

Employee Silence and Organisational Performance in Selected Privately Owned Universities in Anambra State

Agha Nancy Chinwe Ebonyi State University Abakaliki nanciagha@gmail.com

Chukwujama Ngozi Comfort Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka ngo4real1190@yahoo.com

Nweze Chinwe Irene Ebonyi State University Abakaliki : nwezeirenechinwe11@gmail.com

.Eke, Ifeanyichukwu Innocent: Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State
writeinno@gmail.com

<p><i>Abstract</i></p> <p><i>This study titled Employee Silence and Organizational performance in Privately owned Universities in Anambra State examined the extent of relationship between defensive silence and organizational performance and the extent of relationship between deviant silence and organizational performance. The study is anchored on the Social Exchange Theory developed by Cook, Cheshire and Rice (2013). The study employed descriptive research design. Data were sourced from primary sources. Pearson's product moment correlation was used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that defensive silence has a positive correlation with organisational performance; deviant silence has a positive correlation with organizational performance. The study recommended that fear is the primary source of defensive silence, and it should be reduced: secondly, management should create an environment in which deviant silence is viewed as an important variable to be considered, as well as opportunities to create good communication and formal systems for the transfer or exchange of information, concerns, and ideas in order to take the necessary action.</i></p>	<p>Journal of Policy and Development Studies (JPDS)</p> <hr/> <p>Vol. 17 Issue 1 (2024) ISSN(p) 1597-9385 ISSN (e) 2814-1091 Home page: https://www.ajol.info/index.php/jsda</p> <p>ARTICLE INFO:</p> <p>Keyword Employee silence, Defensive silence, Deviant silence, Organizational performance</p> <p>Received: 25th August 2024</p> <p>Accepted: 9th October 2024</p> <p>DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jpds.v17i1.11</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. Introduction

In any organization, effective communication is essential for identifying and addressing issues, fostering innovation, and driving performance. When employees choose to remain silent, valuable insights and feedback are lost, which can hinder decision-making processes and stifle organizational growth. In most privately owned universities in Anambra State, employee silence may be influenced by various factors, including fear of negative repercussions, lack of trust in management, or a perceived lack of value in their contributions.

Employee silence, a phenomenon where employees withhold their opinions, concerns, or suggestions, can have profound implications for organizational performance. Understanding the dynamics of employee silence is crucial for fostering a culture of open communication and continuous improvement.

In organizations, employees play a crucial role in driving change, fostering innovation, and contributing to organizational success (Karaca, 2013). Despite having important thoughts and ideas about the organization, many employees choose to remain silent due to various factors, both known and unknown. Organizational silence, as highlighted by Karaca (2013), is a behavioral decision that can impact organizational performance positively or negatively. Beyond its challenging emotional aspect, silence can serve as a means of signaling approval and collaboration or disapproval and opposition, thereby exerting pressure on both individuals and organizations.

The discussion of organizational silence and how to address it holds significant importance in organizational contexts. The way employees think and act towards customers has a direct impact on customer satisfaction and the quality of services offered, ultimately contributing to the overall effectiveness of the company. Workplace silence has several adverse effects, such as decreasing employee dedication, exacerbating internal conflicts, slowing down decision-making processes, hindering change and innovation, and stifling the communication of both positive and negative feedback to management. This can lead to increased instances of negative behaviors like absenteeism, tardiness, and a decline in staff morale and motivation. To achieve their objectives, organizations undertake a wide range of initiatives.

According to Pinder and Harlos (2001), silence is the lack of voice. Regarding a few significant organizational aspects, the staff members say nothing. According to Fatima et al. (2015), there are a number of significant reasons why organizations remain silent, such as a lack of organizational political skills, fear and humiliation, and friends becoming implicated. According to Morrison and Milliken (2000), organizational silence is the result of a situation wherein a negative reaction results in a lack of voice being raised in response to the existence of a problem.

Determining the performance level and enabling management to decide where, if anywhere, within the processes to start taking action to improve corporate performance require quantifying the various repeatable activities that depend on processes for an organization to succeed. Consequently, the idea of corporate performance is closely linked to the main goal of the company. As a result, every business aims to increase the efficiency with which it accomplishes its goals. Therefore, both the organizational objective and the organizational inputs or resources may be included in an analysis of company performance. Educating young minds on how to act and think in the workplace depends on the continued success of companies (Okoro & Okoro, 2014). Workers who are trusted to make their own decisions and act on their initiatives are more invested in their work (Gupta & Shaw, 2014).

This study aims to investigate the relationship between employee silence and organizational performance, examining how the reluctance to speak up affects overall productivity, innovation, and morale within the university.

By exploring the causes and consequences of employee silence, this research seeks to provide actionable recommendations for creating an environment that encourages open dialogue and engagement. Understanding the impact of employee silence on organizational performance is vital for such universities to achieve their strategic objectives and maintain a high-performing, collaborative workplace.

Collective quiet at meetings, poor involvement in proposal schemes, and low levels of collective voice are what constitute employee silence in these universities. In addition, this trend promotes transparency and a sense of adventitious impotence among workers, which in turn lowers job satisfaction and dedication. Moreover, employee silence has generated negative organisational outcomes over the years (Aylsworth, 2008). One of the elements that causes conflict in most universities is the dominance of silence culture. When this culture is dominant, there will be an apparent paradox in which some employees know the facts about organisational issues but do not care to speak about it (Morrison & Milliken, 2000 cited in Talimasebi, Sobhanipour & Aghaziarati, 2013).

Fear of losing employment, lack of promotion and other counter attacks make staff of these Universities to remain silent. A lack of open communication may have a chilling impact on team spirit, ethics, motivation, and ultimately productivity in the workplace. It's common for workers to offer insightful recommendations about how to enhance their jobs and their companies. Sometimes these workers use voice by speaking up and sharing what they know or what they think, while other times they use silence by keeping quiet. Silence in the workplace is a behavioral choice that may either hinder or boost productivity. Aside from the obvious emotional difficulty, silence may be used as a powerful pressure tool on both people and groups, signaling either acceptance and sharing or disapproval and disagreement (Gambarotto & Cammozzo, 2010). Scholarly attention to whistle blowing and "rocking the boat" has resulted from the uncovering of scandals, both corporate and otherwise, and violations of ethics. It has also been discovered that, depending on the scenario and the sort of commitment involved, an employee's productivity to the organization may generate both good and negative consequences on the option of whether or not to speak up. Therefore, it is important to understand employee silence so as to prevent it from negatively affecting the performance of companies, especially higher institutions. The existence of these problems in Paul University Awka and Madonna University Okija both in Anambra State makes it imperative that a study on Employee silence and Organisational performance be carried out.

The broad objective of this study is to examine the effect of Employee Silence on Organisational Performance in the two Universities.

2.Review of Related Literature

Concept of Employee silence

Workers frequently participate in a practice known as "organizational silence," wherein they consciously choose to keep their opinions and feelings about their company to themselves. If workers opt to keep quiet, they may suppress knowledge that could be harmful to the company's growth. The financial health of the business and the morale of its employees are both severely impacted by employee silence. When important concerns inside a business are not communicated

about, employee silence happens. This report focuses on a few of the less evident variables that could endanger patient safety and lead to organizational silence.

Employee silence describes situations where employees of a firm suppress information that could be very beneficial to the business. According to Van Dyne (2003), silence is an employee's incentive to keep ideas, information, and opinions on changes at work to themselves or to others. Workers are allowed to communicate silently if that is how they like to communicate. Workers may be withholding information from others, whether on purpose or accidentally, according to Tangirala and Ramanujam (2008). When employees believe it would be foolish to raise their voices, there is silence at work. Employees are less likely to divulge sensitive information when they know that the company stands to gain greatly from their disclosure. They are also reluctant to voice concerns that could be misconstrued by superiors and seen as a threat. As Milliken (2000) points out, employees are aware of the problems and talk about them among themselves when they are alone, but they are afraid to tell their superiors the truth, so they remain silent. Silence within an organization is not an isolated incident, but rather a repeated phenomenon that demands workers to think widely, but even so, it will have consequences for the organization's newcomers. As a result, employees no longer value communication because of the precedent of unfavorable episodes among long-tenured workers. Senior employees set the example for new hires who choose to remain silent in order to safeguard the company. Aktan (2006) states that workers who feel powerless to change unfavorable work conditions frequently give up, become discouraged, and eventually feel even more powerless. Aylsworth (2008) states that rather than resisting unfavorable work conditions, employees learn to accept and adjust to them. Studies conducted at the intersection of the cognitive, social, and organizational sciences with socio-technical system studies may provide light on some of the elements that contribute to and preserve quiet in the workplace. These elements have been divided into their individual, societal, and organizational components. The self-serving bias, the availability heuristic, and the status quo trap are all factors that individuals can influence. Social factors include things like small-group dynamics of suspicion, conformity, and blame-spreading. Organizational factors include the good provider fallacy, unquestioned beliefs, and disregarding interdependencies. In the past, devotion was associated with silence, and the lack of complaints was taken as proof that everything was OK. Nonetheless, recent research has shown that a calm environment may actually work against an organization's performance (Aylsworth, 2008).

Types of Employee Silence

Acquiescent quiet, defensive silence, prosocial silence, deviant silence, and diffident silence are the five varieties of silence identified by Van, Ang, and Botero (2003), who defined employee silence as a multidimensional construct.

Acquiescent Silence: Acquiescence is the term for submissive, passive quiet. Admissive quietness includes passive behavior. It usually stays out of operational organizational procedures as a requirement of servile behavior. Acquiescent quiet naturally leads to employee resignation, or a lack of interest in the evolution of silence as a behavior. As demonstrated by Van, Ang, and Botero (2003). According to research by Pinder and Harlos (2001), which Van, Ang, and Botero (2003) quoted, acquiescent quiet was defined as "withholding crucial thoughts, facts, or opinions, based on resignation." Van, Ang, and Botero (2003) cite Kahn (1990) as saying that passivity shows up as calm instead of action. Those who choose quiet in the workplace have become accustomed to their surroundings and are unwilling to make any changes to their condition (strongly rooted resignation).

Defensive Silence:

Defensive silence is the deliberate withholding of information relevant to one's job out of fear of reprisals. Defensively silent employees decide to use their composure as a personal coping mechanism by being proactive in exploring their options in the future. This is radically different from traditional quiet, and it is more active. Based on protective quiet in 2003, there is a fear of making suggestions or advocating for change (Van, Ang, & Botero). Defensive silence stems from an employee's internal fear of raising their voice. It is called "Quiescent Silence" (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) in this context. Morrison and Milliken (2000) claim that one of the main reasons for organizational silence is fear. Additionally, it aligns with the concepts of psychological security and voice opportunity described as necessary preconditions by Avery and Quinones (2002) or raising one's voice in formal situations.

Deviant silence

This is a harmful deviant behavior that can occur in the workplace. Rego (2013) defined deviant silence as when employees purposefully choose not to speak up in an effort to persuade others to make a bad decision. Employees that take up abnormal habits can occasionally cause organizational issues. These behaviors can be advantageous or detrimental to the business. Destructive deviant behaviors, such as theft, workplace hostility, and sabotage, are intentional acts intended to cause harm to the organization and its personnel, in addition to deviant silence (Ahmad & Omar, 2014).

Concept of Organisational Performance

Organizational performance is a thorough evaluation of how well a particular company accomplishes its goals. These goals are highly firm-specific, yet they frequently fit within the pre-established categories of shareholder, market, and financial performance. Every company needs to set its own performance objectives. After the objectives have been determined, a system for monitoring, evaluating, and achieving the objectives needs to be implemented. Even though the organization doesn't produce any labor, its managers finish the tasks they are given, and the total of these tasks is what is known as organization performance. In order to meet the expectations of many stakeholders, senior managers always work to improve the performance of their enterprises. Generally speaking, corporate planning, strategy implementation, and performance assessment or evaluation are the three main tasks that comprise organizational improvement approaches (David, 2005). Setting goals and objectives in line with the company's corporate vision, mission, and value statements is a part of the corporate planning process. A SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis, also referred to as a corporate analysis, is used to carefully and critically analyze the organization's internal strengths and weaknesses as well as its external opportunities and threats before developing goals and strategies. Strategies are created after the business analysis to help achieve the predetermined goals, and the corporate plans are implemented.

The Relationship between Employee Silence and Organisational Performance

The deliberate withholding of constructive criticism, suggestions, and candid opinions about the organization by an employee is referred to as "employee silence" (OS). Establishing a culture where employees feel comfortable voicing concerns, exchanging ideas, and disagreeing with management is crucial for company leaders (Erenler, 2010). Three varieties of employee silence have been identified by Van-Dyne et al. (2003): acquiescent, defensive, and pro-social.

When an employee takes an acquiescent position, it means that they are conscious of their silence and aware that there are multiple approaches to address the current problem, but they have chosen to remain silent because they feel helpless. Employees frequently exhibit a level of silence during the compliance process that conceals a cursory comprehension of the situation and an unquestioning readiness to accept it as it is (Fein, Tziner, & Vasiliu, 2021). Defensive silence is a type of passive but self-aware behavior that an employee may do if they fear consequences for speaking up. A person may employ defensive silence as a strategy to fend off possible outside threats.

According to Van-Dyne et al. (2003), it is protective, defensive, and proactive. Good social silence is demonstrated by employees who keep quiet about their commitment and teamwork because of a desire to protect their employer and/or coworkers (Fein et al., 2021). Similar to OCB, positive pro-social silence (quiet for the benefit of the organization) entails deliberate, voluntary steps made to enhance the work environment (Van-Dyne et al., 2003; Erenler, 2010). Measured in terms of both quantity and quality, organizational performance is the culmination of an individual's, a team's, or an organization's efforts toward the objectives of an undertaking. Work performance is the degree to which objectives have been fulfilled (Fein et al., 2021).

The performance of employees is not something that occurs in a vacuum or on its own. Consequently, companies and their management teams must take a position on the issue, look into the circumstances that make their employees happy, and then establish an environment that promotes peak performance. Furthermore, it is vital to endeavor towards discerning the specific behaviors exhibited by both individuals and groups that result in improved performance (Yeomans et al., 2002). When managers generate, nurture, and support a workforce that is both profoundly devoted to the organization's objectives and core values and extremely content with their work, their efforts will yield the greatest results.

Causes of Silence in Organisation

Silence comes up when people cannot contribute freely on issues of concern about the organisation. Morrison and Milliken (2010) pointed out that many organisations are caught in an apparent paradox in which most employees know the truth about certain issues and problems within the organisation yet dare not speak that truth to their superiors. Fundamentally, they believed that organisational silence is an outcome that owes its origin to managers' fear of negative feedback and a set of implicit beliefs often held by managers. However, many studies on this topic have emphasized on the causes of silence that are within the organisation such as;

First, co-workers can influence organisational silence through reward such as recognition or friendship or even punishment like isolation (Stephen & Judge, 2007; Cakici, 2008). They can also establish norms or rules on how others should react to situations in the organisation.

Second, management beliefs and actions are also a major cause of silence. Management's implicit beliefs about employees are that they are self-interested and untrustworthy.

Third, silence can also result from the characteristics of the organisation as depicted in their structures and culture such as communication system and leadership styles (Sayğan, 2011). For instance, silence is less prevalent in a pluralistic organisation that values and reflects differences among employees and that allows for the expression of multiple perspectives and opinions (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

2.1 Empirical Review

Anyanwu and Ebhote (2023), carried out a study on Organizational Silence Behaviour and Corporate Performance of Selected Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. The study used descriptive survey research design to investigate the relationship between organizational silence behaviour and corporate performance, the population of the study consists of the Twenty-one thousand, three hundred and sixty-nine (21,369) employees from three (3) institutions in Edo state such as: University of Benin, Edo University Uzairue, and Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma. A sample size of three hundred and fifty (393) was determined using Taro Yamane. The questionnaire is the major instrument used in collecting data for this research and the data were further analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and regression analysis with the help of statistical packages for social science (SPSS). Finding from the study reveal that there is significant relationship between defensive silence, acquiescent silence, pro-social silence, deviant silence, diffident.

Ibironke, Oderibigbe, and Jokosanya, (2022), carried out a study on Employee silence and Organisation Performance: The relationship in Nigeria with particular reference to the Institute of Chartered Accountant of Nigeria. The study adopted survey research design and used the primary source of data collection. Data were collected from 100 employees of ICAN out of which 86 valid responses were used for the study analysis. Two research questions and hypotheses were raised in line with the study objectives. Data were analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis at 0.05 level of significance. The results of the two hypotheses tested in the study confirmed that employees' silence is significantly related to organisational performance.

Sharu, P. John I. and Manikandan K. (2019), carried out a study on Employee Silence: A Meta-Analytic Review in India. Here the investigator planned to go through the studies conducted in India as well as outside to have a deep understanding on the concept of employee silence, its dimensions, method of study, related concepts, implications etc. The investigators used meta-analysis as the method for approaching the problem. Twenty studies that met the inclusion criteria were selected for this study. Findings of the study shows that there are organisational, individual and socio-demographic factors that contributes to employee silence. It was also found that employee silence has an impact on both employees and on organisation.

Durowoju, S.T. & Elegunde, A. F. (2018), carried out a study on Organisational Silence and performance of selected small and medium enterprises in Lagos state. Survey research design was employed in this study. Primary and secondary data were used in this study. The target population covers SMEs registered with Nigerian Association of Small & Medium Enterprises (NASME). 100 copies of questionnaire were administered to members of NASME (Lagos State Chapter) as a sample size. 71 copies were duly filled, returned and valid for this study. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data collected. Spearman rank correlation was used to test the hypothesis of this study. $r = 0.70$, which 70% level of relationships. The result of the analysis revealed that organisational silence has effect on performance of SMEs in Lagos State

Nevin, and Aral (2013), carried out a study in a private hospital in Istanbul, Turkey. Questionnaires were presented and completed in hard copy form. In total 175 surveys were completed and the results were used to test the hypothesis. Factor analysis with principal component by varimax rotation, performed to find out the factor structure conducted and all dependent and independent variables were analyzed concurrently. The results of this research show us there is a negative and significant relationship between defensive employee silence and organizational commitment.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Social Exchange Theory developed Peter Blau in 1964. The theory is of the view that when the risks outweigh the rewards, individuals cease or abandon that relationship. The implication of this is that due to the restricted rules and procedures prevailing, within the organisational climate, employees feel fear and decide to keep silent. This feeling causes them to be limited in their concerns regarding the organisation.

Assumptions of the theory

Social Exchange Theory posits that employees who feel deeply embedded in their jobs and within the organization are more inclined to engage in behaviours that benefit them. In addition, the theory assumes that organisations have policies and principles guiding the behaviours of employees, employees do not feel free to disclose information that benefit organisations.

3. Methodology

Descriptive survey research design was used for this study and the reason for adopting descriptive survey research design was because the study intended to adopt a research design that will make provision for the direct collection of data from respondents. Thus, since descriptive survey research design supports the collection of data directly from respondents, it was considered appropriate for the study.

The area of the study is Awka and Okija in Anambra State. The capital of the Anambra State is Awka Town which is the seat of Government. The economic activities in Awka are major commercial activities such as trading of household items, transportation, teachers and lecturers, doctors and nurses, broadcasters, and factory workers among others. The motto of the state is “light of the nation”.

The population of this study comprised of 135 academic staff of both Institutions..

The study made use of a complete enumeration method to determine the sample size of 135. The reason for adopting the complete enumeration method is because the population is within the research capacity of the researchers and can be accessed easily. Hence, the researchers used the entire population as the sample of the study.

4. Data analysis

Table 1. QUESTIONNAIRE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

	SA	A	UD	D	SD
Problems in the institutions can be identified easily if all employees speak up.	50 47.2	45 41.2%	-	20 8.8%	20 2.9%
If employees speak up, management could get feedback that could be used to improve the institutions	60 44.1%	40 35.3%	5 5.9%	20 8.8%	10 5.9%
Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institutions because of fear of retaliation from executives/co-workers.	25 17.6%	50 38.2%	40 17.6%	10 14.7%	10 11.8
Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institutions because of fear of losing employment,	60 35.5%	40 23.5%	5 1.5%	20 8.8%	10 5.9%

Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institutions because of fear of not being promoted,	50 29.4%	70 41.2%	10 17.6%	3 8.8%	2 2.9
Employees who speak up are never victimized,	2 2.9%	3 8.8%	10 5.9%	50 29.4%	70 41.2%
My institution's culture support employees to speak up.	20 15.5%	15 10.1%	5 5.6%	70 40.1%	25 30.2%
It is normal for employees not to speak up or to omit some parts when raising an issue in the institution.	50 17.6%	60 37.2%	10 20.6%	7 12.8%	8 11.8%
Employees do not speak up during meetings because they do not want to support the management.	40 26.5%	50 29.4%	20 20.6%	10 5.9%	15 17.6%
If I want to speak, I do not support a view that is different from that of many other employees	50 47.2%	40 38.2%	20 5.9%	15 5.9%	10 2.9%

Source: Field Survey (2024)

Table 2 computed- Mean and Standard Deviation

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Problems in the institutions can be identified easily if all employees speak up.	135	1.00	5.00	4.2941	.87141
If employees speak up, management could get feedback that could be used to improve the institution	135	1.00	5.00	4.0294	1.19304
Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institutions because of fear of retaliation from executives/co-workers.	135	1.00	5.00	3.3529	1.27641
Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institution because of fear of losing employment.	135	1.00	5.00	3.6176	1.12855
Most employees do not speak up on critical issues in the institution because of fear of not being promoted,	135	1.00	5.00	3.8529	1.04830

Employees who speak up are never victimized,	135	2.00	5.00	4.4118	.74336
My institutional culture support employees to speak up.	135	1.00	5.00	3.3235	1.17346
It is normal for employees not to speak up or to omit some parts when raising an issue in the institution.	135	1.00	5.00	3.3824	1.25565
Employees do not speak up during meetings because they do not want to support the management.	135	1.00	5.00	3.4118	1.41673
If I want to speak, I do not support a view that is different from that of many other employees	135	1.00	5.00	4.2059	1.00843
Valid N (listwise)					

Source: Field Survey (2024)

4.1 Test of Hypotheses

Test of Hypothesis One

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between defensive silence and Organisational performance in Paul University, Awka, and Madonna University Okija in Anambra State.

Table 3 Correlations between Defensive Silence and Organisational Performance

		Defensive Silence	Organisational Performance
Defensive Silence	Pearson Correlation	1	.728**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.021
	N	117	117
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.728**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	
	N	117	117

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table Summary

Table 4.3.1 result show that there is a significant relationship between defensive silence and Organisational performance at $r=0.728$, $n=117$ and $P=0.021$ ($p<0.05$) at 5% significant level. At this significant level, alternative hypothesis is accepted. Since p value is less than 0.05, the

alternate hypothesis will be accepted that there is positive relationship between defensive silence and Organisational performance in Paul University, Awka and Madonna University Okija, all in Anambra State.

Test of Hypothesis Two

Ho2: Deviant silence is not significantly related to Organisational performance in Paul University Awka and Madonna University Okija, Anambra State.

Table 4 Correlations between Deviant Silence and Organisational Performance

		Deviant silence	Organisational Performance
Deviant silence	Pearson Correlation	1	.728**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.021
	N	117	117
Performance	Pearson Correlation	.728**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.021	
	N	117	117

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table Summary

From table 4 indicated positive relationship between deviant silence and organisational performance with $r=0.736$, $n= 117$ and $P=0.043$ ($P<0.5$) at 0.05 significant at 2tailed, alternative hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is positive relationship between deviant silence and Organisational performance of Paul University, Awka, and Madonna University Okija Anambra State.

5. Summary of Findings

From the analysis carried out, it was found that defensive silence has a positive relationship with organizational performance; deviant silence also has a positive relationship with organizational performance. Regarding the reasons behind silence as examined in the hypothesis, the research discovered that it was typical for staff members to remain silent or to leave out certain details when bringing up concerns within the institution when they believed the communication system was insufficiently sound to ensure impartial and equitable treatment. Speaking up was useless, according to the majority of respondents to the study on the reasons behind people's quiet. The research additionally discovered that employees' quiet was influenced by their feelings of not having the right to speak, fear of not being promoted, stigmatization, losing their job, and retaliation from bosses and coworkers.

Conclusion

The study investigated Employee Silence and Organisational Performance in Paul University , Awka and Madonna University Okija. Silence is an important issue to be considered in Organisational Performance in these two Universities since silence has the power to impair an organization's performance and growth. It was evident that the majority of respondents agreed on this point. A common conclusion from the study is that defensive silence and deviant silence affect workers behaviors in related areas that affect job performance, which in turn forces the disadvantaged ones to keep mute hence breeds negative work attitudes. In addition, silence among workers is caused by a range of factors that include organizational culture, communication system, leadership styles, and organizational politics which in turn exert significant effect on performance.

Recommendations

1 Fear is the primary source of defensive silence, and it should be reduced. Fear of dismissal is heightened by employment insecurity, which is why employees' job stability and security must be maintained.

2. Management should create an environment in which deviant silence is viewed as an important variable to be considered as well as opportunities to create good communication and formal systems for the transfer or exchange of information, concerns, and ideas in order to take the necessary action

References

- Ahmad, N., & Taghvaei, R. (2019). The Role of Transformational Leadership in Employees' Empowerment with The Mediation Role of Organizational Silence. *Scinzer Journal of Accounting and Management*, 3(4), 38-46.
- Amuna, Y. M. A., Aqel, A., Kasim, E., & Tharya, H. (2021). How far Organizational Silence Influence NGOs Job Performance?. (*IJAMSR*), 5(6).
- Aktan, A.G. (2020) Organizational Silence: Concepts, causes and consequences. *Quarterly Journal of Science of Managing, Iran* 104.
- Alqarni, A.Y.S. (2020). How school climate predicts teacher's organizational silence. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1),12-27.
- Aylsworth, J. (2018, May 26). Change in the workplace: Organizational silence can be dangerous. *Organizational Psychology* examiner.<http://www.examiner.com/article/change-the-workplaceorganizational-silence-can-be-dangerous>
- Brinsfield, C.D., Edwards, M.S., & Greenberg, J. (2009). Voice and silence in organisations: Historical review and current conceptualizations. In J. Greenberg, M.S. Edwards (Eds), *Voice and Silence in Organisations*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd., 3-33.
- David, W. (2015). Human Resource Management and Corporate Performance in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(2), 291-314.

- Erenler, E. (2020). The relationship of employee silence behaviour with some personal and organizational features: A field study on tourism industry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences.
- Fein, E. C., Tziner, A., & Vasiliu, C. (2021). Perceptions of ethical climate and organizational justice as antecedents to employee performance: The mediating role of employees' attributions of leader effectiveness. *European Management Journal*.
- Gambarotto, F., & Cammozzo, A. (2020). Dreams of silence employee voice and innovation in a public sector. *Community of Practice, Innovation, Management, Policy and Practice*, 12(2), 166-179.
- Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (2014). Employee compensation: The neglected area of HRM research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 24(1), 1–4.
- Karaca, H. (2023). An exploratory study on the impact of organisational silence in Hierarchical organisations: *Turkish National Police case*. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(23), 38-50.
- Liu, D., Wu, J., & Ma, J. (2009). Organisational silence: A survey on employees working in a telecommunication company. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, IEEE Conference Publications, 1647-1651.
- Milliken, F.J., Morrison, E.W., & Hewin, P.F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.
- Nikmaram, S., (2012). Study on relationship between organisational silence and commitment in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 17(10), 1271-1277.
- Okoro, N. P. & Okoro, E. O. (2014). Time and Change: Development of Private Universities in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(9), 186-192.
- Pinder, C.C., & Harlos, K.P. (2021). Employee silence: quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, K.M Rowland and G.R. Ferris eds., New York: JAI Press, 20, 331-369.
- Rego, A. (2020). *Personal and Organizational Communication - Theory and Practice*. Syllabus Editions, Portugal.
- Saaed, H. K., Raheemah, S. H., & Shaalan, U. H. (2019). The Effect of Organizational Silence on Occupational Burnout. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, (22), 875-891.
- Van, D.L, Ang, S., & Botero I. C. (2022). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee

Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359-1392.

Yousefi Saeedabadi, R. & Mohammadian, S. (2015). "Determining the relationship between organizational silence and organizational productivity in Education and Training Office in City of Ghaemshahr", *Journal of Educational Researches*, Vol. 7, No. 25, pp. 65-86.

Yang, T., Guo, Y., Ma, M., Li, Y., Tian, H., & Deng, J. (2017). Job stress and presenteeism among Chinese healthcare workers: the mediating effects of affective commitment. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(9), 978.