Reasons for Employee Silence Behavior: Developing and Validating a Scale for Nurses

Ali Murat ALPARSLAN[*]
Ali CAN[**]
Ramazan ERDEM[***]

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop a scale that aims at revealing and measuring the reasons for the silence of nurses regarding the improvements and faults in the workplaces. The data was obtained via two field research and two focus group discussion. Through field research conducted among 117 nurses and 2-focus group discussion 38 reasons for remaining silent have been obtained. The scale developed during the 2nd field research was conducted among 265 nurses. As a result of the researches, a scale including 5 dimensions and 26 items has been developed. The dimensions are as follows: "lack of confidence in senior management", "fear of the senior management's reaction", "getting along with co-workers", "tendency towards prosocial behavior" and "meek personality". While the explained variance of the scale is 67%, the reliability of the whole scale is 0.93, and the reliability of each dimension is over (above) 0.85 except the meek personality dimension (0.67). The validity of the scale "has been verified statistically. Besides, the statistical relations –that are in accordance with the literature- regarding the determined criteria (the perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and the intention to quit the job) have been identified. In this sense, the scale developed particularly for nurse sample will contribute significantly to academic researchers and researches.

Keywords: Organizational Silence, Employee Silence Behavior, Nursing, Developing Scale

Çalışan Sessizlik Davranışının Nedenleri: Hemşireler için Bir Ölçek Geliştirme ve Geçerlilik Çalışması

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı; hemşirelerin çalıştıkları işyerlerinde iyileştirmeler ve aksaklıklara ilişkin sessiz kalma nedenlerini ortaya çıkaran ve ölçen bir ölçek geliştirmek üzerinedir. Veriler iki farklı saha araştırması ve 2 odak grup çalışmasından elde edilmiştir. 117 hemşire ile yapılan saha araştırması ve 2 odak grup çalışmasından araştırmada 38 sessiz kalma nedeni elde edilmiştir. İkinci saha araştırmasında oluşan ölçek 265 hemşire üzerinde uygulanmıştır. Araştırmaların sonucunda 5 boyuttan ve 26 maddeden oluşan bir ölçek geliştirilmiştir. Boyutlar; "üst yönetime güven eksikliği", "üst yönetimin tepkisinden korku", "iş arkadaşları ile geçinmek", "prososyal davranış eğilimi" ve "uysal kişilik" adları altında oluşmuştur. Açıklanan varyans %67, ölçeğin güvenilirliği ise 0.93 iken, uysal kişilik boyutu (0.67) dışında her bir boyutun güvenilirliği 0.85'in üzerindedir. Hemşirelerin sessiz kalma nedenlerini ölçen ölçeğin geçerliliği istatistiki olarak sağlanmıştır. Bunun yanında, ilgili literatüre uygun olarak belirlenen kriter değişkenler (algılanan örgütsel destek, iş tatmini, işten ayrılma niyeti) arasındaki istatistiki ilişkiler de saptanmıştır. Bu bağlamda hemşire örneklemi için oluşturulan bu ölçek akademik araştırmacılara ve araştırmalara önemli bir katkı sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Sessizlik, Çalışan Sessizlik Davranışları, Hemşirelik, Ölçek Geliştirme

[*]*Assist. Professor, PhD. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversity, Health Management Departmant, alimurat@mehmetakif.edu.tr*
[**] *Assist. Professor, PhD. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversity, Business Management, alican@mehmetakif.edu.tr*
[***] *Professsor, PhD. Süleyman Demirel Üniversity, Health Management Departmant, ramazanerdem@sdu.edu.tr*

I. INTRODUCTION

The reluctance of employees to talk about their jobs is an obstacle before innovation and organizational change, and it exacerbates employees' stress and depressed feelings (Cortina Magley 2003; Argyris, Schön 1978; Morrison Milliken, 2000). With silence turning into an ingrained belief, employees consider themselves worthless, and cognitive contradictions emerge between what they do and what they think; and thus, job satisfaction, fidelity and motivation are affected adversely (Morrison Milliken, 2000). Also, cynicism towards the organization may emerge in such cases (Beer Eisenstat 2000; Nartgün Kartal 2013). Like a vicious circle, the employee who finds himself/herself in cynicism and whose fidelity has weakened grows more indifferent towards his/her organization, and s/he continues to remain silent (Donaghey et al 2011). The research carried out in relevant literature reveals that the foremost reasons for silence behavior are the fear of the following: being labelled and perceived as an agitator, the harming of relationships with other people, retaliation and punishment, conflicting with others and being isolated by others. Also, although the employees do not want to remain silent, they do so because they think that what they say will not mean anything and will not make a difference because of the administrative factors (Milliken et al. 2003, Vakola, Bouradas, 2005; Brinsfield 2013; Gephart et al. 2009). The most basic reason underlying these reasons is regarded as lack of confidence. Research reveals that the employee's lack of confidence in his/her organization, leader and his/her immediate superior lead to organizational silence (Nikolaou et al. 2011; Çakıcı 2008).

In addition to the researches mentioned above, there are studies that put forward that there may be reasons for remaining silent that are peculiar to the Turkish society. For instance, in our country many people may prefer to remain silent because they give importance to being accepted and appreciated by society. In favor of this view, the Turkish idiom "speak out of both sides of your mouth", which means to talk out of both sides of your mouth to satisfy people may be put forward as a cultural support to reach such a conclusion. Moreover, in Turkish society, which has a communitarian culture where the gap between people and the dominant power is wide, the view that "The people in charge know it all, they are absolutely right." is the dominant view among people (Çakıcı 2007). Such Turkish proverbs that literally mean "The early cock gets his head cut off", "Alas, my tongue, into pieces I'll chop you, for the troubles that afflict me are all because of you", "The tongue says and hides, the mind suffers and fights" are manifestations which reveal that silence may be suggested as a cultural norm (Eroğlu et al. 2011). Therefore, the Turkish idiom "keep one's nose clean", which roughly means to keep your nose clean, can be seen as an idiom related to the reason for remaining silent. As far as the research found in the Turkish literature is considered, in one research conducted among academicians, the reasons for remaining silent are explained as follows: maintaining the status quo, the reluctance to risk the academic expectations, supporting the administration and fidelity to the organization (Demir, Demir, 2012). In the study conducted by Arlı (2003), the reasons for silence are explained as being related to personal factors, the characteristics of the managers, the organizational climate and environmental factors. In a research carried out by Bildik (2009), the reasons for silence are listed as follows: lack of confidence in managers, lack of experience, considering that speaking out is risky, fear of isolation and fear of harming relationships.

It is highly probable that there are reasons for remaining silent that are peculiar to every occupation. Thus, this study hereby identified particularly the nurses who serve in state hospitals as samples. It is the purpose of this study to discover the reasons for silence behavior in this occupation and to develop a scale that aims at measuring these reasons. Providing the literature -which lacks a specific scale in the recently studied case of silence behavior particularly within the context of nurses- with a measuring tool whose validity and reliability have been verified statistically, will serve as a valuable contribution. So this study

aims to reveal the causes of nurses remain silent in the workplace, but also work to developing a scale for measuring reasons for which they were more experienced. Thus, this measurement contribute to research which intended to demonstrate the negative consequences caused by the silence and antecedents of silence.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE AND THE SILENCE BEHAVIOR OF EMPLOYEES

Today many researchers assert that the information and different viewpoints that come from the bottom of an organization in a hierarchical structure are quite important for the sustainability of the organization (Morrison, Milliken 2000). The voice of the employee may lead to contributive changes in the decisions and the output of the organization. This contribution has an effect on the motivation of the employee, as well (Mcfarlin, Sweeney 1996). This initiative should be regarded as important building blocks of change as long as it does not include a critical and destructive intention against change in an atmosphere of inertia (Brinsfield 2009). Particularly, both the appliers and researchers have stated that the contributions that are expressed "voluntarily" have great importance for practices in the workplace (Van Dyne et al. 1995).

Organizational silence -*which is defined as employees' deliberate withholding of their ideas, information and opinions about the improvement of their jobs and the organization which they work for*- is regarded as a collective phenomenon in literature. Employees' withholding their ideas and opinions regarding the organizational problems and organizational improvements, and the fact that this happens collectively are major obstacles before organizational change and improvement (Morrison, Milliken 2000; Dyne et al. 2003). The silence of the employee - which is a reflection of this collective phenomenon on individuals- means that people who have the capacity to change a negative situation hide and withhold their behaviorally, cognitively and emotionally truthful and genuine utterances regarding the improvements of the conditions of the organization (Pinder, Harlos 2001). Like a vicious circle, the organizational silence climate may contribute to the emergence and growing of silence behavior, and in turn, the increase in the silence behavior may lead to the strengthening of this climate and its evolvement into a culture (Noelle-Neumann 1991; Bowen, Blackmon 2003). At this point, another fact that should be highlighted is that – as many researchers who study the silence of employees have particularly stressed- the preference to remain silent is a proactive behavior rather than lack of communication (Van Dyne et al. 2003; Gephart et al. 2009; Pinder, Harlos 2001; Moll et al. 2013).

Silence behaviours have been studied in different dimensions. These dimensionalizations particularly stress the basic reasons for silence. First, Van Dyne et al (2003) have classified the silence behaviours as such: acquiescent silence (in this type of silence the employee accepts to remain passive), defensive silence (in this type, the employee wants to protect himself because he fears) and prosocial silence (collaborationist) (this type of silence is organization-oriented or "others-oriented") in the context of organizational citizenship behaviour. In his doctoral thesis research, Brinsfield (2013) puts forward a wider dimensionalization of silence behaviour as follows: deviant silence (silence as a deviant behaviour), relational silence, defensive silence, diffident silence, acquiescent silence (silence that stems from the perception that "there is no use in speaking out"), and "factor six" (silence that stems from indifference).

III. THE REASONS FOR SILENCE IN ORGANIZATIONS

There are many reasons for remaining silent in organizations that emerge from individual, organizational and cultural factors. When the research previously done on the reasons for

silence related to individual factors is scrutinized, first it can be observed that self-esteem of a person has a rather important and positive effect on the formation of his/her individual behaviors at the workplace (Le Pine, Dyne 1998). Individuals whose self-esteem is high make more effort to bring about a change. Individuals whose self-esteem is low have a self-protective tendency, and they abstain from behaviors that may cause them to find themselves in a defenceless state. They avoid presenting themselves and their ideas due to the risk that they perceive (Premeaux, Bedeian, 2003). The following has an influence on the employee's decision to remain or not to remain silent in the organization: the low self-esteem of the employee, his/her perceived communication fear and the negative situations that s/he thinks s/he may experience in case of establishing communication, and his/her perceived status in terms of authority and control (Brinsfield 2009). Undoubtedly, the employee's lack of experience and his/her low status are factors that hamper speaking out (Milliken et al. 2003). In addition, neurotic personality traits increase silence whereas being extroverted decreases silence (Brinsfield 2013). Besides these, emotional breakdown or pychological lethargy that a person may experience leads to indifference to the organization (Whiteside, Barclay 2013).

Employees who work at an environment where a culture of fear and intimidation prevails are forced to remain silent, and they seem reluctant to intervene in organizational policies and administrative powers. Employees –as an important group of stakeholders- know that their ideas will not be transmitted to the senior management. Particularly in public institutions the practices in the workplace are limited to the management of the senior management (Calpham, Cooper 2005). Some managers want to avoid negative feedback because they fear to be harmed or perceived as unsatisfactory. Thus, they may make an effort to create a climate that inhibits negative feedback that comes from their subordinates (Slade 2008). In that case, managers find a way to imply that they are uneasy when faced with people who have different opinions coming from their subordinates. These implications give rise to the fear of confrontation between the superior and the subordinate, and the subordinate prefers to remain silent and to express opinions parallel to those of his/her superior (Perlow, Williams 2003). The senior management of an organization cannot benefit from this diversity of its employees if it is not aware of the employees' different values, abilities, beliefs, characteristics and experience and if it evaluates things from only its own point of view and keeps its employees at bay (Morrison, Milliken 2000; Tangirala, Ramanujam 2008). Decisions made without negotiations and discussions are not transparent whatsoever (Calpham, Cooper 2005).

In the context of "the spiral of silence", people's willingness to explain their ideas or their preference of silence is not only affected by their individual characteristics. In addition to this, the perceived and obvious climate of ideas in the organization -"group thinking"- has an influence on the formation of opinions and ideas of the individual (Bowen, Blackmon 2003). Whereas this kind of group thinking sometimes serves in behalf of the company, at other times it turns into an authority that suppresses people (Wang 2011). Besides, the fact that organizational silence turns into a culture and an organizational climate and its being ingrained as a social norm leads to the emergence of people who know what is right but who do not express them. Employees remain silent since they think that they will be ineffective and that they will not cause any difference even if they speak out or that they may find themselves in a dangerous situation if they speak out, and their perceived confidence and support is low (Bowen, Blackmon 2003; Gephart et al. 2009; Morrison, Milliken 2000; Brinsfield 2013). The injustice that the employee feels (discrimination/favoritism), also, increases his/her silence based on indifference (Whiteside, Barclay; Cemaloğlu et al. 2014). In addition to these, the employee shares the ideas and opinions of the majority so that his/her social capital and position in the organization will not be harmed and in order not to be subjected to social isolation. This way of thinking prevents the person from expressing

his/her opinions frankly both on an individual basis and collectively (Bowen, Blackmon 2003).

Leadership practices also have an impact on silence and speaking out. Particularly transformational leadership approach decreases silence in a positive sense as it boosts the self-confidence of the employee (Wu et al. 2010). That is why the leadership type of the manager regarding his/her relationships is quite important. Particularly the competency of the section manager regarding relationships has a bigger impact on the employee output than the type of leadership does. This, in turn, shows that the communication established with employees and a climate of confidence have an impact on motivation at work (Madlock 2008). At this point, a high perceived level of organizational support will strengthen the climate of confidence, increase positive feedback and decrease harmful silence (Valentine et al. 2006; Wang, Hsieh 2013).

Research shows that employees' not remaining silent is possible only if they feel secure psychologically (Botero, Dyne 2009; Brinsfield 2013). The employee needs to get this feeling from especially his/her immediate superior because the immediate superior –the employee is directly in his/her sphere of influence- has a greater influence on the emergence of silence (Perkins 2014; Vakola, Bouradas 2005). Open, genuine, consistent and continual communication in the organization forms a climate of confidence, enables the emergence of different approaches to problems, different values and suggestions, and speeds up career development by enhancing work performance (Eby et al. 2000). Confidence influences the frequency and the duration of the communication between employees and managers and among employees themselves, and thus it contributes to the improvement of relationships (Ruppel, Harrington 2000; Perkins 2014; Dixon-Kheir 2001; Gao et al. 2011).

Cultural issues also plays an important role on the silence of workers. Because, cultural values have a big influence on communication. Particularly high power distance causes silence to be accepted as a cultural norm rather than a climate (Huang et al. 2005; Porter et al. 1980). In accordance with this, it is suggested that in a collectivist cultural structure acquiescent and prosocial silence may be greater and that acceptance due to the power of authority may be observed (Rhee et al. 2014; Hofstede, Bond 1988). For instance, in societies -such as Turkish society- where focus of control is relatively external, personal characteristics tend to be as follows: being external control-oriented (fatalist), a high level of competence in adapting oneself, and a low self-confidence and a low ability to establish good communication (Çakıcı 2007).

Silence may also be considered in close association with elements of ethics and virtue such as modesty, respect for others and common sense. Silence in social relationships is defined as avoiding inconvenience, trouble and problems that one will inevitably face in case of verbal communication (Nakane 2006).

The survey conducted in the context of Turkish literature, some of the reasons why nurses that they remain silent has been identified. Tayfun and Çatır (2013)'s research on nurses reveal that defensive silence and acquiescent silence decrease job performance. Also, a study conducted among nurses; fear, lack of experience, fear of isolation and fear of undermining relations have come to the highlight reasons among the reasons of silence (Yalçın, Baykal 2012). In another research study on nurse report reasons such as more perceived distance between manager and nurse, negative perception about having voice, belief of speaking doesn't make a difference, exposed to bad results who speaking before and speaking nurse isn't wanted by managers (Bayın et al. 2015).

IV. METHOD

This study aims at discovering why nurses prefer not to express their opinions and suggestions about their organizational activities and existing flaws in their organizations and which meaningful dimensions these reasons may be categorized. .Finally it aims at developing a scale that measures the reasons for silence behavior for scientific studies. Such kind of efforts to develop such a scale in the field of organizational behavior should start by focusing on the theoretical background, dimensions and variables of the relevant subject matter, then should be continued with receiving experts' opinions and finally with empirical studies (focus groups and field researches). Only one research may not be sufficient to carry out these procedures when dealing with a scale and ensuring its validity and reliability – which is the main purpose. Qualitative research pattern (exploratory) should be the starting point, and a measuring model that is supported by quantitative research should be put forward. Churchill's (1979) paradigm for scale development has guided this research process. This process, which consists of 8 steps, the suggested methods and the application techniques of these methods are presented in detail in Table 1:

Table 1. Scale Development Process (Churchill, 1979)

Steps of the procedure	Suggested Methods	Techniques used in the method
Determining specific factors	Literature review	Literature review
Creating the item pool	Literature review Experience research (qualitative) Inspirational samples Critical events Focus group interviews	Literature review Interviews in depth Experts' views
Gathering of data		Pilot study
Refining the scale	Factor analysis Reliability coefficient	Factor analysis Reliability coefficient
Gathering of data again		Experts' feedback on the internet
Evaluation of reliability	Reliability coefficient Calculating reliability by dividing the data	Mutual reliability
Evaluation of Validity	Multiple-method matrix Validity of criteria	Validity of content Convergent validity Structural validity
Developing the norms	Relevant statistics of the data (average values, standard deviations, distributions)	Average, Standard deviation

Churchill (1979) states that researchers should carry out this process but that they can use various alternatives in terms of methods and techniques during the process, and added that there may be flexibility partially depending on the subject matter and the sample. For example, while in the process above literature review and generating items are suggested as the first step; because of the nature of the sample, firstly items that are appropriate for the sample have been obtained from the field, and then the reasons that are deemed missing have been added from the literature.

In this study hereby, the studies carried out in the context of methods and techniques were summarized. In accordance with this, in the study, first of all, literature review related to the subject matter was conducted, and the dimensions of the reasons for silence put forward in the previous studies have been examined. Then, in order to create an item pool, a sample group of 117 nurses were asked open-ended questions about the reasons for silence. In this way qualitative data was obtained. An item pool was formed by making content analysis of the qualitative data. The item pool was enriched by interviews conducted with two focus groups with managers and working nurses, and by previous research results. Also, four instructors who work in the related field were asked their opinions. The item pool that had been formed was as a scale, and a pilot study was conducted among 50 people. In the pilot study the items that affect the reliability adversely were omitted, and the items that were difficult to understand were simplified. Then, the questionnaire was applied to a sample that consisted of 265 nurses. . Factor analyses and reliability analyses were made on the data obtained. Also, the hypotheses -which were formed (in accordance with the relevant literature) between the "perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and intention to quit the job variables" added to the questionnaire in order to ensure the criterion validity, and the dimensions related to the reasons for silence- were tested by a correlation analysis. The structural validity of the factors was tested by factor analysis. These factors' reliability and their suitability to the normal distribution were tested and thus the research process was completed. In this survey, it was selected as examples of nurses working in public hospitals. Convenience sampling method was used during the research process due to some contraints (research permit, time constraints owing to the sector of the sample, apprehension felt because of the delicacy of the issue). Yet, at least in each of the samples the number of the participants was sufficient for the requirements of the analysis.

To carry out the procedure thoroughly and to put into use both qualitative and quantitative research patterns, two different researches were carried out. It should also be underlined that the study was carried out with a specific job in mind because a proper scale should be reduced to a specific subject matter and sample as much as possible (Bordens, Abbott 2011). The nurses who work at state hospitals in Turkey make up the target population of the study. "The scale for the reasons for silence", which may be the greatest element of this study that will contribute to the relevant academic literature, is a scale that was created and that should be used in relation to nurses.

4.1. Research 1: Formation of the Items' Pool

The purpose of the research that was carried out first was to learn from the nurses themselves the reasons why they remain silent and what may be the items in the item pool that would be formed. The nurses who work at state hospitals in Turkey constitute the target population of the study. However, because this target is very comprehensive, and there are problems in establishing contact and the data have a qualitative pattern, a very big number as a sample could not be reached. Through cluster sampling, 117 nurses who work at Isparta State Hospital (%52 of hospital) were identified as the sample of the first researches. Firstly, silence behavior in an organizational context was defined to the 117 nurses. The definition was worded as follows: "employees' deliberate withholding of their ideas and opinions about organizational problems and organizational improvements, employees' not expressing these ideas and opinions to their superiors; withholding and not sharing behaviorally, cognitively and emotionally genuine and truthful expressions regarding the improvement of the organizational conditions." After the concept was defined in this way, the research question - i.e. "Why don't you share your opinions, suggestions and the setbacks that you experience regarding your activities in your organization with senior managers?-was asked to the sample in an open-ended way, and they were asked to write 5 reasons that they found the most important.

Several reasons for silence were presented so that the nurses could think more properly about the issue. It was concluded that the sample that took part in the research was enough by looking at the fact that the nurses expressed similar reasons for silence behavior.

A total of 248 statements that were obtained as a result of the research were analyzed content wise. Similar statements were combined, and the reasons that were expressed in an extreme way were omitted from the pool. Before finalizing the item pool, literature review on silence behavior and its reasons was carried out, the scales and the dimensions of these scales used in the previous studies were analyzed. According to these analyses, some adaptations to the style in which the items were expressed were made. Thus, the items were tailored to the theoretical background of the subject matter.

The item pool that was formed within the context of these dimensions was dimensionalized as such: "the indifference of the management, and the submissive nature of the nurses", "the nurses' apprehension of the management's attitude, reactions and retaliatory behavior", "nurses' willingness to maintain their good relationships with (and to be close to) one another and the senior management" and "prosocial silence for the senior management, their colleagues and patients." As a result of these analyses, the items that were deemed to be forgotten were added to the item pool that was categorized as above. Then, the item pool was presented to three academician and one research assistant to get their opinions as experts who had done studies on silence in the organizational behavior field, and their opinions were asked. Below are the item pool that was formed as a result of the research, information about how many times the items were repeated, and its classification made according to the dimensionalization that was formed within the context of literature.

Table 2. Reasons for Nurses' Remaining Silent

Factors and Items	The number of discourse (frequency)
Silence Based on the Indifference of the Management and Acquiescence	**144**
Item 1.I remain silent because I am ignored.	23
Item 2.I remain silent because the managers do not spare time to listen to us, they do not take an interest in us.	6
Item 3. I remain silent because I do not want to be seen as a problematic and whining person who creates trouble.	45
Item 4. I remain silent because I know that the senior management would not stand by me.	5
Item 5. I remain silent because I do not trust the equity of the senior management.	5
Item 6. I remain silent because I think that what I say would not make a difference.	48
Item 7. I remain silent in order not to attract the management's attention.	3
Item 8. I remain silent because the senior management likes the ones who remain silent and dislikes the ones who speak out.	3

Table 2. Reasons for Nurses' Remaining Silent (continue)

Factors and Items	The number of discourse (frequency)
Silence Based on Fear	**61**
Item 9. I remain silent because I do not think that the senior management appreciates me.	5
Item 10. I remain silent because I am passive and taciturn in nature.	1
Item 11. I remain silent because of the possibility to be sent to another unit.	9
Item 12. I remain silent because of the possibility to assume more workload.	2
Item 13. I remain silent because I am afraid of being left alone when I speak out.	5
Item 14. I remain silent because I am afraid of being involved in an argument.	4
Item 15 I remain silent because I am afraid of being ostracized.	3
Item 16. I remain silent because I am afraid of ending up being the one in the wrong although I am right.	4
Item 17. I remain silent because I am afraid of forfeiting my rights.	5
Item 18. I remain silent because I am afraid that managers will make things difficult for me.	11
Item 19. I remain silent because I am afraid of the possibility to be dismissed from my job.	4
Item 20. I remain silent because I shy away from the strict attitude of the management.	12
Item 21. I remain silent because as a civil servant we do not have freedom of thought and ideas.	1
Item 22. I remain silent because I am afraid that events may grow bigger.	1
Silenced Based on the Maintenance of Good Relationships	**14**
Item 23. I remain silent so that my relationships with my friends will not be spoilt.	6
Item 24. I remain silent so that I do not have a bad image among the employees.	1
Item 25. I remain silent in order not to be at odds with the senior management.	2
Item 26. I remain silent so that there is no discord in my workplace environment.	3
Item 27. I remain silent because I think that I will be misunderstood.	2
Silence Based on Prosocial Tendency	**25**
Item 28. I remain silent due to the respect that one should have for the senior management.	1
Item 29. I remain silent so that I will not be seen as person complaining about his/her coworkers to the management.	2
Item 30. I remain silent in order to protect my coworkers and not to put them in a tight spot.	17
Item 31. I remain silent in order not to create negative energy among my colleagues in the workplace	4

Table 2. Reasons for Nurses' Remaining Silent (continue)

Factors and Items	The number of discourse (frequency)
Item 32. I remain silent because I do not want to disturb the disciplined system that should be in place.	1
Item 33. I remain silent in my workplace when it is necessary to do so.	1
Item 34. I remain silent so that my coworkers are not criticized.	1
Item 35. I remain silent so that patient satisfaction is ensured and so that patient rights are protected.	1
Item 36. I remain silent because I sometimes find the fault in myself.	1

When the findings of the first research is taken into consideration, 114 reasons are related to the indifference of the management and submissive nature. Another reason that was commonly expressed was silence based on fear with 61 statements. The other 25 statements include reasons for prosocial silence, and finally 14 statements are statements that are related to maintaining the relationships. Within these dimensions the most common reasons for remaining silent were examined. Keeping the four dimensions displayed in Table 1 in mind, the most commonly stated reasons in each dimension can be summarized as such: the nurses stated the reason "I remain silent because I think that what I say would not make a difference." within the dimension "The indifference of the management and submission" (48) Next, the following statement was expressed the most within the same dimension: "I remain silent because I do not want to be seen as a problematic and whining person who creates trouble." (45). These statements indicate that the nurses think that the suggestions they make or the problems they point out would not be considered worthwhile by the senior management and that they do not want to be seen as a problematic person when they express these thoughts. Another commonly found reason that may be expressed as a prosocial behaviour is the following statement: "I remain silent in order to protect my colleagues and not to put them in a tight spot" (17). Probably lack of trust in the senior management and the thought that they are not worthwhile foster the nurses' relationships with their peers. For this reason, remaining silent in order to protect their friends may be an important reason for silence. As regards the dimension related to silence based on fear, many factors create the feeling of fear. The most commonly stated one of these are the following reasons: "I remain silent because I shy away from the strict attitude of the management." (12), and "I remain silent because I am afraid that managers will make things difficult for me." (11). The nurses are afraid of the senior management's reaction, thus they may prefer to remain silent. Finally, when the reasons in the dimension called "silence based on the maintenance of good relationships" are examined, the following reasons stand out: "I remain silent so that my relationships with my friends will not be spoilt.", and "I remain silent so that there is no discord in my workplace environment." At least the need to get along with colleagues and to form a peaceful work environment may be influential reasons why they remain silent about certain issues.

The headings of the factors in Table 1 were renamed with the guidance of the experts' views. The items obtained remarkably emphasize the senior management's lack of appreciation of the nurses and its indifference towards their views and opinions. In the light of the experts' suggestions, the dimensionalization was not named solely as "acquiescent" as it is called in the literature, but also the concept of the senior management's indifference was added. After these analyses, the item pool was brought up for discussion through 2 different focus group interviews. 8 nurses who work at a state hospital and who have a master's degree in health management constitute the first focus group, and 7 nurses who work at a

state hospital constitute the second focus group. In the first focus group interview, the interviewees were generally 30 years old or younger, and the nurses in the second focus group were employees above 31. In these interviews, which items are more important, which items should definitely be in the scale, and which items are not that important were discussed. At the end of the interviews, the most commonly stated reason was the lack of trust in the management regarding the management's support for the nurses and lack of trust in the equity displayed by the management. These findings were influential in the naming of the factor that was obtained at the end of the factor analysis. Similarly, the nurses stated that they remained silent because they are afraid of being left alone and being involved in intense discussions when they speak out. In addition to these fears, they stated that they remain silent so that their workplace is a peaceful place at least when their colleagues are taken into consideration, good relationships are maintained and in order not to create a negative and tense atmosphere. Also, the fear that their work duties may be made more difficult regarding the night shift lists and that they may be subjected to retaliatory behaviour that makes things more difficult for them were the items that were added to the list after the focus group interviews. Thus, 36 different reasons for remaining silent were defined within the context of 4 dimensions regarding the reasons for silence behaviour stated in the literature; these reasons reveal the underlying reasons why the nurses who work in a state hospital remain silent in the organization that they work at.

It is clearly seen that the most common reason why the nurses remain silent is the indifference of the management and the nurses' own acquiescent attitude that they adopt as a result. When the frequency of the items are examined, among the most important reasons are as follows: the thought that speaking out will not make any difference, that they may be considered as whining people they speak out, and that they are ignored by the management. Another reason for the tendency of the nurses towards silence is based on fear. They fear the management's strict attitude, they fear to be sent to another unit, they fear that things may be made more difficult for them and they fear to lose what they already have. Besides these, the nurses often stated that they remained silent in order not to experience disquiet, not to put their friends in a tight spot and in order not to spoil their relationships with their superiors or with the other nurses in the workplace. An important portion of the nurses remain silent for reasons based on prosocial tendencies. They state that they remain silent in order not to put their friends in a tight spot, to protect them and not to create negativity in the workplace.

4.2. Research 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Item Pool- A Field Research

In the second research that was conducted, an item pool that consisted of 38 items was presented to 265 nurses who work at state hospitals within the context of a scale. The item pool was formulated by using the qualitative data obtained as a result of the field research done on nurses, information obtained from academicians who work in the relevant field, information obtained from the two focus group discussion and from relevant literature review. The academicians who examined the scale stated that it should be in accordance with the Likert scale ("1. I strongly disagree. - 5. I strongly agree.") After the questionnaires were distributed to 3 state hospitals and a faculty of medicine, the research was completed with the participation of 265 people (%36 of 3 hospital). The previously mentioned limitations related to the sample led to the fact that the number of the samples was not very high, and the chosen participants were identified through convenience sampling method. Yet, this number is deemed sufficient for the factor analysis to be made (Stevens, 2009). Hair et al (1998) states that a sample between 5-10 times the numbers of the items in a scale can be sufficient for factor analysis. In this sense, 36 items were applied to a sample that was 7,4 times higher, and thus the volume of the sample was deemed sufficient for the research.

In social sciences exploratory factor analysis can be made in scale development studies in order to test the structural validity of a scale. By using this technique, it is possible to define the relevant subject matter better, and to identify the factors that must be expressed to make it understandable (Çokluk, et al. 2012). Identifying which factors are used to measure the feature that the researcher wants to measure enables one to understand the theoretical background of the subject better and to enrich it. To this end, the statistics software programme SPSS 16 was used to make the exploratory factor analysis of the 36 items obtained as a result of the first research. The information about variance that was expressed by the resulting factors that could be named in a meaningful way, the total explained variance information, the KMO value and the eigenvalue are presented below in Table 2. In addition to these, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients related to their reliability, and the findings related to kurtosis and skewness values to check if there is normal distribution are stated in Table 2.

Before the statistical analysis, a data scanning process took place. In this process, it was checked whether there was any questionnaire with lost data or not, and whether there were data with extreme values on the basis of all variants. After the factor analysis, it was checked whether the total points of the resulting factors that could be named in a meaningful way conform to the normal distribution.

Table 3. Findings of the Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factors and Items (KMO=0.910)	Factor Loading
Lack of Trust in the Management	
Cronbach's Alpha	**0,853**
The Explained Variance	**13,052**
Eigenvalue:	**3,393**
Item 5. I remain silent because I do not trust in the equity of the management.	0,851
Item 4. I remain silent because I know that the senior management would not stand by me.	0,799
Item 6. I remain silent because I think that what I say would not make a difference.	0,781
Item 1. I remain silent because I am ignored.	0,683
Item 3. I remain silent because I do not want to be seen as a problematic and whining person who creates trouble.	0,540
Item 6.I remain silent in order not to attract the management's attention.	0,501

Table 3. Findings of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (continue)

Fear of the Senior Management's Reaction	
Cronbach's Alpha	**0,916**
The Explained Variance	**22,976**
Eigenvalue:	**5,974**
Item 20. I remain silent because I shy away from the strict attitude of the management.	0,811
F1. I remain silent because I fear that I may find myself in a difficult situation regarding the night duty lists.	0,798
Item 19. I remain silent because I am afraid of the possibility to be dismissed from my job.	
Item 11. I remain silent because of the possibility to be sent to another unit.	0,783
Item 18. I remain silent because I am afraid that managers will make things difficult for me.	0,745
F2. I remain silent because I fear that I may be subjected to retaliatory behavior.	0,732
Item 13. I remain silent because I am afraid of being left alone when I speak out	0,729
Item 15. I remain silent because I am afraid of being ostracized.	0,723
Item 22. I remain silent because I am afraid that events may grow bigger.	0,674
Item 14. I remain silent because I am afraid of being involved in an argument.	0,570
Getting Along with Coworkers	
Cronbach's Alpha	**0,860**
The Explained Variance	**11,782**
Eigenvalue:	**3,063**
Item 23. I remain silent so that my relationships with my friends will not be spoilt.	0,813
Item 26. I remain silent so that there is no discord in my workplace environment.	0,795
Item 24. I remain silent so that I do not have a bad image among the employees.	0,740
Item 27. I remain silent because I think that I will be misunderstood.	0,622
Tendency towards Prosocial Behavior	
Cronbach's Alpha	**0,866**
The Explained Variance	**11,827**
Eigenvalue:	**3,075**
Item 30. I remain silent in order to protect my coworkers and not to put them in a tight spot.	0,824
Item 34. I remain silent so that my coworkers are not criticized.	0,771
Item 29. I remain silent so that I will not be seen as person complaining about his/her coworkers to the management.	0,750
Item 32. I remain silent because I do not want to disturb the disciplined system that should be in place.	0,706
Passive Personality	
Cronbach's Alpha	**0,674**
The Explained Variance	**6,924**
Eigenvalue:	**1,800**
Item 28. I remain silent due to the respect that one should have for the senior management.	0,738
Item 10. I remain silent because I am passive and taciturn in nature.	0,659

Table 3. Findings of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (continue)

Total Explained Variance: 66,561		
Findings That Display Conformity to Normal Distribution	**Kurtosis**	**Skewness**
Lack of Trust in the Senior Management	-0,121	-0,486
Fear of the Senior Management's Reaction	0,077	-0,978
Getting along with Coworkers	-0,125	-0,331
Tendency towards Prosocial Behavior	-0,226	-0,204
Passive Personality	0,097	-0,023

In the factor analysis, it was decided that the items whose factor loading was above 0.50 should remain included in the analysis. In this analysis, the size of the number of the samples is also taken into consideration because Hair et al. (2008) and Comrey, Lee (1992) stated that 0.50 factor loading value is more reliable and that it can make a distinction between factors more sensitively. They even stated that as the number of the samples increases, this value may decrease (Çokluk et al. 2012). Yet, in most resources the suggested value of 0,50 is taken into consideration. Besides this, the items with a difference of 0,1 or below between the factor loadings, which were thought to be serving more than one factors were taken out of the scale. These items are called overlapping items, and they may be harmful to the validity of the scale (the validity of the scale: the degree to which the scale can measure the points that it aims to measure accurately and exactly without involving the other points (Çokluk et al. 2012).

The total explained variance is also an important sign of validity for the exploratory factor analysis. Hair et al (2008) stated that it should be at the level of 60%. Stevens (2009) stated that the 0.60 % factor loading would be more reliable regardless of the volume of the sample and that the total explained variance rate should be 70 %. Both researchers suggested that the eigenvalue should be minimum 1, and stated that the higher this value is, the more reliable the nature of the scale becomes. In this scale development study hereby, the number of the items with a factor loading below 60 % is rather low (3 items); and the total explained variance is approximately 67 %. The eigenvalues are significantly over 1 except the meek personality factor. Also, the reliability coefficients of the factors obtained are rather high. The fact that meek personality has a relatively low reliability is related to the fact that the number of items is relatively low. Yet, due to the opinion that one's personality has an influence on silence behavior; it was deemed wrong to ignore that dimension just because its reliability is low. In parallel with this view, there are resources that put forward that 0.674 Cronbach's Alpha coefficient may be sufficient. With all these findings, it can be concluded that the items and the factors are reliable and valid. Also, when it is examined whether all the factors have a normal distribution when the total points are considered, it was discovered that the kurtosis and skewness values were between +-1, and thus all of them were in accordance with the normal distribution (Morgan et al. 2004).

The item pool consisting of 36 items and 4 factors analyzed within the literature turned into a structure that consists of 26 items but that is categorized into 5 meaningful factors as a result of the exploratory factor analysis. It was deemed necessary to rename the factors according to the items that they include. The factor with the highest explained variance is the factor which was called "silence based on fear" in the item pool and whose name was later changed into "fear of the senior management's reaction". In this factor, there are two items that were suggested in the focus group interviews. When the items are examined, it can be seen that nurses' fear of a counter move of the senior management determined the factor in general (making things more difficult, strict attitude, difficulties in the night duties, being sent to another unit, facing retaliatory action, making events grow bigger). The other factor with the highest explained variance factor is the factor that was called "the indifference of

the senior management and acquiescent silence" in the first place and then renamed as "lack of trust in the management". The reason why this factor was renamed as such is that the following items form a unity: being ignored, lack of trust in the equity of the management, believing that the management would not stand by you, believing that speaking out would not make a difference, and the fear of being seen as a problematic person.

It is suggested that criterion validity should be tested after the testing of the structural validity of the scale. In order to test the criterion validity of the scale formed to measure the reasons for silence, its relations with various organizational perception and attitude variances in statistical terms were examined.

These variables were determined by reviewing the literature and by taking into consideration the effect of these variables on the relevant silence dimensions. Firstly, it was observed that the perceived organizational support is in negative correlation with silence based on both indifference and fear (Wang, Hsieh 2013; Donaghey et al. 2011). Also, it was found out that silence behavior based on managers' communication incompetence increases, and this, in turn, decreases fidelity (Madlock 2008). Another criterion variable was expressed as the intention to quit the job. It was stated that the employees who remain silent have a high tendency to leave the organization as soon as they find an opportunity (Graham 1986; Nord, Jermier 1994). Another criterion variable is job satisfaction. Research shows that job satisfaction is an important antecedent to and output of silence or speaking out. Employees who are satisfied with their job speak out on the behalf of the organization whereas employees who are not satisfied ignore the organizational changes and improvements and they remain silent (Morrison, Milliken 2000; Vakola, Bouradas 2005; Knoll, Dick 2013). According to this conclusion derived from literature, it is expected that the silence dimension related to lack of trust in the senior management and the silence dimension based on the fear of the management's reaction are in meaningful and negative correlation with the perceived organizational support. In parallel with this, it is expected that these reasons for silence are in negative correlation with job satisfaction and in positive correlation with the intention to quit the job. If silence based on protecting the relationships with friends and on displaying prosocial behavior is observed, it may be expected that job satisfaction is in meaningful and positive correlation with these dimensions.

Firstly, it should be underlined that the highest correlation among the criterion factors is 0,597 (prosocial attitude- good relationships with coworkers). In order not to have a problem of multicollinearity, it is expected that these correlation powers should be below 0,90. In the testing of the criterion validity, judgments were made based on the relationships (current within the context of literature) between other organizational perceptions and attitudes that were included in the research and the factors related to the reasons for remaining silent. According to this, as it was expected, there is a meaningful and negative correlation between perceived organizational support and lack of trust in the senior management (r= 0,191; p<0,001). Also, again as it was expected, lack of trust in the senior management (r= -0,124; p<0,05) and fear of the senior management's reaction (r= -0,156; p<0,05) affects job satisfaction adversely and in a meaningful way, and they affect the intention to quit the job positively and in a meaningful way (r= 0,342; p<0,001; r= 0.342; p<0,001). These findings are in parallel with the relevant theory, as well. This parallelism is an indication of the fact that the criterion validity of the scale of reasons for silence is partially achieved. The high positive correlation of the perceived organizational support with job satisfaction and its negative correlation with the intention to quit the job constitute the proof of the fact that these variables can be measured theoretically in an accurate way.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis Findings

Factors	Mean	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. The Senior Management's Reaction	2,49	1	0,503**	0,548**	0,523**	0,342**	0,017	-0,124*	0,342**
2. Lack of Trust in the Senior Management	2,94		1	0,393**	0,345**	0,334**	-0,191**	-0,156*	0,246**
3. Good Relations with the Coworkers	2,85			1	0,597**	0,442**	0,058	0,008	0,113
4. Prosocial Attitude	3,00				1	0,407**	0,036	0,076	0,110
5. Passive Personality Traits	2,78					1	0,121*	0,191**	-0,045
6. Perceived Organizational Support	2,68						1	0,419**	-0,174**
7. Job Satisfaction	2,72							1	-0,162**
8. The Intention to Quit the Job	3,04								1
*. Correlation is significant at the 0,05 level (2-tailed).									
**. Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).									

The relationships among the factors that measure the reasons for silence are also helpful in reaching supporting conclusions related to the issue at hand. There is a meaningful and positive correlation between the silence based on maintaining the good relationships and the silence arising from prosocial tendency (r= 0,597; p<0,001). As the nurses like each other more and display behavior that tends to protect each other, they display a prosocial attitude. Therefore, the good relationships among the coworkers in a workplace are a trait that should be underlined and encouraged rather than being a trait to be feared of. The nurses whose relationships are good with each other have a higher tendency to display prosocial behavior on behalf of the organization. In parallel with this, the correlation between the silence behavior based on lack of trust in the senior management and the silence behavior based on fear arising from the senior management's reaction is positive (r= 0,503; p<0,001). There is a positive correlation between the silence behavior of the nurses who fear the senior management's reaction and the silence behavior based on protecting their relationships with coworkers (r= 0,548; p<0,001). The nurses who do not trust the senior management and who fear them have a strong impetus for maintaining their relationships with their peers.

V. CONCLUSION

Silence behavior is a negative trait that could be harmful to the organization where the silent employees work and that could be harmful even to employees themselves, and it should be eliminated. However, the silence that is mentioned in this sense means the following: not expressing the existent problems, not giving feedback on setbacks and not making useful suggestions or providing constructive criticism. Certainly there are situations that require people to prefer silence, and that require partial acceptance or obedience. What

this research focuses on is discovering the reasons for remaining silent proactively –in situations where one should not remain silent- dimensionalizing them and developing a measuring tool that will determine the reasons for silence for other researches, as well.

Although in literature there are scales that measure silence behavior and its reasons, and although these scales have been used in a study conducted in Turkey –even if its levels of reliability are at an acceptable standard- the cultural dimension of silence reinforces the assumption that measuring tools that were developed in different cultures may not yield very reliable results in Turkish culture and that they may not find out all the reasons and the true reasons for silence. Also, it is assumed that there are different reasons for silence in every occupation group. This study hereby uses the nursing occupation as its sample because this occupation is one that entails expertise, and sometimes remaining silent or not in a professional sense may lead to even vital consequences.

It is important that the nurses talk about the setbacks that occur at the hospitals or units without fear, take iniative when necessary, make suggestions about their expertise and present their feedback about processes to the relevant doctors or managers. In such an organization, breakdown in communication may lead to important consequences. Also, it should be highlighted that this profession entails many difficulties and the possibility to suffer from occupational burnout is high in this occupation. In that case, communication breakdown, the nurses' problems that stem from administrative procedures and the managers, and problems that they will have with their friends will create additional problems. Nurses, who need to remain energetic both physically and psychologically as a requirement of their profession, who need to take initiative and be proactive, should not experience the problems mentioned above. Their job is already difficult in nature in many aspects.

In the relevant literature, the silence behavior that was focused on firstly is the silence behavior that is based on fear (Brinsfield 2013). The perceived hierarchical structure and the organizational characteristics are organizational factors that lead to silence. Fear of being punished or retaliatory behavior is expressed as the most important antecedent to silence behavior (Milliken et al. 2003). One of the first reactions to mobbing that people face within the administrative context is to remain silent (Gül, Özcan 2011). While particularly silence based on indifference and fear affect performance adversely, it was observed that prosocial silence has a positive effect (Zehir, Erdoğan 2011; Whiteside, Barclay 2013; Tayfun, Çatır 2013). In both of the studies that found out the reasons for nurses' silence, the reasons that are related to the management are dominant. Lack of trust in the senior management and fear of senior management stand out as the main reasons for silence. In the first research, reasons for silence related to the indifference of the senior management and the nurses' submissive attitude were categorized into two as the trust dimension and the fear dimension in the exploratory factor analysis. Therefore, it is necessary to form a reliable, caring and consistent management style for nurses. Also, it is important to avoid a management style based on fear, punishment and retaliation. This is not ethical after all. These problems reinforce the intentions of nurses to quit the job and decrease their job satisfaction. Also, the positive correlation of perceived organizational support with job satisfaction and its negative correlation with the intention to quit the job support these findings. According to the findings of the exploratory factor analysis, the highest variance belongs to these dimensions. Morrison and Milliken (2003), who are among principal researchers that have created the organizational silence literature, state that managers need to provide a psychologically safe environment by eliminating the status barriers in order to ensure that employees speak out and that they need to create an open communication channel as a team. In the research conducted by Cemaloglu (2013), the reasons for silence were discovered as reasons that stem from management. The following stand out as the most important reasons: lack of trust in the

management, the arrogant attitude that implies that they know it all, and the feeling that speaking out wouldn't make a difference.

Another reason for silence is related to maintaining the good relationships with coworkers. Getting along with coworkers, working in a peaceful atmosphere and avoiding confrontation are issues that they attach importance to. For this reason, other prominent reasons are reasons for silence based on prosocial behavior. This dimension is related to protecting the teammates, protecting them from facing criticism or a plight, and abstaining from being seen as a person who complains about his/her coworkers to the management.

As it can be observed in both of these dimensions, the coworkers of the nurses are as effective shareholders as the senior management. However, at this point it should be noted that these two dimensions should not be considered a negative type of silence. The instinct of people -who are at the same status and in the same situation- to protect one another and the will to stay in a peaceful and friendly atmosphere are the factors that account for these silence dimensions.

Premeaux and Bedeian (2003) state that the role of the characteristics of employees in silence behavior should not be underestimated. In the first research that was conducted, the reasons for silence related to meek personality that was considered within the acquiescence dimension turned out to constitute another dimension in the scale as a result of the exploratory factor analysis. The reasons related to meek and taciturn personality and personality traits that reflect respect for superiors are reasons that are related to distinct individuals. This kind of silence may sometimes be positive or it may be negative at other times. Yet, particularly in a culture in which the power distance is low, and which is communitarian and feminine, these reasons for silence are related to the cultural structure rather than personality. One may need to evaluate this dimension from a cultural viewpoint, as well.

Both of the studies have aimed at finding out the reasons for silence from the nurses' points of view and at contributing a scale to the future academic researches studies that will be conducted on this sample. The validity of the scale has been confirmed statistically with the help of the following: the validity studies (face validity, structural validity, criterion validity) conducted after the field researches done by employing various methods (a field research done by using open-ended questions, focus group discussions, expert academicians' opinions, and another field research done by using the items obtained); and the statistical analyses (content analysis, exploratory analysis, reliability analyses, correlation analyses). It is scientifically very important that researchers give importance to the cultural context and occupational characteristics and thus develop and use the right scales in research studies.

REFERENCES

1. Argyris C. and Schön D. (1978) **Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective.** Addison-Wesley, MA.

2. Arlı D. (2013) The Views of School Principals on Organizational Silence. **Trakya University Journal of Education** 3(2): 69-84.

3. Bayın G., Yeşilaydın G. ve Esatoğlu A. E. (2015) Hemşirelerde Örgütsel Sessizlik Nedenlerinin Belirlenmesi. **İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi** 7(1): 248-266.

4. Beer M. and Eisenstat R. A. (2000) The Silent Killers Of Strategy Implementation and Learning. **Sloan Management Review** 41(4): 29-40.

5. Bildik B. (2009) Liderlik Tarzları, Örgütsel Sessizlik ve Örgütsel Bağlılık İlişkisi. **Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Doktora Tezi**, Kocaeli.

6. Brinsfield C. T. (2013) Employee Silence Motives: Investigation Of Dimensionality and Development Of Measures. **Journal of Organizational Behavior** 34(5): 671–697.

7. Brinsfield C. D., Edwards M. S. and Greenberg J. (2009) 'Voice and Silence in Organizations: Historical Review and Current Conceptualizations'. In: Greenberg, J. M. and Edwards S. (eds.) pp. 3-33. **Voice and Silence in Organizations.** Emerald Group Publishing, UK.

8. Bordens K. S. and Abbott B. B. (2011) **Research Design and Methods**. McGraw Hill, New York.

9. Botero I. C. and Van Dyne L. (2009) Employee Voice Behavior: Interactive Effects of LMX and Power Distance in the United States and Colombia. **Management Communication Quarterly** 23(1): 84-104.

10. Bowen F. and Blackmon K. (2003) Spirals of silence: the dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. **Journal of Management Studies** 40(6): 1393–1417.

11. Brinsfield C. T. (2009) Employee Silence: Investigatıon of Dimensionalıty, Development of Measures, And Examination of Related Factors. **The Ohio State University, Doctorate Thesis**, USA.

12. Çakıcı A. (2007) Örgütlerde Sessizlik: Sessizliğin Teorik Temelleri ve Dinamikleri. **Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi** 16(1): 145-162.

13. Çakıcı A. (2008) Örgütlerde Sessiz Kalınan Konular, Sessizliğin Nedenleri ve Algılanan Sonuçları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. **Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi** 17(1): 117-134.

14. Churchill G. (1979) A Paradigm For Developing Better Measures Of Marketing Constructs. **Journal of Marketing Research** 16(1): 64-73.

15. Clapham S. and Cooper R. (2005) Factors of Employees' Effective Voice in Corporate Goverance. **Journal of Management and Governance** 9(3-4): 287–313.

16. Demir M. and Demir Ş. Ş. (2012) Organizational Silence at the Institutions of Higher Education: A Study at Institutions of Tourism Bachelor's Degree-Granting. **Milli Eğitim Dergisi** 193: 184-199.

17. Donaghey J., Cullinane N., Dundon T. and Wilkinson A. (2011) Reconceptualising Employee Silence: Problems and Prognosis. **Work Employment Society** 25(1): 51–67.

18. Eby L. T., Adams D. M., Russell J. E. A. and Gaby S. H. (2000) Perceptions of Organizational Readiness For Change: Factors Related To Employees' Reactions To The Implementation Of Team-Based Selling. **Human Relations** 53(3): 419-42.

19. Eroğlu A. H., Adıgüzel O. and Öztürk U. (2011) Dilemma of Silence Vortex and Commitment: Relationship Between Employee Silence and Organızational Commitment. **Suleyman Demirel University The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences** 16(2): 97-124.

20. Gao L., Janssen O. and Shi K. (2011) Leader Trust and Employee Voice: The Moderating Role of Empowering Leader Behaviors. **The Leadership Quarterly** 22(4): 787–798.

21. Gephart J. J. K., Detert J. R., Trevin L. K. E. and Amy C. (2009) Silenced by Fear: The Nature, Sources, and Consequences of Fear at Work. **Research in Organizational Behavior** 29: 1-31.

22. Hair J. F., Anderson R. E., Tatham R. L. and Black W. C. (1998) **Multivariate Data Analysis.** Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.

23. Hofstede, G., Bond, M. H., (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. **Organizational Dynamics**, 16, 5-21. http://doi.org/df96mz

24. Huang X., Van de Vliert E. and Van Der Vegt G. (2005) Breaking The Silence Culture: Stimulation of Participation and Employee Opinion Withholding Cross-Nationally. **Management and Organization Review** 1(3): 459–482.

25. Knoll M. and Dick R. V. (2013) Authenticity, employee silence, prohibitive voice, and the moderating effect of organizational identification. **The Journal of Positive Psychology** 8(4): 346-360.

26. LePine J. A. and Van Dyne L. (2001) Voice and Cooperative Behavior as Contrasting Forms of Contextual Performance: Evidence of Differential Relationships with Big Five Personality Characteristics and Cognitive Ability. **Journal of Applied Psychology** 86(2): 326–336.

27. Madlock P. E. (2008) The Link between Leadership Style, Communicator Competence, and Employee Satisfaction. **Journal of Business Communication** 45(1): 61-78.

28. Mcfarlin D. B. and Sweeney P. D. (1996) Does Having a Say Matter Only if You Get Your Way? Instrumental and Value-Expressive Effects of Employee Voice. **Basic and Applied Social Psychology** 8(3): 289-303.

29. Milliken F. J., Morrison E. W. and Hewlin P. F. (2003) An Exploratory Study of Employee Silence: Issues That Employees Don't Communicate Upward and Why. **Journal of Management Studies** 40(6): 1453–1476.

30. Moll S., Eakin J. M., Franche R. L. and Strike C. (2013) When Health Care Workers Experience Mental Ill Health: Institutional Practices of Silence. **Qualitative Health Research** 23(2): 167–179.

31. Morgan G. A., Leech N. L., Gloeckner G. W. and Barret K. C. (2004) **SPSS for Introductory Statistics: Use and Interpretation**. Lawrance Erlbaum Associates, London.

32. Morrison E. W. and Milliken F. (2000) Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. **Academy of Management Review** 25(4): 706–725.

33. Morrison E. W. and Milliken F. J. (2003) Speaking Up, Remaining Silent: The Dynamics of Voice and Silence in Organizations. **Journal of Management Studies** 40(6): 1353-1358.

34. Morrison E. W. and Milliken F. J. (2004) Sounds of Silence. **Stern Business** 25: 31-35.

35. Nartgün Ş. S. and Kartal V. (2013) Teachers' Perceptions on Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Silence. **Bartın Unıversity Journal of Faculty of Education** 2(2): 47-67.

36. Nakane I. (2006) Silence and Politeness in Intercultural Communication in University Seminars. **Journal of Pragmatics** 38(11): 1811-1835.

37. Nikolaou I., Vakola M. and Bourantas D. (2011) Who Speaks Up at Work? Dispositional Influences on Employees' Voice Behavior. **Personnel Review** 40(6): 723-741.

38. Noelle-Neumann E. (1993) **The Spiral of Silence**. The University of Chicago Press, London.

39. Perkins D. (2014) Conceptualizing Defensive Silence in Project-Manager-To-Project Sponsor Communication. **Leadership & Organization Development Journal** 35(1): 2-19.

40. Perlow L. and Williams S. (2003) Is Silence Killing Your Company? **Harvard Business Review** 31(4): 52-58.

41. Pinder C. C. and Harlos K. P. (2001) Employee Silence: Quiescence and Acquiescence As Responses to Perceived Injustice. **Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management** 20: 331-369.

42. Porter L. W., Allen R. W. and Angle H. L. (1980) 'The Politics of Upward Influence in the Organization'. In: Cummings L. L. and Staw B. M. (eds.) pp. 109-149. **Research in Organizational Behavior**. JAI Press, Greenwich.

43. Premeaux S. F. and Bedeian A. G. (2003) Breaking the Silence: The Moderating Effects of Self-Monitoring in Predicting Speaking Up in the Workplace. **Journal of Management Studies** 40(6): 1537–1562.

44. Rhee J., Dedahanov A. and Lee D. (2014) Relationships Among Power Distance, Collectivism, Punishment, and Acquiescent, Defensive, or Prosocial Silence. **Social Behavior and Personality** 42(5): 705-720.

45. Ruppel C. P. and Harrington S. J. (2000). The Relationship of Communication, Ethical Work Climate, and Trust to Commitment and Innovation. **Journal of Business Ethics** 25(4): 313-328.

46. Slade M. R. (2008) The Adaptive Nature of Organizational Silence: A Cybernetic Exploration of the Hidden Factory. **George Washington University, Doctorate Thesis**, USA.

47. Stevens J. P. (2009) **Applied Multivariate Statistics For The Social Sciences**. Taylor & Francis Group, America.

48. Sussman L. (2008) Disclosure, Leaks, and Slips: Issues and Strategies For Prohibiting Employee Communication. **Business Horizons** 51(4): 331-339.

49. Tangirala S. and Ramanujam R. (2008) Employee Silence on Critical Work Issues: The Cross-Level Effects of Procedural Justice Climate. **Personnel Psychology** 61(1): 37–68.

50. Tayfun A. ve Çatır O. (2013) Örgütsel Sessizlik ve Çalışanların Performansları Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma. **İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi** 5(3): 114-134.

51. Wang Y. D. and Hsieh H. H. (2013) Organizational Ethical Climate, Perceived Organizational Support, and Employee Silence: A Cross-Level Investigation. **Human Relations** 66(6): 783–802.

52. Wang A. C., Hsieh H. H., Tsai C. Y. and Cheng B. S. (2011) Does Value Congruence Lead to Voice? Cooperative Voice and Cooperative Silence under Team and Differentiated Transformational Leadership. **Management and Organization Review** 8(2): 341–370.

53. Whiteside D. B. and Barclay L. J. (2013) Echoes of Silence: Employee Silence as a Mediator between Overall Justice and Employee Outcomes. **Journal of Business Ethics** 116(2): 251–266.

54. Vakola M. and Bouradas D. (2005) Antecedents and consequences of organizational silence: An empirical investigation. **Employee Relations** 27(5): 441–458.

55. Valentine S., Greller M. M. and Richtermeyer S. B. (2006) Employee Job Response as a Function of Ethical Context and Perceived Organization Support. **Journal of Business Research** 59(5): 582–588.

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

57. Yalçın B. ve Baykal Ü. (2012) Özel Hastanelerde Görevli Hemşirelerin Sessiz Kaldığı Konular ve Sessiz Kalma Nedenleriyle İlişkili Faktörler. **Hemşirelikte Eğitim Ve Araştırma Dergisi** 9(2): 42-50.

58. Zehir C. and Erdoğan R. (2011) The Association Between Organizational Silence and Ethical Leadership through Employee Performance. **Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences** 24: 1389–1404.