boss about suggestions for improvement. In this situation, the employee has time enough to deliberately and consciously determine the costs and benefits of speaking up (in case he wants to), to consult others and to evaluate different strategies instead of speaking up (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010). This therefore affects their collaboration. For example, for an individual who developed fear of talking openly to his leader due to a past negative experience, he is unlikely to check again if there are still threats by speaking up (contributing, that way, for the climate of silence).

Relationship between acquiescence and self-defense oncreativity.

Table 4.50: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	6.920	.259		26.709	.000
1	Acquiescence	-.145	.029	-.148	-4.918	.000
	Self-defense	-.637	.023	-.838	-27.867	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Creativity

Acquiescence shows a negative but significant relationship with the creativity of employees. This shows that an increase in acquiescence of employees would stimulate and lead to a corresponding increase in the workplace creativity of employees. When employees or teams are in silence they tend not act in ways that will favor the organization, and sometimes fail to achieve the high performance expected of them (Sims, Salas & Burke, 2019). In fact, everyday experience tells us that in many cases teams, far from being mechanisms for capitalizing effectively and satisfactorily on collective effort, turn into black holes that relentlessly consume the physical, mental and emotional energies of their members. This tends to involve their wasting a great deal of effort to attain their goals – if indeed those goals are even met at all. This therefore accounts for the negative relationship observed here. This finding coincides with the review by Cannon-Bowers, Tannenbaum, Salas and Volpe (2015), more recently, Salas, Stagl, Burke and Goodwin (2019).

Self-defense displays a negative and significant relationship with the creativity of employees. This shows that, when leaders display acquiescence, this leads to lower workplace creativity of employees. For example, an employee can show other-oriented behavior and cooperation by preserving proprietary knowledge for the benefit of the organization. That is, an employee can have an opinion regarding to an important decision and not be in a position of discussing it with other individuals (Van Dyne et al., 2021). Such employee therefore suppress creativity (Brinsfield, 2022; 2019).

Relationship between acquiescence and self-defense on productivity.

Table 4.51: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	11.082	.368		30.130	.000
	Acquiescence	-.181	.042	-.188	-4.344	.000
	Self-defense	-.828	.032	-1.106	-25.494	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Productivity

Acquiescence shows a negative and significant relationship with the productivity of employees. This shows that an increase in acquiescence of employees would reduce and lead to a corresponding decrease in the workplace productivity of employees. Acquiescence is an indicator of the lack of organizational support manager support and preparedness. It can be identified that; Lack of organizational support is well aligned with lower levels of perceived organizational support, as would be expected, and with lower levels of manager creative-supportive behavior. Conversely, this interrupter was not nearly as well aligned with lower levels of all the employee creativity characteristics: creative self-identity, creativity self-expectations, creative self-efficacy, and creative work involvement. Lack of manager support to prepare the employee to do creative work is well aligned with lower levels of both manager factors of expectations for creative work and creativity-supportive behavior. Lack of

preparation to overcome creativity was similarly aligned with all the factors in the model, but only at very minimal levels. Lack of skill to complete creative tasks is moderately well aligned with lower levels of creative self-identity, self-expectations for creative work, creative self-efficacy, creative work involvement and future creativity engagement. This findings tallies with those of previous literature that have clearly discussed the downside of employee productivity such as Sharma and Bhat (2020) and Morales et al., (2024).

Self-defense displays a negative and significant relationship with the productivity of employees. This shows that, when leaders display acquiescence, this leads to lower workplace productivity of employees. Piaget, 1975 cited in Greene & Kamimura, (2021) hinted a negative relationship after they observed that self-defense might positively influence social behaviors, the quality of interpersonal relationships, and it might also assist individuals in coping with challenges in establishing and maintaining relationships but fail if improperly deployed or manage. This is possible when considered from the deviant silence perspective. According to Rego (2019) in deviant silence employees remain silent in order to lead their superiors or colleagues to decide wrong. Employees' adoption of deviant behaviors is a common problem in organizations and can be categorized into two categories: constructive deviant behaviors or destructive deviant behaviors. Besides deviant silence, theft, workplace aggression and sabotage are included in destructive deviant behaviors and the aim of them is to hurt the organization and its members (Ahmad & Omar, 2020).

Conclusion and Recommendations

The results of this study support the assertion that each of the organizational silence factors in play important roles in affecting employee and team creativity and that the model effectively describes how the factors interrelate. The findings of the study reveal that the model fully describe the creativity process and should be enhanced to re-characterize the cycle of sustainability due to the identified negative relationship between employed variables. The study recommends thatemployees perceive organizational support matters a great deal to sustaining creativity. When employees believe it is present, they not only believe they will be creative, but they believe their manager will support them and they will reengage creatively after they are interrupted. When there is a lack of support for creativity, they are more inclined to be interrupted creatively. Therefore, organizations need to ensure that both managers and employees have the necessary support to be creative and understand how to use it in their particular job situation. More also, managers of firms should put in place meaningful and consistent organizational support for creativity. Just saying that you think it is important is not enough. It needs to be visible, tangible, and culturally relevant to each employee in each part of the organization; e.g., the R&D department needs one type of support and operations need another, but both need to feel like their leaders will prioritize creative work and give them the right tools, resources and environment to be successful creatively.

References

Afşar, D. (2021). *Politics of housing in Hisarüstü: Intergenerational encounters in an İstanbul locality* (Doctoral dissertation).

Aylsworth, J. (2008). Change in the workplace: Organizational silence can be dangerous. Organisational Psychology Examiner,www.examiner.com.

Bagheri, G., Zarei, R., & Aeen, M. N. (2021). Organizational silence: Basic concepts and its development factors. *Ideal Type of Management*, 1(1), 47-58.

Bowen, F., & Blackmon, K. (2021). Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1393-1417.

Byars, L.L. & Rue, L.W. (2006). Human Resource Management (8 Ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill.

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2019). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (4) 225-241.

Donaghey, J., Cullinane, N., Dundon, T., Dobbins, T., & Hickland, E. (2022). Employee choice of voice and non-union worker representation. *Industrial Relations Journal*, *53*(6), 503-522.

Durak, İ. (2020). Relationships between organizational silence and demographics, institutional factors: a study on academic staff]. *Atatürk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 28(2), 89-108.

Fapohunda, O. (2019). *Strategies for Mitigating Employee Turnover in the Nigerian Financial Services Industry* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).

Gibson, C. B., Porath, C. L., Benson, G. S., & Lawler III, E. E. (2007). What results when firms implement practices: The differential relationship between specific practices, firm financial performance, customer service, and quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(6), 1467.

Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2005). A theory of team coaching. *Academy of management review*, *30*(2), 269-287.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The Management of Cross-Functional Groups and Project Teams. *Harvard Business Review*, *17*.

Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1037/ a0017103

Kozlowski, S. W., & Ilgen, D. R. (2006). Enhancing the effectiveness of work groups and teams. *Psychological science in the public interest*, *7*(3), 77-124.

Mäki-Penttilä, S. (2021). Writer's silence and writing among silence. *Scriptum: Creative Writing Research Journal*, (1).

Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2021). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of management studies*, 40(6),1453-1476.

Morales-García, W. C., Vallejos, M., Sairitupa-Sanchez, L. Z., Morales-García, S. B., Rivera-Lozada, O., & Morales-García, M. (2024). Depression, professional self-efficacy, and job performance as predictors of life satisfaction: the mediating role of work engagement in nurses. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *12*, 1268336.

Morrison, E. W. (2020). Employee voice and silence. *The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* 1(1),173-197.

Morrison, E.W., & Milliken, F.J. (2021). Speaking up, remaining silent: the dynamics of voice and silence in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1353-1358.

Omar, A. T., & Ahmad, U. N. U. (2020). The role of toxic leadership and perceived organizational support on academic staff's psychological distress. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *10*(12), 958-980.

Park, C., & Keil, M. (2022). Organizational silence and whistle-blowing on IT projects: An integrated model. *Decision Sciences*, 40(4), 901-918.

Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2021). Employee silence: quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331-370.

Premeaux, S.F., & Bedeian, A.G. (2021). Breaking the silence: The moderating effects of self-monitoring in predicting speaking up in the workplace. *Journal of Management Studies,* 40(6), 1537-1562.

Rego, A., (2013). Comunicação Pessoal e Organizacional - Teoria e Prática. 3rd edition, Portugal: Edições Sílabo.

Salas E., Rosen M., Burke S., Goodwin G. (2009). The wisdom of collectives in organizations: An update of team competencies. In Salas E., Goodwin G., Burke S. (Eds.), *Team effectiveness in complex organizations* (pp. 39–79). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Salas, E., Sims, D. E., & Burke, C. S. (2005). Is there a "big five" in teamwork?. *Small group research*, *36*(5), 555-599.

Sharma, V., & Bhat, D. A. R. (2020). An empirical study exploring the relationship among human capital innovation, service innovation, competitive advantage and employee productivity in hospitality services. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *9*(2), 1-14.

Sims, D. E., Salas, E., Burke, C. S., & Wheelan, S. A. (2005). Promoting effective team performance through training. *The handbook of group research and practice*, 407-425.

Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2018). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(1), 37-68.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Botero, I. C. (2021). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6),1359-1392.

Worley, C. G., & Lawler III, E. E. (2006). Designing Organizations as if Change Matters. *Center for Effective Organizations University of Southern California Marshall School of Business*.

Wuchty, S., Jones, B. F., & Uzzi, B. (2007). The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science*, *316*(5827), 1036-1039.

Yilmaz, F. K., Ugur, T. N. N., & Rese, M. (2019). A comparative study of the Turkish and German health care systems with regard to quality management in psychiatric hospitals. *International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences (IJMESS)*, *8*(3), 223-241