Volume 20 Issue 14
Originally issued as A6



Global Journal of Management and Business Research: A Administration and Management
Volume 20 Issue 6 Version 1.0 Year 2020
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

Debate on the Role of Organizational Silence Behaviors and Employee Efficiency

By Oduyoye, O., Francis-Odii, M. I. & Asikhia, O. U
Babcock University

Abstract- Organizations are growingly demanding their staff to be innovative, to express their ideas and to be responsible for the excessive expectations of the customers, and focus on the quality service delivery as an indicator of changing world. However, it has been observed from literature that organizations find it difficult to achieve their set goals due to lack of committed employees. Thus the paper investigated the role of organisational silence behaviours on employee efficiency in selected private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The work made use of quantitative survey design where questionnaire was employed as the instrument of data gathering from six hundred and ninety six employees from five selected private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The results from the multiple regression analysis conducted revealed that oorganizational silence behaviors have combined positive significant effect on employee efficiency (Adjusted R2= 0.218, F(5,620) = 35.886, p< 0.05)).

GJMBR-A Classification: JEL Code: D23



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2020. Oduyoye, O., Francis-Odii, M. I. & Asikhia, O. U. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Debate on the Role of Organizational Silence Behaviors and Employee Efficiency

Oduyoye, O., [α] Francis-Odii, M. I. [σ] & Asikhia, O. U. [ρ]

Abstract- Organizations are growingly demanding their staff to be innovative, to express their ideas and to be responsible for the excessive expectations of the customers, and focus on the quality service delivery as an indicator of changing world. However, it has been observed from literature that organizations find it difficult to achieve their set goals due to lack of committed employees. Thus the paper investigated the role of organisational silence behaviours on employee efficiency in selected private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The work made use of quantitative survey design where questionnaire was employed as the instrument of data gathering from six hundred and ninety six employees from five selected private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. The results from the multiple regression analysis conducted revealed that oorganizational silence behaviors have combined positive significant effect on employee efficiency (*Adjusted* R^2= 0.218, $F(5,620) = 35.886$, $p< 0.05$)). However, from the individual sub-variables, top management characteristics, communication opportunity, subordinates perception of feedback and official authority had positive and significant effect on employee efficiency. The paper recommend that management should encourage more of communication flow from top to bottom to enhance employee efficiency.

I. Introduction

Organizational silence, and ways of dealing with it have great importance in organizational discussions. Employees who have a determining role in giving services and establishing a relationship with customers, their attitude and behaviour towards customers affect the satisfaction, quality of the services which, in its turn are effective in the improvement of organizational performance (Bageri et al., 2011). Organisational silence not only slows down organisational development but also causes several consequences such as decreasing in employees' commitment levels, causing internal conflicts, reducing decision making process, blocking change and innovation, preventing positive or negative feedbacks to the management. It also causes an increase of behaviours such as breaking down of morale and motivations of employees, absenteeism, tardiness which negatively affect individual and organisational activities. Employee's performance remains sine-qua-non for building appropriate work behaviour and disposition in higher institutions (Okoro & Okoro, 2014). Employees' also tend to perform well if they are given the privilege to participate in decision making process and empowered to take initiative and responsibility (Gupta & Shaw, 2014).

Several studies have been carried out in relation to the effect of organisational silence behaviours on employee efficiency but the findings seem contradictory (Frances, Cindy & Bishara, 2015; Kiu-Sik, Hiroyuki, Takao, Dong-Bae & Isao, 2011; Ikon & chukwu, 2017; Naquib, Muhammad & Hafiz, 2016;Procter, 2014). Daniel, Damiao, and Susa (2015) conducted a study on Organizational Silence: A Survey on Employees Working in a Telecommunication Company. The study confirmed the direct and indirect effects of participative decision-making leadership behavior and information-sharing leadership behavior on the negative psychological feelings of employees, employees' silence behavior, and the work performance. Establishing the evaluate criteria for, we should decide whether the manager has participative decision-making leadership behavior and information-sharing leadership behavior. In order to ensure the rationality of the evaluation, that need to be considered as one of the key to evaluate business managers. We can also give more guidance on how to implement the leadership behavior of effective participative decision-making and sharing-information in fostering outstanding managers. In short, the study concludes that the importance of the leadership behavior of participative design-making and sharing-information should be highlighted in work. It is benefit for enhancing the enterprise performance

In contrast, Nafei (2016) research study on the Impact of Organisational Silence on Job Attitudes: A Study on Pharmaceutical Industry in Egypt. Results indicate that supervisors' attitudes to silence, top management attitudes to silence and communication opportunities are associated and predict employee silence behaviour. The research has found that there is a significant relationship between organisational silence and job attitude. Also, the research has found that organisational silence directly affects job attitude at the pharmaceutical industry in Egypt. In the light of these findings, the paper determined if there is a significant effect of organisational silence behaviours on employee efficiency of selected private Universities in Ogun State, Nigeria.

II. Literation Review

a) *Employee efficiency*

Khademfar and Amiri (2013) state that efficiency means doing things in the right way. Two sorts of

Author α σ ρ: School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun state. Nigeria.
e-mail: francisodiimercy@gmail.com

© 2020 Global Journals

efficiency are often referred to, namely static efficiency and dynamic efficiency. Static efficiency relates to refining existing products, processes or opportunities; making improvements within existing conditions. Dynamic efficiency refers to the continuous development of new products, processes or opportunities, so that profitability improves. Something is only efficient when it is effective. In other words: something is efficient if it has a useful effect. It has to be functional. Efficiency is the ability to act or produce effectively with a minimum of waste, expenditure or unnecessary effort. The focus is on the resources and speed with which organisational goals are achieved. The effectiveness of your organisation is determined by how successfully you assign resources in order to achieve your organisational goals in the right way. In other words, how well your organisation converts input into output, such as products, programmes and services. In this way effectiveness contributes to the success of your organisation.

Efficiency measures relationship between inputs and outputs or how successfully the inputs have been transformed into outputs (Katrina, 2012). To maximize the output Porter's Total Productive Maintenance system suggests the elimination of six losses, which are: reduced yield–from start up to stable production, process defects, reduced speed, idling and minor stoppages, set-up and adjustment and equipment failure. The fewer the inputs used to generate outputs, the greater the efficiency. According to Pinprayong & Siengthai (2012) there is a difference between business efficiency and organisational efficiency. Business efficiency reveals the performance of input and output ratio, while organizational efficiency reflects the improvement of internal processes of the organisation, such as organisational structure, culture and community. Excellent organisational efficiency could improve entities performance in terms of management, productivity, quality and profitability.

Effectiveness and efficiency are exclusive, yet, at the same time, they influence each other; therefore it is important for management to assure the success in both areas. Efficiency is all about resource allocation across alternative uses (Kumar & Gulati, 2010). It is important to understand that efficiency doesn't mean that the organisation is achieving excellent performance in the market, although it reveals its operational excellence in the source of utilization process.

b) Organizational silence

According to Bagheri, Zarei, and Aaeen, (2012) early definitions of silence equated it with loyalty and the assumption that nothing was wrong if concerns were not being voiced. Today this situation is seen as a reaction and recession. Organisational silence is an inefficient process which can waste all organizational efforts and may take various forms, such as collective silence in meetings, low levels of participation in suggestion schemes, low levels of collective voice and so on (Nikmaram, Gharibi, Shojaii, Ahmadi, & Alvani, 2012). While in a changing world, organisations need for employees who express their ideas; employees also choose organisations in which they can express themselves because both employees and managers have high motivation and high performance in a place that silence doesn't exist. How to break silence culture and establish a free climate to encourage employees' voice are big challenges faced to mangers (Beheshtifar, Borhan, & Moghadan, 2012). It is obvious that a silent climate can work against organisational outcomes and vice versa

Hence, Brinsfield, Edwards, and Greenberg (2013) defined Organisational silence as the lack of effective interactions among staff and it stands opposite to the concept of organisational voice. The term organisational voice, which means stating effective opinions and ideas, is discussed as opposite to the phrase organizational silence. Organisational silence occurs when organisational voice does not exist. In other words, when the down-top relationship weakens in the organisation, organisational voice would be undermined too and organisational silence would replace it. Also, Ozdemir, and Ugur (2013) defined organisational silence as the condition where the employees do not share their opinions or concerns about the company issues with both their employers and their colleagues. Bagheri, Zarei & Aaeen, (2014) stated that with the passage of time, organisation silence brought low quality of work for organisation. Hence, this not only hurts the organisation but the employee as well

c) Top management characteristics

The reasons for organisational silence are attributed to organisational biases, negative reactions from management, lack of objectivity, lack of trust, personality characteristics of managers and their limited experience (Yildiz, 2013). The reasons can be explained in five headings: the first are administrative and organisational reasons, as the individuals resort to organisational silence for fear of negative reactions leading to many problems related to decision-making, organisational efficiency and poor performance (Robbins, & Judge, 2013). The second is the fear of social isolation, as talking about work problems leads to damage in social relations within the organization (Morrison & Millikon, 2003). The third is limited experience, as the previous experiences by the individuals regarding the negative results they encountered make them avoid problems or discussing them with their coworkers or superiors, despite their awareness of the importance of standing up early. The fourth reason is the fear of damaging the relations, as the fear of losing relations with colleagues who are

© 2020 Global Journals

valuable is hard to concede and the fifth and last reason is work related concerns, as fear of losing a promotion and being abused.

d) Communication opportunity

Once a relationship is established, and the lines of communication are open, it is undeniably easier to have others on your side and others who are willing to help you out, both professionally and personally. Eisenberger & Stinglhamber (2011) acknowledged the dynamic relationship among trust, relationships, and power when the say, sometimes building a relationship so that others will help you requires nothing more than being polite and listening. Being nice to people is effective because people find it difficult to fight with those who are being polite and courteous. When that key component of mutual understanding is absent in an organisational setting, however, silence comes into play, and a myriad of power schemes and competing agendas can influence the decision of whether or not to communicate concerns.

Donaghey, Culliane, Dundon and Wilkinson (2016) suggest ways in which management, through agenda-setting and institutional structures, can perpetuate silence over a range of issues, thereby arranging employees out of the voice process. When a dominant group voices certain opinions, these perceptions become the dominant ideologies that float across the organisation. The subordinate viewpoints are therefore never brought to the forefront because they are inevitably silence. Ozturk, Eryesil, & Beduk (2016) in their study noted that the employees who feel that their ideas and opinions are valued by the management will trust their organisations more and as a result, this will prevent the silence climate from happening within an organisation. If job security and principle of meritocracy are promoted in an organisation, it will lead to an increase in employee commitment and a decrease in fear, which in turn, will create suitable conditions to stop organisational silence within a company. As far as the findings of this study are concerned, it has been found that compared to men, women have a relatively bigger tendency to show silence behaviour. In order to decrease silence behaviours within an organization, the management should periodically organize seminars in which employees feel more confident in terms of expressing their opinions.

e) Supervisors' characteristics

The freedom to express dissenting opinion may be restricted when working under the leadership of a supervisor with prestige and power, because the subordinate tends to the option of silence due to fear of the negative impact of expressing the dissent opinion (Turner & Pratkanis, 1998). Power and status of the supervisor can increase or decrease the silence of subordinates. It can be concluded that silence could increase in the presence of a powerful supervisor (Edmondson, 2003). Study by Owuor (2014) found out that silence had an effect on both the employees and the organisation. On the employees it was found that silence affected their level of commitment, trust, and fear. However it also found that silence cause stress that lead to depersonalisation and feelings of low personal accomplishment, as well as negative job attitudes. The study also found that to the organisation, silence would mean the organisation not benefiting from intellectual contribution, problems not identified, and development of a negative organisational culture. It would also be detrimental to organisational learning.

f) Official authority

Official authority is based on the strength of the position or location in the organisational structure. Vakola and Bouradas (2005) concluded that Organisations today need not only to recruit but also to retain and motivate talented employees. Managers may consider OS as an important variable when they explore organisational climate and culture or when they want to create an environment where talented people would choose to remain or wish to join. These practical implications are also important in a change context where the truth must be heard in order to be able to effectively implement and institutionalize the change and improve the existing situation.

g) Subordinates perception of feedback

The effects of organisational silence are not limited to the organisation, as it can negatively affect the behavior of individuals working in the organisation. These effects are represented in the individual's feeling unappreciated, lack of the individual's ability to control, and the individual suffering from cognitive dissonance. This is because silence makes it difficult to the individual to strike a balance between his beliefs and behaviors (Panahi, Veisehb, Divkharc, & Kamarid, 2012). OS correlates negatively with three dimensions of organisational trust (trust in the organization, trust in leadership, and trust in the supervisor). This means that the more silence means less trust (Nikolaous, 2011). OS has a negative impact on the removal of inadequacies and mistakes occurring in the organisational activities as well as on the establishment of a healthy feedback mechanism. In an organisation without feedback mechanisms, mistakes turn into a mechanism of carrying out activities or become more severe (Milliken & Morrison, 2003).

Nafei (2016) discovered that although employees are expected to contribute to the development of organisation with their knowledge, ideas, opinions and suggestions, they sometimes prefer to remain silent. Justice can be as a reason. It is noted that Perceived justice, especially procedural justice can be important in employers' decision to speak up about organisational issues. Employees choose to be silent because of their managers and maybe they fear, fear of

© 2020 Global Journals

reprimand or punishment or even dismissal. So they prefer silent of course sometimes they are silent because of they don't have the ability to do any voice or they don't know how express their mean. So the organisation isn't able to use them and they aren't as sources of change, creativity, learning and innovation.

h) Empirical review

Najafi and Khaleghkhah (2017) results suggest that open communication between management and employees is an effective way to increase employee's performance—both their standard job and extra-role activities—mainly because it signals that the organization cares about the well-being and values the contributions of its employees. Bag and Ekinci (2018) exerted that based on the findings of this research, the study has been able to reveal that effective communication creates mutual understanding between management and workers which helps in building genuine relationship among both parties in the organisations. Also, this study reveals that poor communication can affect workers performance. Therefore, organisations should regularly articulate it policies, goals and objectives to it workers in other to improve work performance. That is, communication is a means through which the task and the resources needed to carry out an assignment, the roles and duties and the expected results are made known to the subordinates which makes work easier for better performance. Also, managers need to communicate with employees regularly to get feedback and offer suggestions in other to prevent confusion about future job assignments; this will help improve workers performance and organizational productivity. In addition, top managers should communicate directly with their subordinates on issues of importance. Organisations should eliminate the barriers on communication and create efficient, participative, and transparent communication medium to improve workers commitment.

Hamdi and Rajablu (2012) state that the findings of public and private sector universities on organisational communication system functioning and organizational performance scores revealed harmonization between organisational communication and organisational performance. It was concluded that independent variable (Organisational Communication) had significant effect on dependent variable (Organisational Performance) of public and private sector universities. In addition, on the basis of organisational communication scores and organisational performance ranking scores of universities, it was concluded that organisational performance improves subsequently when organisational communication system performs well. Both organisational communication and organisational performance are interdependent. Imperfect functioning of one element (communication system), results in the failure of other (performance). Organisational communication and organisational performance of public and private sector universities turned out to be interrelated with each other.

Proctor (2014) opined in a study effective organisational communication: a key to employee motivation and performance that organisational communication plays a vital role in employee motivation and performance as real changes are taking place in modern organizations which confront the new reality of tighter staffing, increased workloads, longer hours and a greater emphasis on performance, risk-taking and flexibility. Today's organisations are run by multi and cross functional teams which show little tolerance for unquestioned authority. To deal with this situation, the art of persuasion and the effort to find the correct emotional match with your audience is necessary. Shonubi, and Akin taro (2016) recommends that for an effective and efficient organisational performance, management must embrace; more clarity of ideas before communicating; better understanding of the physical and human environment when communicating; purpose of communication must be thoroughly analyzed; when planning communication, consultation should both be top down and bottom up, and all facts must be implicit and explicit; consideration should be given to the content and tone of the messages; the languages must be messages the receiver would find valuable; communication with precise messages and are short run often possess long run importance; all interested parties in communication should be encouraged to be good listeners; immediate actions must be accompanied and accomplished with communication; and lastly effective feedback and follow up mechanism process must succeed effective communication.

i) Theoretical

Social exchange theory (SET) is among the most influential conceptual paradigms for understanding workplace behavior. Its venerable roots can be traced back to at least the 1920s (Malinowski, 1922), bridging such disciplines as anthropology (Firth, 1967; Sahlins, 1972), social psychology (e.g., Gouldner, 1960; Homans, 1958; Thibault & Kelley, 1959), and sociology (Blau, 1964). Although different views of social exchange have emerged, theorists agree that social exchange involves a series of interactions that generate obligations (Emerson, 1976). Within SET, these interactions are usually seen as interdependent and contingent on the actions of another person (Blau, 1964). One of the basic tenets of SET is that relationships evolve over time into trusting, loyal, and mutual commitments. To do so, parties must abide by certain rules of exchange. Rules of exchange form a normative definition of the situation that forms among or

© 2020 Global Journals

is adopted by the participants in an exchange relation (Emerson, 1976). In this way, rules and norms of exchange are the guidelines of exchange processes.

The strength of the theory is based on the fact that it is important for managers to understand the significance of social exchange to get to know the level of commitment of employees (Mitchell & Cropanzona, 2005). This implies that employees interpret human resource practices and the trustworthiness of management as indicative of the personified organization's commitment to them (Whitener, 2001). Similarly, Mitchell and Cropanzona (2005) concluded that exchanges with a positive outcome will result in reciprocal responses (Whitener, 2001). When negotiating, there is an exchange of social activities (Redmond, 2015). Also, when negotiating, both parties want to maximize their values. The best outcome would be a win-win situation, where both participants benefit. For example, if a person gets a job offer from a company, both parties negotiate about the employees' allowances. Hence, in a negotiation, it is doubtlessly true, that there is some form of social exchange between them. An example would be the negotiation about wages, working hours, vacation days or the distribution of tasks and duties (Redmond, 2015). Generally speaking, when researchers discuss relationships, they are referring to an association between two interacting partners (whether individuals or institutions). As reviewed earlier, management research has extensively examined different forms of interpersonal exchange. Of special interest to social exchange theorists are differences in the parties involved in the relationships (Levine, Kim, and Ferrara 2010).

III. Methodological Review

Past research on the study variables employed survey research design with multiple regression method of analysis to examine the combine effect of explanatory variables on dependent variable in their study. Such studies are Erhan & Hatice (2014); Mclean, Burris & Dertert, (2013); Peter, Belinda, & Brian, (2013); Subrahmaniam, & Rangaraj, (2012); Kaine, (2012); Chris, Kerstin, & Mark, (2013); Platt, & Saundry, (2016); Herfferner, & Dundon, (2017); Irbha, (2016); Malikeh, Hossein, Mahmood, & Moghadam, (2012); Fapohunda, (2016); Zaid, Lily, & Mohd, (2017); İnayet, Özge, Sildiroğlu, Güner, & Burcu, (2016); Maria, & Dimitris, (2014); Elbeyi, Afyon, Füsun, & Dinçer, (2015); employed moderating regression method of analyses in their study. Based on these past studies methodological review, multiple regression method of analyses has the ability to determine the combine, moderating effect of more explanatory variables on the dependent variable. Multiple regression method of analysis has the ability to determine the relative effect of more predictor variables to the dependent variable and also identify anomalies. However, one of the inadequacies of the multiple regression analysis is that of its complex data sets which can lead to false conclusion if not properly analysed. In this study, survey research design and multiple regression method of analyses will be employed to examine the effect of explanatory variables on the dependent variable in the study. In addition, moderating regression method of analysis will also be employed to determine the effect of the moderating variables of the study (organisational justice and organisational culture) on the link between dependent and independent variables.

Five private universities were used based on year of establishment (1999-2009) and academic excellence. The selected private universities include Babcock University, Bells University, Covenant University, Crawford University, and Crescent University. The target population consisted of regular faculty and staff. A sample size of 696 was obtained using the formula recommended by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Items used in the questionnaire were adopted and adapted based on conceptual review. The pilot test was conducted using two private universities in Ogun State namely, Christopher University and Mountaintop University. The content validity was used to determine how well the research instrument measures the intended items. While the construct validity was determined by reviewing literatures and obtaining validated research instruments. The reliability of the research instrument was subjected to internal consistency method. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested using the Cronbach's Alpha correlation coefficient and Cronbach coefficient of 0.7 and above was considered adequate for an adapted questionnaire; as results ranged from 0.704 to 0.948 (Livingston, 2018).

Therefore, the multiple regression equation was established based on the representation of organisational silence behaviours. Thus the model was formulated as:

$$Y = f(X)$$

Where:

Y = Dependent Variable (Employee Efficiency)
X = Independent Variable (Organizational Silence)

Where:

x_1 = Top Management Characteristics (TMC)
x_2 = Communication Opportunity (CO)
x_3 = Supervisors Characteristics (SSC)
x_4 = Official Authority (OA)
x_5 = Subordinates Perception of Feedback (SPF)

The functional relationship of the model is presented as

$$EFF = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TMC + \beta_2 CO + \beta_3 SC + \beta_4 OA + \beta_5 SPF + \varepsilon_i$$

© 2020 Global Journals

IV. Results and Discussions

The inferential statistics was applied to determine whether organizational silence behaviours have no significant effect on employee efficiency in selected private universities in Ogun State.

Model	*B*	*T*	*Sig.*	*F(df)*	R^2	*Adj* R^2	*F(Sig).*
Constant	10.091	9.155	.000	F(5,620), 35.886	0.225	0.218	0.000
TOP MANAGEMENT CHARACTERISTICS	.396	6.986	.000				
COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITY	.175	3.171	.002				
SUPERVISORS CHARACTERISTICS	.041	.741	.459				
OFFICIAL AUTHORITY	.120	2.282	.023				
SUBORDINATES PERCEPTION OF FEEDBACK	-.127	-3.127	.002				
Dependent Variable: Employee Efficiency							

a) Interpretation

Table 1 reveals the result of the multiple regression on the effect of organizational silence behaviours (top management characteristics, communication opportunity, supervisor characteristics, official authority and subordinates perception of feedback) on employee efficiency of selected private university in Ogun State. The table shows that organizational silence dimension when combine to determine their effect on employee efficiency of selected private university in Ogun State produced a coefficient of multiple correlation, r = 0.474 and an adjusted R2 = 0.218 at p = 0.000 < 0.05, indicates that percentage of variation in employee efficiency jointly explained by the explanatory variables is 47.4% and other factors that are not studied contributes a balance of 52.6%.

The table further reveals that the coefficients of the regression model designed to investigate the effect of organizational silence dimension on employee efficiency are provided. From the results, top management characteristics, communication opportunity, official authority and subordinates perception of feedback has significant effect on employee efficiency of selected private university in Ogun State while supervisor characteristics does not.

The results reveals the unstandardized coefficients of top management characteristics [β = 0.396, p = 0.000], communication opportunity [β = 0.175, p = 0.002], supervisor characteristic [β = 0.041, p = 0.459], official authority [β = 0.120, p = 0.023], and subordinates perception of feedback [β = 0.127, p = 0.002] are all statistically insignificant.

This therefore indicates that a percentage increase in top management characteristics will have a 39.6% increase in employee efficiency of selected private university, a percentage increase in communication opportunity will have an 17.5% increase in employee efficiency of selected private university, a percentage increase in supervisor characteristics will have an 4.1% increase in employee efficiency of selected private university, a percentage increase in official authority will have a 12.0% increase in employee efficiency selected private university, while a percentage increase in subordinates perception of feedback will have a 12.7% increase in employee efficiency of selected private university. The final regression model for thus becomes:

$$EE = 10.091 + 0.396(TMC) + 0.175(CP) + 0.120(OA) + 0.127(SPF) \ldots\ldots eq2$$

Where:
EE = Employee Efficiency
TMC = Top Management Characteristic
CO= Communication Opportunity
OA = Official Authority
SPF= Subordinates perception of feedback

Based on the regression equation above, taking into account all organizational silence dimension (top management characteristics, communication opportunity, supervisor characteristics, official authority and subordinates' perception of feedback) have significant contributions to employee efficiency. The *a priori* expectation was that the variables of organizational silence dimension will have a significant effect on employee efficiency. Thus, the null hypothesis should be accepted if $\beta_1 - \beta_5 \neq 0$ and $p \leq 0.05$ H_{02} otherwise it has to be rejected. Based on the results in the table, the coefficients of the measures of organizational silence dimension are not equal to zero and their p values are found to be higher than 0.05. Since we have predictors

© 2020 Global Journals

of organizational silence having significant effect on employee efficiency, thus, we have to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that organizational silence dimensions have significant effect on employee efficiency of the selected private university in Ogun State.

b) Discussion of findings

The test of hypothesis two revealed that organizational silence variables have significant effect on employee efficiency. This position was taken based on the fact that more predictors were found to have significant contributions to employee efficiency. Discussing this finding, Bag & Ekinci (2018) revealed that effective communication creates mutual understanding between management and workers which helps in building genuine relationship among both parties in the organizations. Also, this study reveals that poor communication can affect workers performance. Therefore, organizations should regularly articulate it policies, goals and objectives to it workers in other to improve work performance. That is, communication is a means through which the task and the resources needed to carry out an assignment, the roles and duties and the expected results are made known to the subordinates which makes work easier for better performance. Also, managers need to communicate with employees regularly to get feedback and offer suggestions in other to prevent confusion about future job assignments; this will help improve workers performance and organizational productivity. In addition, top managers should communicate directly with their subordinates on issues of importance. Organizations should eliminate the barriers on communication and create efficient, participative, and transparent communication medium to improve workers commitment.

Hamdi and Rajablu (2012) state that the findings of public and private sector universities on organizational communication system functioning and organizational performance scores revealed harmonization between organizational communication and organizational performance. It was concluded that independent variable (Organizational Communication) had significant effect on dependent variable (Organizational Performance) of public and private sector universities. In addition, on the basis of organizational communication scores and organizational performance ranking scores of universities, it was concluded that organizational performance improves subsequently when organizational communication system performs well. Both organizational communication and organizational performance are interdependent. Imperfect functioning of one element (communication system), results in the failure of other (performance). Organizational communication and organizational performance of public and private sector universities turned out to be interrelated with each other.

Proctor (2014) opined in a study effective organizational communication: a key to employee motivation and performance that organizational communication plays a vital role in employee motivation and performance as real changes are taking place in modern organizations which confront the new reality of tighter staffing, increased workloads, longer hours and a greater emphasis on performance, risk-taking and flexibility. Today's organizations are run by multi and cross functional teams which show little tolerance for unquestioned authority. To deal with this situation, the art of persuasion and the effort to find the correct emotional match with your audience is necessary.

Shonubi and Akintaro, (2016) recommends that for an effective and efficient organizational performance, management must embrace; more clarity of ideas before communicating; better understanding of the physical and human environment when communicating; purpose of communication must be thoroughly analysed; when planning communication, consultation should both be top down and bottom up, and all facts must be implicit and explicit; consideration should be given to the content and tone of the messages; the languages must be messages the receiver would find valuable; communication with precise messages and are short run often possess long run importance; all interested parties in communication should be encouraged to be good listeners; immediate actions must be accompanied and accomplished with communication; and lastly effective feedback and follow up mechanism process must succeed effective communication.

V. Conclusion and Recommendation

As a result of statistical analysis, there was statistical significance effect of organisational silence behaviours on employee efficiency of the employees in the selected private Universities in Ogun State. Nigeria. Administrators should address the organisational silence behaviours using the suitable way to achieve work interests. Administrators should be concerned of University workers who have high efficiency at work, to reinforce the benefit of organizational silence among them and increase their self-efficacy. Administrators should heed the field studies to monitor the methods for dealing with the organisational silence behaviours taking into account the work interests and the workers in the selected Universities.

References Références Referencias

1. Bağ, D., & Ekinci, C. E. (2018). Organizational silence behaviors of faculty members, their causes and consequences. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *15*(1), 567.
2. Bagheri, G., Zarei, R. & Nik A, M. (2014). Organizational silence (Basic concepts and its development factors). *Ideal Type of Management, 1 (1).*

© 2020 Global Journals

3. Barry, M., & Adrian, J. W. (2016). Pro-social or pro-management? A critique of the conception of employee voice as a pro-social behaviour within organizational behaviour. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 5 (2), 261-284.*
4. Beheshtifar, M., Borhani, A., & Moghadan. (2012). Destructive role of employee silence in organizational success. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *2*(11).
5. Blau, P. M. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley.
6. Bogosian, R. (2012). Engaging organizational voice: A phenomenological study of employee's lived experiences of silence in work group settings*. The faculty of graduate school of education and human development of the George Washington University*.
7. Brainfield, C., Edwards, M., & Greenberg, J, A. (2013). Voice and silence in organizations: Historical review and current conceptualizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *30* (8), 3-33.
8. Cakici, T. V (2010). The role of silence on employees' attitudes "the day after" a merger. *Personnel Review*, 40 (6), 723-741 29.
9. Cinar, O., Karcioglu, F., & Atiogullari, Z. D. (2013). The relationship between organizational silence and organizational citizenship behavior: A survey study in the province of Erzurum, Turkey. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 99, 314 – 321.*
10. Chris, R., Kerstin, A., & Mark, G. (2013).Employee voice and engagement: Connections and consequences*. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24 (4), 2780-2798.*
11. Donaghey, J., Cullinane, N., Dundon, T., & Wilkinson, A. (2011). *Reconceptualising employee silence.* Work, Employment and Society, *25* (1), 51-67.
12. Edmondson, A. (2003). Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams, *Journal of Management Studies, 40 (6), 1419-52.*
13. Eisenberger, R., & Stingl hamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees.* Washington, DC: APA
14. Elbeyi, P., Afyon, K., Füsun, I., & Dinçer, İ. K. (2015).The effect of nepotism on organizational silence, alienation and commitment: A study on hotel employees in Turkey*. Journal of Management Research ISSN 1941-899X 2015, 7 (4).*
15. Erhan K., & Hatice U. (2014) Investigation of organizational citizenship behavior, organizational silence and employee performance at physicians and nurses, and the relationship among them*. Case Studies Journal, 5 (9).*
16. Fapohunda, T. M. (2016).Gender, voice and silence: Strategies for inclusion of female employees. *Archives of Business Research 4 (1). Nigeria.*
17. Firth, R. (1967). *Themes in economic anthropology*. London: Tavistock
18. Frances, J. M., Cindy, A. S. N., & Bishara, A. M. P. (2015).Linking workplace practices to community engagement: The case for encouraging employee voice. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 29, (4), 405–421.*
19. Gambarotto, F., & Cammozzo. A. (2010). Dreams of silence employee voice and innovation in a public sector. *Community of Practice, Innovation, Management, Policy and Practice, 12(2), 166-179*.
20. Gupta, N., & Shaw, J. D. (2014). Employee compensation: The neglected area of HRM research. *Human Resource Management Review, 24(1), 1–4.*
21. Hamdi, S., & Rajablu, M. (2012). Effect of supervisor-subordinate communication and leadership style on organizational commitment of nurses in health care setting. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *7*(23).
22. Herfferner, M., & Dundon, T. (2017).The role of front line managers in employee voice: A social exchange perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management.*
23. Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American journal of sociology, 597-606.*
24. Ikon, M. A., & Chukwu, A. C. (2017). Employee engagement and performance of selected private universities in Delta state, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Resource ManagementVol.5, No.5, 42-53.*
25. Irbha, M. (2016). Why employees remain silent: A study on service sector. *International conference*
26. Inayet, A., Özge, E., Sildiroglu, T., Güner, D., &Burcu, T. (2016). Silence belongs to the young, speech belongs to the old: The reason why research assistants remain silent. *Journal of Education & Human Development December 2016, 5, (4), 109-118.*
27. Jahanbakhshian, P., Assadi, R., & Pahlavaninejad, F. (2015). Providing a conceptual model on organizational silence behavior based on organizational culture, organizational climate and organizational commitment components in service firms. *Management and Administrative Sciences Review, 4(2), 438-448.*
28. Kaine, S. (2012). Employee voice and regulation in the residential aged care sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *22*(3), 316-331.
29. Katsuhiko, S. (2017). Senders' bias: How can top managers' communication improve or not improve strategy implementation? *International Journal of Business Communication, 54(1) 52–69.*

© 2020 Global Journals

30. Khademfar, M., & Amiri, S. A. (2013). The relationship between ethical leadership and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Social Science. 4(1).*
31. Katrina, R. (2012). Evaluating the performance of an organization/ better evaluation Beta. *http://bettereval uation.org/theme/organizational_performance.*
32. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610.
33. Kumar, S., & Gulati, R. (2010). Measuring efficiency, effectiveness and performance of Indian public sector banks. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *59*(1), 51-74.
34. LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(6), 853-868.
35. Levine, T. R. Kim, S. (2010). Social exchange, uncertainty, and communication content as factors impacting the relational outcomes of betrayal. *Human Communication, 13, 303- 318.*
36. Malikeh, B., Hossein, B., Mahmood, N. & Moghadam, M. (2012). Destructive role of employee silence in organizational success. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 2, (11).*
37. Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the archipelagos* of Melansian New Guinea. London: Routledge
38. Maria, V., & Dimitris, B. (2014). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: an empirical investigation. *International Business Research. 8 (5).*
39. McClean, E. J., Burris, E. R., & Detert, J. R. (2013). When does voice lead to exit? It depends on leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(2), 525-548.
40. Mitchell, M. S. & Cropanzano, R. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management, 31:6, 874-900.*
41. Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, *5*(1), 373-412.
42. Nafei, W. A. (2016). Organizational silence: Its destroying role of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Business Research*, *9*(5), 57.
43. Naqib, U. K., Muhammad, K., & Hafiz, U. (2016). Relationship between organizational silence and citizenship behavior-mediating role of commitments: Evidence from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Universities. *Pakistan Journal of Applied Economics, 281-297.*
44. Najafi, H., & Khaleghkhah, A. (2017). The impact of organizational silence on organizational performance (Case study: Nurses of Mazandaran Bo-Ali-Sina hospital). *Iranian Journal of Nursing Research*, *12*(5), 45-52.
45. Nikolaou, I., Vakola, M., & Bourantas, D. (2011). The role of silence on employees' attitudes the day after a merger. *Personnel Review*, *40*(6), 723-741.
46. Nikmaram S., Gharibi, Y. H., Shojaii, S., Ahmadi, Z. M. & Alvani, S.M. (2012). Study on relationship between organizational silence and commitment in Iran. *World applied sciences journal, 17 (10), -1271-1277.*
47. 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).*
48. Owuor, A. A. (2014). *Organizational silence affecting the effectiveness of organizations in Kenya: A case study of safaricom call center.* Doctoral thesis.
49. Özdemir, L., & Sarıoğlu Uğur, S. (2013). Evaluation of organizational voice and silence perceptions of the employees in terms of demographic characteristics. A survey of public and private sector. *Journal of Faculty of Economics, 27 (1), -257-281.*
50. Ozturk, M., Eryesil, K., & Beduk, A. (2016). The effect of organizational justice organizational cynicism and turnover intention: A research on the banking sector. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *6* (12).
51. Panahi, B., Veiseh, S., Divkhar, S., & Kamari, F. (2012). An empirical analysis on influencing factors on organizational silence and its relationship with employee's organizational commitment. *Management Science Letters*, *2*(3), 735-744.
52. Peter, J. H., Belinda, C. A., & Brian, K. C. (2013). Reducing burnout in Australian nurses: The role of employee direct voice and managerial responsiveness. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24, (16), 3146–3162.*
53. Pinprayong, B., & Siengtai, S. (2012). Restructuring for organizational efficiency in the banking sector in Thailand: A case study of Siam commercial bank. *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business, 8 (2), 29-42.*
54. Proctor, C. (2014). *Effective organizational communication affects employee attitude, happiness, and job satisfaction*. A thesis submitted to Southern Utah University. USA.
55. Redmond, M. V. (2015). *Social Exchange Theory*. English Technical Reports and White Papers. 5.
56. Shonubi, A. O., & Akintaro, A. A. (2016). The impact of effective communication on organizational performance. *The International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention, 3(3).*
57. Subrahmaniam, T., Robert, H. S., & Rangaraj, R. (2012). Ask and you shall hear (but not always): Examining the relationship between manager consultation and employee voice. *Personnel psychology, 65, 251–282.*

© 2020 Global Journals

58. Sahlins, M. (1972*). Stone age economics*. New York: Aldine. Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. 1996. Social exchange.
59. Tangirala, S., & Ramanujam, R. (2008). Employee silence on critical work issues: The cross level effects of procedural justice climate. *Personnel Psychology*, *61*(1), 37-68.
60. Thibaut, J. W. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The *social psychology of groups*. N. *John Wiley & Sons.*
61. Turner, M., & Pratkanis, A., (1998). A Social Identity Maintenance Model of Group Think. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 37, - 210-235.*
62. Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: An empirical investigation. *Employee Relations*, *27* (5), 441-458.
63. Whitener, E. M. (2001). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23 (3), 513-530.*
64. Yıldız, E. (2013). Enigma of silence in organizations: What happens to whom and why? *Beykent University Journal of Social Sciences, 6(2), 30-44.*
65. Zaid, A., Lily, S., & Mohd, A. (2017). Employee voice and job satisfaction: An application of Herzberg's two-factor theory. *International Review of Management & Marketing, 7(1), 150-156.*

© 2020 Global Journals