

Field : Sport Sciences

Type : Research Article

Received:05.10.2015 - Accepted:22.11.2015

Study on Relationship between Working Performance and Organizational Silence among Employees of Central Organization of Ministry of Youth and Sports

Gözde DOĞU¹, Baki YILMAZ²

¹Aksaray University, School of Physical Education and Sport, Aksaray, TURKEY

²Yildirim Beyazit University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Ankara, TURKEY

Email: gzdalgn@hotmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between work performance and organizational silence among employees of Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization. Within the scope of this study, questionnaire is conducted on employees of Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization and results were analyzed statistically. Universe of the study comprises of employees of Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization. Random sampling method is used in this study. Questionnaire method was utilized as a tool for gathering data. 361 questionnaires were applied.

Within the scope of this study, Organizational Silence Scale and Performance Scale were used. For reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used. For demographic features analysis frequency analysis was conducted; to investigate the relationship between organizational silence and performance levels of the employees, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin, Bartlett's tests and correlation study were employed.

As a result of the study, it is seen that there is a meaningful and directly proportional relationship between organizational silence and working performance.

Keywords: Organizational Silence, Performance, Sports

Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Merkez Teşkilatı Çalışanlarının Örgütsel Sessizlik ve Çalışma Performansları Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı; Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Merkez Teşkilatı çalışanlarının örgütsel sessizlik ile performans düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Çalışma kapsamında Bakanlık merkez teşkilatı personeline anket uygulanmış ve sonuçlar istatistiksel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Araştırmanın evrenini Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı Merkez Teşkilatı çalışanları oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada tesadüfi örneklem yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Veri toplama aracı olarak anket uygulanmasından yararlanılmıştır. Çalışmada 361 adet anket uygulanmıştır.

Araştırma kapsamında Örgütsel Sessizlik Ölçeği ve Performans Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın güvenilirlik analizi için Cronbach's alpha kat sayısı hesaplanmıştır. Demografik özelliklerin analizi için frekans analizi, çalışanların örgütsel sessizlik ile performans düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek amacıyla Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin ve Barlett's testleri ve korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır.

Analiz sonucunda çalışan performansı ile örgütsel sessizlik arasında anlamlı ve aynı yönde bir ilişki olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Sessizlik, Performans, Spor

Introduction

There is a meaningful and directly proportional relationship between organizational silence and working performance, showing that issue of organizational silence in organizations is to be carefully investigated and solved.

As a communication problem, definition of organizational silence as it is like gold is not always valid. The case where employees consciously remain silent for certain cases and not sharing the knowledge that would be beneficial for the organization is an unfavorable condition and this is conceptualized as “organizational silence” (Bangherivd., 2011, Çakıcı, 2007).

Silence, when used in verbal expressions, is defined as avoidance behavior from facing inevitable trouble, distress or problem. According to Morrison and Milliken (2000), silence is not only expressing denial or opposition, but also it might be resulted from individuals’ lack of knowledge, absence of voice opportunities or the belief that expressing ideas is unnecessary or even that would be futile or dangerous (Pinder, C.C and Harlos, K.P., 2001).

Silence in organizations, on another hand, may be defined as employees refraining or consciously silencing their opinions and suggestions about technical and/or behavioral subjects related to their work and workplace (Çakıcı, 2007: 149).

Performance concept is related to realization or execution of a certain aim, task or function. It is a concept determining the outcome in terms of quality/quantity. Outcome may be explained as absolute or comparatively (Akal, 2002: 1).

Organizational performance, on the other hand, is a scale to what extent objectives and results are accomplished as a result of enterprise’s activities. (Eren, 2007, p.61). Performance of an organization is the result of an outcome of a definite time or work. When considered from this perspective, negative or positive opinions and behaviors of employees and all activities performed by the employees for sake of the organization will emerge as a tool determining their performance level (Şehitoğlu and Zehir, 2010:96).

Organizational silence is a behavior pattern which might improve or undermine organizational performance. Although organizational silence is an emotionally difficult way of expression, it is an effective way of expressing favorable or unfavorable situations in the organization (Bagherivd, 2012:276).

It is important to define effects of personally perceived silence on performance to determine the results incurred to the organization objectively due to organizational silence. Considering results of organizational silence via performance criteria will open a new perspective for institutions to determine their policies regarding organizational communication and silence (Aktaş and Şimşek, 2014).

In this content, aim of the study is to investigate relationship between performance and organizational silence among employees of Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization.

Organizational Silence

Organizations expect much higher performance from their employees when they did in the past. Employees are expected to take more initiative, to express their opinions and ideas

openly to be more creative and to take more responsibility resulting from rising expectations of customers, high level and complicated technologic structures, harsh competitive environment and globalization removing borders day by day (Robert E. Quinn ve Gretchen M. Spreitzer). Even if, it is pointed out that employees are expected to believe in themselves, to express their ideas freely, to assert knowledge they possess without any fear, conducted researches reveal results opposing to this situation. In literature, in practice, many employees state that knowledge sharing and communication is not supported (Isıl Özgen and Olca Sürgevil). There are beliefs that employees explicitly expressing their ideas and opinions about any problem or issue may affect their position and would result in a perception that they would seem to be a troublemaker and these ideas and opinions would not result in any change. Moreover, majority of the employees exhibit an approach that would accord with ideas of the community by giving consent to others' suggestions. Therefore, under these circumstances, employees' such behaviors find its location within organizational silence (Özgen and Sürgevil, p. 303).

In spite of the fact that there are 3 dimensions in the original scale of organizational silence, it can be asserted that the result is not in completely parallel with the literature for the sampling group observed. It is seen that from acquiescent silence, defensive silence and pro-social silence factors at original level, dimensions of acquiescent silence and pro-social silence are gathered under the same factor. Since these two dimensions in question are more related to silence behavior of the employee, the newly emerging dimension is named as "individual silence". Since other dimension appearing in original dimension holds its basis as it is and accommodates silence behavior towards protecting the institution they are working for and their surroundings, it is found convenient to name such silence as "relational silence".

Individual silence is defined as the situations where employees withhold their opinions and information about their work for reasons such as helpfulness and caring other's happiness and for the sake of their organization (Dyne, 2003).

On the other hand, relational silence is known as withholding work-related information and opinions for caring sake of others (Karacaoğlu and Cingöz, 2009:701).

Employee Performance

Employee in the organization generates benefits in physical and intellectual means, also coordinates other resources which are required for sustainability of the organization. Realization of effectively utilizing human resources for organizations may only be possible with an effective human resources policy. One of the uttermost important element of these policies is the policy related to performance. Therefore, performance is the most important subject from the viewpoint of an enterprise (Burçin Özgür, 2003).

Performance is the actions that the organization wants their employees to achieve at highest level (Campbell, 1993). Therefore, performance is also not only defined with the action itself but also judgment and evaluation processes (S. J. Motowidlo and J.R. Van Scotter, 1994). Also, it is thought that only quantifiable actions constitutes the performance (Campbell, 1993).

Employee performance is the base fact for organizations, managers and employees as much as researchers. Hence, to reach their targets and to gain competitive power, organizations need employees who exhibit high performance at works they perform. Presence of high employee

performance is important for organizations as well as for the employees. For individuals, carrying out their works properly and achieving success are main sources of accomplishment and satisfaction; employee performance constitutes basis for many outcomes that are essential for individuals such as a better career and a higher social status etc. (Yelboğa, 2006:200).

Main objective of the organizations is to work with individuals exhibiting high performance. Performance is generally a dependent variable in organizational works but it is one of the most important source of data related to operation of a system. Although talking about problems or issues related to work pose many risks, remaining silent has many negative outcomes for individuals and organization. Some of them may be listed as feeling of uselessness, declined job satisfaction, increase in workforce turn-over rate (Milliken and Morrison, 2003:1563). If organizational silence is high, it is linked with organizational stress (Kılıç et.al., 2013), depression and health problems (Bagheri, Zarei and Nik, 2012); if it is low, it is linked with loyalty and job satisfaction (Barçın, 2012). All of these dimensions influence performance negatively (Lepine and Van Dyne, 2013).

Method

Universe of the study comprises of employees of Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization. Random sampling method is used in this study. Questionnaire method was utilized as a tool for gathering data. 361 questionnaires were applied.

Within the scope of this study, Organizational Silence Scale and Performance Scale were used. As organizational silence scale; the method developed by Linn Van Dyne, SoonAng and Isabel C. Botero and adapted to Turkish by Erdoğan (2011) is used. For performance scale, the method developed by Fuentes, Saez, Montes (2004) and Rahman-Bullock (2004) and adapted to Turkish by Göktaş (2004) is employed.

Questionnaire form used in the study comprises of 3 main parts. First part contains questions regarding demographic features of the employees (Education level, sex, marital status, title, age, working duration), second part includes 15 questions to measure organizational silence and third part includes 6 questions to determine performance levels of employees. 5 level likert scale is employed in the study. For the analysis of the questionnaire data, we benefitted from packaged softwares.

For reliability analysis of the study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient is calculated. For demographic features analysis frequency analysis was conducted, to investigate the relationship between organizational silence and performance levels of the employees, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin, Barlett's tests and correlation study were employed.

Findings

Within the scope of the study, following results are obtained regarding age, education level, working period, title, marital status and sex for employees working at Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization.

When age distribution of the participants are investigated; %40 of the participants lie within 18-25 age group, 27% of the participants lie within 26-35 age group, 9% of the participants lie within 46-55 age group, 6% of the participants lie within 65 age group. Considering educational background; 17% of the participants are high school graduate, 8% of the

participants are community college graduate, 64% of the participants hold bachelor degree and 11% of the participants hold graduate degree. Once working periods are investigated, it is concluded that 6% of the participants serve for 0-1 year, 30% of the participants serve for 1-5 years, 4% of the participants serve for 6-10 years, 30% of the participants serve for 11-15 year and 30% of the participants serve for 16-30 years. It is also indicated that 75% of the participants work as public servants, 23% of the participants work as contracted personnel and 2% of the participants work as branch managers. Moreover, it is found that 53% of the participants are married and 47% of the participants are single. When gender status is examined, it is seen that 50% of the participants are female and 50% of the participants are male.

Reliability and Validity Analysis

As analyzing organization silence, KMO and Barlett's Tests are conducted and KMO value is found to be 0.595. Since it is $0.595 > 0.5$, it seems suitable for factor analysis on the basis of these data.

In Barlett's test, sig. value is 0.000. This value indicates the meaningful relationship between factors.

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,817	24,087	24,087	4,817	24,087	24,087	3,289	16,445	16,445
2	2,472	12,362	36,449	2,472	12,362	36,449	3,237	16,186	32,631
3	1,866	9,330	45,779	1,866	9,330	45,779	2,630	13,148	45,779
4	1,567	7,835	53,615						
5	1,265	6,327	59,942						
6	1,060	5,298	65,240						
7	,983	4,915	70,155						
8	,899	4,493	74,648						
9	,835	4,177	78,826						
10	,734	3,671	82,497						
11	,653	3,267	85,763						
12	,602	3,010	88,773						
13	,509	2,544	91,317						
14	,392	1,960	93,278						
15	,303	1,513	94,790						
16	,269	1,345	96,135						
17	,226	1,130	97,266						
18	,217	1,085	98,351						
19	,184	,919	99,271						
20	,146	,729	100,000						

According to results given above, first factor indicates individual silence while second factor shows relational silence. Regarding 15th question, scale seems to be 2 factored (dimension). According to table, 2 factor explains total variance of 59,753%. First factor defines 44,621% of total variance while second factor defines 15,132% of total variance.

Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component	
	1	2
D1	,726	-,439
D2	,748	,008
D3	,672	,259
D4	,614	,430
D5	,845	,237
D6	,867	-,002
D7	,826	-,151
D8	,766	-,015
D9	,817	-,336
D10	,831	,014
D11	,648	,226
D12	,498	,325
D13	,039	,560
D14	-,025	,861
D15	,011	,659

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

According to results given above, first factor shows individual silence and second factor shows relational silence. Regarding 15th question, scale seems to be 2 factored (dimension). According to table, 2 factor explains total variance of 59,753%. First factor defines 44,621% of total variance while second factor defines 15,132% of total variance.

Once table is evaluated;

There are 12 and 3 questions under individual silence factor and relational silence factor, respectively.

Questions generating individual silence are 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12 and factor loading lies within 0,498-0,867.

Questions generating relational silence are 13-14-15 and factor loading lies within 0,560-0,861.

Reliability Analysis Regarding Factors

Individual Silence

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,924	12

Once reliability analysis made for individual silence factor, cronbach's alpha value is 0.924. This value is considered to be very reliable.

Relational Silence

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,707	3

Once reliability analysis made for relational silence factor, cronbach's alpha value lies within 0.707 and this value is considered to be reliable since it lies within 0,60-0,80.

Analysis Regarding Employee Performance

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,750
Approx. Chi-Square		1180,331
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	15
	Sig.	,000

In factor analysis made for employee performance, considering KMO and Bartlett's Test, KMO value is seen to be 0.750.

These data may be used in factor analysis since $0.750 > 0,5$.

According to above results, scale regarding 6 questions is single factored (dimensional). Single factor explains 56,026% of total variance.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3,242	54,026	54,026	3,242	54,026	54,026	3,196	53,259	53,259
2	1,234	20,568	74,593						
3	,760	12,659	87,252						
4	,421	7,010	94,262						
5	,202	3,371	97,633						
6	,142	2,367	100,000						

Reliability Analysis Regarding Working Performance
Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,761	6

When reliability analysis table showing work performance is examined, cronbach's alpha value is recorded as 0.761. This can be called reliable since it is within 0,60-0,80.

Employee Performance and Organizational Silence
Correlations

		Employee Performance	Organizational Silence
Employee Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	,017
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,023
	N	361	361
Organizational Silence	Pearson Correlation	,017	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,023	
	N	361	361

H0: "There is no meaningful relationship between employee performance and organizational silence"

H1: "There is a meaningful relationship between employee performance and organizational silence"

According to findings in the tables, it may be said that there is a meaningful relationship at the same direction within 95% confidence interval. ($p < 0,05$). H0 hypothesis is rejected.

Discussions and Results

Examining demographic features of employees working at Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization, 361 Ministry personnel have participated to this study that aims investigating the relationship between organizational silence and working.

Interpreting in the light of findings, relationship between organizational silence and work performance of the employees in this division is discussed within the scope of conducted questionnaires in a literature based manner.

Once studies towards how organizational silence affects employee performance are researched, Briednsfield (2009) asserted that employee silence influences enterprise and employee performance.

Mission oriented leaders aim to eliminate complications such as inequity and troubles among their employees, which may occur during performance of works, by informing generally about answers of what, how, when and whom questions with planning. Therefore, employees choose to remain silent. In addition, apart from the planning, leader explains employees about qualities of their tasks; thereby eliminates misunderstandings and follows operation of the organization. Employees may remain silent not to break the order within the organization. The possibility of any harm to the organization might directly or indirectly affect employees; this also promotes behavior of organizational silence for the sake of organization (Ullah and friends (2011)).

Also, in studies of Van Dynev, it is stated that the belief that silence in favor of the organization cause employees to think that they made positive contributions to the organization (Van Dyne vd., 2003) and this indirectly contributes to the employee performance.

Employees in the organization cannot find alternative ways since they accept issues related to organization so they are inadequate for solving problems. From this aspect, employees who accepted all issues within the organization are not expected to show high performance. Employees tending to react for self-protection chooses to remain silent due to stress induced by the authority, this will result in falling away from an efficient working environment. Employees may express their ideas, opinions and information related to organization for the benefit of the organization. This case may highlight negative behaviors of other employees and employee performance may be negatively affected by this situation. Employees may withhold their ideas and opinions related to the organization for the future of the organization or for the sake of their associates. Especially, it is of highest importance that not sharing confidential information to their rivals and keeping silent in this regard for both the organization and their associates (Tayfun and Çatır, 2013).

As a result, examining demographic features of employees working at Ministry of Youth and Sports Central Organization, the relationship between working performance and organizational silence is investigated. It is seen that the study is parallel with the literature and there is a meaningful and directly proportional relationship between organizational silence and working performance.

REFERENCES

- Akal Z (2002). İşletmelerde Performans Ölçüm ve Denetimi. MPM Yayınları: 473,Ankara.
- Aktaş H and Şimşek E (2014). Örgütsel Sessizlik İle Algılanan Bireysel Performans, Örgüt Kültürü Ve Demografik Deđişkenler Arasındaki Etkileşim*,Akdenizİ.İ.B.F. Dergisi (28) 2014, 24-52
- Bagheri, G., Zarel R. Aeen M. N (2012). “Organizational Silence”. Ideal Type of Management. Vol:1, No:1, p:47–58.
- Barçın N (2012) İşletmelerde örgütsel sessizliđin örgütsel bađlılık ve iş tatminine etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Adana: Çukurova Üniversitesi.
- Burçin Ö (2008). Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Felsefesinin İşgören Performansı Üzerine Etkisi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Akademisi, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, İnsan Kaynakları ve Yönetim Bilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, s. 63. 183 Zühal Akal, “Performans Kavramları ve Performans Yönetimi”, Milli Produktivite Merkezi Yayınları, Ankara, Ocak 2003, p. 10-11.
- Brinsfield C. (2009). Employee Silence: Investigation of Dimensionality, Development of Measures, and Examination of Related Factors Dissertation, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ohio State University.
- Campbell, v.d. (1993). A theory of performance, In E. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), Personnelselection in organizations, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, p.40, 35–70.
- Çakıcı, A (2007), “Örgütlerde Sessizlik: Sessizliđin Teorik Temelleri ve Dinamikleri”, Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16 (1), p.145-162
- Dyne.L.V,Ang. S and Botero. I.C. (2003) Conceptualizing Employee Silence Voice As Multidimensional Constructs. Journal Of Management Studies, 40(6),1364.
- Erdoğan İ. (1998). İşletmelerde Personel Seçimi ve Başarı Deđerleme Teknikleri. Küre Ajans, İstanbul.
- Isıl Ö and Olca S (2009). “Örgütsel Sessizlik Olgusu ve Turizm İşletmeleri Açısından Deđerlendirilmesi”, Turizm İşletmelerinde Örgütsel Davranış’ın İçinde, Editör: Zeyyat Sabuncuođlu, Bursa: MKM Yayıncılık, p. 304.
- Karacaoglu, K. and Cingöz, A. (2009), İş gören Sessizliđinin Kaynađı Olarak Liderlik Davranışı Ve Örgütsel Adalet Algısı”, 17. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eskişehir, pp. 700-707.
- Lepine JA and Van Dyne L (2013). Predicting voice behavior in workgroups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(6), 853-868.
- Milliken FJ and Morrison EW (2003). Shades of silence: Emerging themes and future directions for research on silence in organizations, Journal of Management Studies, 40(6),1564-1568.
- Özgen I and Olca S (2009). “Örgütsel Sessizlik Olgusu ve Turizm İşletmeleri Açısından Deđerlendirilmesi”, In: Turizm İşletmelerinde Örgütsel Davranış, Editor: Zeyyat Sabuncuođlu, Bursa: MKM Yayıncılık.

- Pinder CC and Harlos KP (2001). "Employee Silence: Quiescence and Acquiescence as Responses to Perceived Injustice", *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, p.331-369
- Robert EQ and Gretchen MS (1997). "The Road to Empowerment: Seven Questions Every Leader Should Consider", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol.26, No.2, p.36.
- Motowidlo SJ and Van Scotter JR (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, p. 475-480.
- Şehitoğlu Y. and Zehir C. (2010). "Türk Kamu Kuruluşlarında Çalışan Performansının, Çalışan Sessizliği ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Bağlamında İncelenmesi". *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Vol 43, No 4, p. 87-110.
- Sipahi, B., Yurtkoru, E. S., Çinko M. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi*, Beta Basım Yayım, İstanbul.
- Tayfun A., Çatır O, (2013). Örgütsel sessizlik ve çalışanların performansları arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(3), 114-134.
- Ullah, S., Ullah, A., &Durrani, B. (2011), Effect of Leadership on Employees Performance in Multinational Pharmaceutical Companies in Pakistan, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2:9, 286-299.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., &Botero, I.C. (2003), Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Construct, *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1359-1392.
- Yelboğa A. (2006). "Kişilik Özellikleri ve İş Performansı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi". *İş, Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*.