

Investigation of teachers' organizational silence levels

RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

Gülsüm Güvenç^{1c}

¹ MEB, Gaziosmanpaşa Secondary School, Ankara, Türkiye,

^c **Corresponding Author:** MEB, Gaziosmanpaşa Secondary School, Ankara, Türkiye, guvencgulsumm@gmail.com

Article Info

Keywords

Secondary School,
Teacher,
Organizational Silence,
Quantitative Research

Highlights:

- Teachers' overall organizational silence level was found to be very low
- Accepting-passive and organizational-benefit silence occurred sometimes.
- Gender, age, education, and seniority caused no significant difference.
- Effective communication strategies within schools are recommended

Abstract

The research aims to measure teachers' perceptions of organizational silence. For this purpose, a quantitative survey method was chosen. The study group consisted of teachers working in secondary schools in the Sincan district of Ankara province during the 2023-2024 academic year. The research involved 207 teachers who participated through a convenience sampling method. The "Organizational Silence Scale" was utilized in this study. This scale includes fifteen questions across three sub-dimensions: accepting and passive, opportunistic, and for the benefit of the organization. Using the SPSS 27 program, it was found that teachers' levels of organizational silence were low, sometimes manifesting in the sub-dimensions of accepting and passive silence, as well as silence for the benefit of the organization. Furthermore, there were no significant differences based on variables such as gender, age, education, or professional seniority. As a result, teachers in secondary schools, who experience the greatest need for self-improvement and productivity in education, may choose to remain silent. It is therefore recommended that schools develop effective communication strategies to address this silence.

Cite: Güvenç, G. (2025). Investigation of teachers' organizational silence levels. *Journal of Teacher Development and Education*, 3(1), 53-65 <https://doi.org/10.29329/journalted.36>

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are defined as important institutions that transform resources into products and services to meet the needs of society (Şenel & Buluç, 2016). In this context, organizations are shaped according to the needs of society for development, self-improvement, and welfare (Ayık, 2007). Today, organizations operate in complex and dynamic environments, which affects employee behaviors. Organizational behavior research seeks to understand employee experiences and foster a positive work environment (Robbins & Judge, 2013). As a special type of organization, schools play a crucial role as structures where education and training are combined and social values are passed on to future generations (Şenel & Buluç, 2016). Schools are among the institutions that hold vital importance in the social structure of society (Dal, 2017). However, due to administrative and organizational issues, teachers working in schools often find it difficult to express their opinions and suggestions, and thus prefer to remain silent (Kalay et al., 2014). Silence is linked to linguistic expressions and refers to the absence of speech and sound (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). Although it does not involve sound or words, silence is a form of communication. It has functions such as approval, rejection, reaction, or expression of agreement (Ceviz, 2017). In various disciplines, silence assumes different meanings. In psychology, it is associated with introversion and lack of self-confidence; in sociology, it reflects social indifference and oppression. In the field of communication, it plays a positive role in terms of listening and courtesy rules (Çakıcı, 2010). In ethics and philosophy, silence is associated with privacy (Yapça, 2024). Correctly interpreting the meaning behind silence forms the basis of effective communication (Çakıcı, 2007). Key points to overcoming silence include adopting a corporate culture that supports continuous learning and development, empowering employees, and designing an organizational structure where transparency prevails at all levels (Yeşilaydın & Bayın, 2015).

While silence refers to refraining from speaking when one lacks sufficient information or opinion, organizational silence occurs when an employee chooses to remain silent due to the negative reactions they may face if they voice a problem in the workplace (Çakıcı, 2008). According to Morrison and Milliken (2000), organizational silence refers to the situation in which individuals do not communicate their analyses of situations within the organization to the authorities (Cited in Soysal et al., 2024). In this context, employees withhold information and problems, opting to remain silent (Karadağ, 2023). The tendency for employees not to share their concerns, ideas, and thoughts at work reflects organizational silence (Dyne et al., 2003). Knoll and Dick (2013) outlined four dimensions of organizational silence. Protective (passive) silence is a selfless behavior where individuals prioritize the interests of the organization and their colleagues over their own (İşler & Akçadağ, 2023). Acceptant silence occurs when employees avoid problem-solving and do not evaluate existing solution suggestions (Pinder & Harlos, 2001); cited in (Gürer & Deniz, 2018). Silence for the benefit of the organization involves concealing opinions and thoughts about work within a framework of cooperation and sacrifice (Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019). Opportunistic silence arises when individuals gain personal advantages by strategically withholding work-related information (Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019). The reasons for organizational silence may include fear of being excluded from the organization, the perception that speaking up is risky, fears of damaging relationships among employees, and distrust of management teams (Bildik, 2009). Furthermore, individual insecurity and organizational pressure hinder employees from expressing their thoughts. Organizational silence can stem from various factors, including fear, lack of trust, apathy, workplace policies, and cultural norms (Ozan & Yolcu, 2024). Power distance and cultural norms significantly influence teachers' silence behavior (Eroğlu et al., 2011). In Eastern cultures, the emphasis is on belonging and silence, and expectations of obedience to managers can lead to organizational silence. Injustices within the organization and a strong organizational culture further contribute to this issue (Tekin, 2024). Özkan (2022) emphasizes the importance of investigating the problems arising from organizational silence and their underlying causes. Macit and Erdem (2020) assert that organizational silence can lead to an organization's failure to adapt to change. According to Morrison and Milliken, there are three detrimental outcomes of this situation: employees feel their feelings are unimportant, cannot intervene in events, and struggle with mental adaptation (Özer et al., 2014; cited in Özkan, 2022). Silence may initially be perceived as a harmonious work process, but over time it results in ignoring problems, alienation of employees from the organization, and demotivation (Macit & Erdem, 2020). The implications of this situation include increased stress, communication problems, job dissatisfaction, low job performance, and a heightened tendency to quit (Ozan & Yolcu, 2024).

Educational management involves the effective utilization of people and resources within educational organizations. The actions of administrators and teachers significantly influence these organizations (Bozgöz, 2020). The development of methods by school administrators and their efforts to maintain order heavily impact the organization. Ensuring transparency in management enhances employees' sense of trust and strengthens their commitment (Klein, 2012; as cited in Demirten, 2024). Teachers' silence and reluctance to share their opinions

can negatively affect the achievement of educational goals (Girgin, 2020). Employees may be reluctant to disclose problems for personal and organizational reasons (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Teachers' failure to voice concerns in schools hampers school development and diminishes motivation (Göven & Şentürk, 2019). This scenario leads to teachers' inability to adapt to organizational culture and decreases their job performance (Faiz, 2023). Freedom of expression and high motivation are essential in education (Kocabaş & Karaköse, 2005). The organizational structure should be flexible, democratic, and open to sharing. Organizational silence must be regarded as a significant threat to organizations (Çiçek Sağlam & Yüksel, 2015). Teachers should not remain silent about problems within the organization and must express their thoughts clearly. Participation of all employees in change and innovation processes should be promoted actively (Dal, 2017).

In our age, complexity and organization are increasing in the social and business world. This situation leads to a rise in organizational problems. Consequently, the number of studies and topics related to organizations has also recently increased. Organizational silence is one of these issues, frequently encountered today (Pekel, 2023). The occurrence of silence in school organizations may contradict the pioneering role of schools in social change, undermining the main purpose of education and conflicting with the mission of schools. The reasons for the existence of organizational silence in schools must be examined comprehensively. To ensure change and development in schools, it is essential to address the issue of organizational silence. Understanding the causes and effects of this silence will enable young people, who are the guarantee of our future, to receive a better education. Administrators and teachers sharing their experiences on this issue will provide important information that can illuminate the solution to the problem. The results of the research will play a significant role in shaping policies and practices in the field of education. These findings, which will guide educational administrators, school leaders, and teachers, are critically important for overcoming organizational silence, which directly impacts the quality of education. Various studies on organizational silence provide significant insights into examining this issue. Çakıcı (2007) elaborated on the theories underlying silence in organizations and the factors that trigger silence. In Çakıcı's 2008 study, he found that the reasons for employees' silence in the education sector were linked to managerial and organizational factors. In his 2010 book, he addressed the theoretical foundations of silence and communication mechanisms. Taşkıran (2010) investigated the effect of leadership styles on organizational silence in hotel businesses and revealed differences between individual and relational silence attitudes. Alparslan and Kayalar (2012) dealt with organizational silence and organizational climate. Kahveci and Demirtaş (2013) developed a scale to measure teachers' levels of organizational silence. İşleyici (2015) studied the relationship between teachers' perceptions of silence and justice. Üçok and Torun (2015) categorized the personal and organizational factors affecting individuals' silence into four types. Ünlü (2015) suggested fair management practices for school administrators. Dönmez (2016) explored the relationship between teachers' silence and socialization levels. Demiralay and Çuhadar (2022) examined the relationship between employees' well-being and silence behaviors in the health sector. Aslan and Çınar (2023) related the reasons for teachers' silence to individual and organizational factors. Kahian (2023) evaluated the effect of motivation on silence. Çağan (2024) investigated how inter-teacher relationships influence organizational happiness, finding that silence plays a mediating role in this process. Özçakal and Demirhan (2023) examined the connection between conflict management and organizational silence. Gürgül (2024) highlighted the importance of the organizational silence climate, which enhances organizational development. Karayel (2024) identified the relationship between ethical leadership practices and organizational silence. İşler & Akçadağ's (2023) research categorized the causes and consequences of organizational silence into four groups. This study aims to determine the organizational silence levels of teachers.

- What level of organizational silence perception do teachers have?
- Is there a difference in teachers' perception of organizational silence with the effect of factors such as gender, age, educational status and professional seniority?

METHOD

Research Model

The study employed the survey method, a quantitative research approach. The survey method is one of the approaches used to explain a situation or phenomenon. This method aims to define the current situation of the individual or object regarding the subject examined (Arılı & Nazik, 2001; Karasar, 2014). The survey model aims to define the event, individual, or object examined within its natural conditions (Can, 2014).

Participants

The study population consisted of 2,159 teachers working in secondary schools in the Sincan district of Ankara Province, limited to the 2023-2024 academic year. The sample size was planned to be 10 times the number of questions on the scale ($n = 200$ people) (Akgül, 2005). The study included 207 people who voluntarily agreed to participate. "Descriptive statistics" were used to analyze the distribution of teachers' personal characteristics in Table 1.

Table 1. General Information of Participants

		f	%
Gender	Male	109	52,7
	Woman	98	47,3
	Total	207	100
Age	21-30	13	6,3
	31-40	89	43
	41-50	82	39,6
	51+	23	11,1
	Total	207	100
Professional seniority	1-10	50	24,2
	11-20	98	47,3
	21 +	59	28,5
	Total	207	100
Education	License(4 year)	159	76,8
	Master's degree	48	23,2
	Total	207	100

When Table 1 is analyzed, 52,7% of the participants were male and 47,3% were female. Additionally, 6,3% were between the ages of 21-30, 43% were between 31-40, 39,6% were between 41-50, and 11,1% were 50 years and older. Furthermore, 24,2% of the participants had a professional seniority of 1 to 10 years, 47,3% had 11 to 20 years, and 28,5% had 21 years or more. Finally, 76,8% of the participants held a bachelor's degree, while 23,2% had a master's degree.

Data Collection Instruments

The scale consists of two main parts. The first part includes general information about the participants, and the second part includes the "Organizational Silence Scale." The adaptation study into Turkish was carried out by Çavuşoğlu and Köse (2019). While the scale consists of 20 questions and 4 dimensions, 5 questions were removed during the adaptation study. Three basic dimensions define the scale. The first is silence for the benefit of the organization, represented by questions 6 and 7; the second is acceptance and passivity, represented by questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 19; and the third is opportunistic, represented by questions 17, 18, and 20. The questions in the scale are as follows: "I kept silent at work to avoid conflicts." (Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019). Table 2 includes the number of questions and alpha values of the scale.

Table 2. Number of Questions and Alpha Value of the Scale

Size	Question.	Alpha Value
Accepting and Passive	10	,946
Opportunist	3	,821
For the Benefit of the Organization	2	,852
Overall average	15	,950

According to Table 2, the scale consists of 15 questions and 3 sub-attributes and Cronbach Alpha values are between ,821 and ,950. This shows that the scale has a high level of reliability in general and in its sub-dimensions. In order to determine the explanatory factor structure of the scale, Çavuşoğlu and Köse (2019) found that the Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin value of the data obtained was ,936 and the data were suitable for factor analysis (Kalaycı, 2010; Karagöz, 2016; cited in Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019) and Barlett's Sphericity Test was significant [$X^2 = 7,690$, $p < ,001$]. Çavuşoğlu and Köse (2019) applied principal component analysis to the data and determined that there were 3 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 in the factor analysis. According to Büyüköztürk (2007), the difference between the loading values of an item on two factors is expected to be as high as possible and this difference is recommended to be at least ,10. Question 8 (Factor 1 loading of ,578; Factor 3 loading of ,577) in the organizational benefit sub-dimension and question 16 (Factor 2 loading of ,492;

Factor 3 loading of ,551) in the opportunistic silence sub-dimension were removed from the scale because they loaded close to two factors. According to Kalaycı (2010: 329), items with a common variance of less than ,50 can be removed from the analysis (Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019). Therefore, in the study conducted by Çavuşoğlu and Köse (2019), the 10th question in the sub-dimension for the benefit of the organization (,471), 14 (,466) and 15 (,384) questions in the sub-dimension for protection purposes, which had low common variance, were removed from the scale. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, Çavuşoğlu and Köse (2019) found that the t values of all observed variables explaining the latent variables of organizational silence behavior in the study were above 1,96 and significant at 95% reliability level.

Data Collection

An online form (Google Form) was prepared and delivered to the participants in secondary schools in a virtual environment. In the first part, a questionnaire form including demographic characteristics was used and in the second part, data were collected using the organizational silence scale developed to measure the participants' perceptions of organizational silence.

Data Analysis

Teachers' responses were analyzed using SPSS 27 software. The kurtosis and skewness values of the data were examined for normality distribution analysis and the results in Table 3 were obtained.

Table 3. Kurtosis and Skewness of the Data

	Skewness	Kurtosis
Accepting and Passive	,453	-,569
Opportunist	,785	,194
For the Benefit of the Organization	,165	-1,098
General	,349	-,582

In Table 3, the general average of kurtosis and skewness values varies between -,582 and ,349. These values show a normal distribution (Hair et al., 2013). Parametric tests were used for the analysis. "Descriptive statistics" were preferred for the distribution analysis of the personal characteristics of the participants of the questionnaire. Independent sample t -test was used to analyze binary variables such as teachers' education level and gender. More categorical variables such as age and professional seniority were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance.

The ranges determined for the Organizational Silence Scale are as follows (Çavuşoğlu & Köse, 2019): 1.00 - 1.80: Strongly disagree and Never, 1.81 - 2.60: Disagree and Very little, 2.61 - 3.40: Neither agree nor disagree and Sometimes, 3.41 - 4.20: Agree and Very, 4.21 - 5.00: Strongly agree and Very much. The significance limit was set as $p < 0.05$. The responses to the questionnaire were analyzed by means and standard deviations.

RESULTS

Findings related to the question "At what level do teachers perceive organizational silence?"

The findings obtained as a result of the analysis of the data collected to observe whether there is a significant difference in organizational silence levels based on the opinions of the teachers are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Silence Perception Levels

Size	n	\bar{X}	Ss
Accepting and Passive	207	2,63	1,040
Opportunist		2,28	1,005
For the Benefit of the Organization		2,83	1,226
General		2,58	,961

According to the values in Table 4, the perception of silence is generally very low ($\bar{X}=2,58$) and sometimes in the sub-attributes of acceptance and passive silence and silence for the benefit of the organization.

Findings related to the question "Is there a difference in teachers' perception of organizational silence with the effect of factors such as gender, age, educational status and professional seniority?"

Based on the teachers' opinions and the analysis results, the level of organizational silence varies according to educational status, as presented in Table 5. These findings were determined based on the data collected.

Table 5. T-Test of Silence Level According to Educational Background

Size	Education	n	\bar{X}	Ss	t	p
Accepting and Passive	License (4 year)	159	2,60	1,037	- ,644	,898
	Master's degree	48	2,71	1,056		
Opportunist	License (4 year)	159	2,32	1,036	1,087	,234
	Master's degree	48	2,14	,888		
For the benefit of the organization	License (4 year)	159	2,79	1,223	- ,717	,931
	Master's degree	48	2,94	1,245		
General	License (4 year)	159	2,57	,973	- ,360	,406
	Master's degree	48	2,63	,927		

In Table 5, the relationship between educational status and organizational silence levels was investigated and the t-test revealed that there was no significant difference ($p > ,05$). The results of the analysis examined whether there is a significant difference in teachers' organizational silence levels depending on gender. These results are discussed in detail in Table 6.

Table 6. Gender Based t-Test of Silence Level

Size	Gender	n	\bar{X}	s	t	p
Accepting and Passive	Male	109	2,60	1,012	-,400	,600
	Woman	98	2,66	1,073		
Opportunist	Male	109	2,22	,978	-,811	,504
	Woman	98	2,33	1,035		
For the benefit of the organization	Male	109	2,78	1,195	-,628	,459
	Woman	98	2,88	1,263		
General	Male	109	2,55	,919	,565	,467
	Woman	98	2,62	1,008		

As a result of the test of significance between the groups in Table 6, it was observed that there was no significant difference in organizational silence levels according to gender ($p > ,05$). Data were collected to determine whether there is a significant difference between teachers' organizational silence perception levels and age and Table 7.

Table 7. ANOVA Test Whether There is a Difference in Silence Perception Level According to Age

ANOVA Results										
Size	Age	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean squares	F	p
Accepting and Passive	21-30	13	2,72	,930	Between Group	3,370	3	1,123	1,040	,376
	31-40	89	2,72	1,067	Within Group	219,304	203	1,080		
	41-50	82	2,60	1,010	Total	222,674	206			
	50+	23	2,30	1,090						
	Total	207	2,63	1,040						
Opportunist	21-30		2,67	1,139	Between Group	2,430		,810	,800	,495
	31-40		2,22	,932	Within Group	205,468		1,012		
	41-50		2,30	1,079	Total	207,898				

For the benefit of the organization	50+		2,19	,937	Between Group Within Group Total	6,450 303,290 309,739	2,150 1,494 1,439		
	Total	207	2,28	1,005					
	21-30		3,23	1,252					
	31-40		2,91	1,217					
	41-50		2,78	1,223					
	50+		2,43	1,218					
General	Total	207	2,83	1,226	Between Group Within Group Total	2,920 116,571 119,491	,918 ,923 ,995		,233
	21-30		2,77	,880					
	31-40		2,65	,947					
	41-50		2,56	,969					
	50+		2,30	1,024					
	Total	207	2,58	,961					

In the examinations based on the opinions of the teachers, no significant difference was found between the levels of organizational silence according to age ranges and between the overall and sub-attributes of the scale ($p > ,05$). The analyses conducted to determine the relationship between participants' organizational silence levels and professional seniority were collected to determine whether professional seniority constitutes a significant difference as a dependent variable. These results are presented in Table 8 in detail.

Table 8. ANOVA Test for the Difference in the Level of Silence According to Occupational Seniority

ANOVA Results										
Size	Professional Seniority	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	sd	Mean squares	F	p
Accepting and Passive	1-10	50	2,73	1,036	Between Group	5,134	2	2,567	2,407	,093
	11-20	98	2,72	1,011	Within Group	217,541	204	1,066		
	21+	59	2,38	1,064	Total	222,674	206			
	Total	207	2,63	1,040						
Opportunist	1-10	50	2,42	,996	Between Group	3,879		1,940	1,939	,146
	11-20	98	2,33	1,055	Within Group	204,019		1,000		
	21+	59	2,07	,932	Total	207,898				
	Total	207	2,28	1,005						
For the benefit of the organization	1-10	50	2,93	1,290	Between Group	7,479		3,739	2,524	,083
	11-20	98	2,95	1,140	Within Group	302,260		1,482		
	21+	59	2,53	1,278	Total	309,739				
	Total	207	2,83	1,226						
General	1-10	50	2,70	,954	Between Group	5,097		2,549	2,811	,063
	11-20	98	2,67	,920	Within Group	184,983		,907		
	21+	59	2,33	1,003	Total	190,080				
	Total	207	2,58	,961						

Based on the opinions of the teachers, no significant difference was observed in the level of organizational silence according to professional seniority when the general and sub-attributes of the scale were examined ($p > ,05$).

DISCUSSION

While this study examined the organizational silence levels of secondary school teachers, it also analyzed how these levels vary based on demographic characteristics. The evaluation, which considered demographic factors such as gender, age, education level, and professional seniority of the participants, involved statistical analysis of the obtained data. Recent literature shows that while some studies overlook the importance of education level, considering it insufficiently among demographic variables, there are also researchers who include education level as a demographic factor. In particular, Canbaz & Çoruk (2022) investigated the relationship between organizational silence and its sub-dimensions concerning teachers' education levels and found no significant effect of education level. This finding aligns with our study.

In the study, we examined whether the perception of organizational silence varies by gender through analyses based on teachers' opinions. The results indicated no gender-based distinction in the overall scale or its sub-dimensions. Bediroğlu's (2020) study reveals that organizational silence displays similar levels among male and female teachers. Similarly, research conducted by Alagöz (2020) and Demirtaş & Demirhan (2023) showed no gender differences in the findings regarding participant teachers, yielding similar results across all dimensions and sub-dimensions. Additionally, Karaca Güzel & Göksoy (2023) and Yılmaz (2021) concluded that there was no significant relationship between gender and silence. However, Yaşar's (2021) study indicated that the organizational silence levels of the examined female teachers were low and varied.

According to the results of the study, when evaluating the teachers' responses to the scale items, the level of organizational silence was found to be very low. In a study conducted by Doğanay (2022), it was determined that the organizational silence levels of public secondary school teachers were low and did not have a significant effect. This study is consistent with Karagöz's (2020) research on preschool teachers. In Karagöz's study, it was confirmed that teachers' organizational silence levels varied across different sub-dimensions, were high in silence anxiety sub-attributes, and were at a medium level in emotional and school environment attributes.

In the study, analyses based on teachers' opinions were conducted to determine whether there is a difference in the perception of organizational silence depending on professional seniority. According to the results of the analysis, no difference was found between professional seniority in the overall scale and sub-dimensions. According to Yılmaz and Aytaç (2022), the increase in teachers' silence attitudes with increasing seniority may be due to their emotional attachment to the organization they work for. Although this situation may seem insignificant, it is noteworthy. On the other hand, Mantı (2020) found that silence levels differed depending on seniority. Those with 1-5 years of professional seniority exhibited higher levels of silence than those with 16-20 years of seniority. This finding contradicts the existing literature. A similar observation was made by Demirtaş & Demirhan (2023); they found that length of service in teaching yielded similar results regarding organizational silence. In addition, Karagöz (2020) found significant differences in the silence levels of teachers based on professional seniority, noting that the lowest score was observed in participants with 0-5 years of experience.

Within the scope of this study, it was examined whether the perception of organizational silence varies according to age through the views of teachers. Analyses were conducted based on specific variables. The results show that there is no difference in the general or sub-dimensions of organizational silence based on age. In particular, Canbaz & Çoruk (2022) and Demirtaş & Demirhan (2023) examined the organizational silence levels of teachers. When the opinions of the teachers participating in the study were evaluated, it was observed that there was no difference among the sub-attributes of organizational silence regarding the age variable. These findings reveal that there is no difference in teachers' opinions on organizational silence levels and its sub-dimensions, regardless of their age. However, in the study conducted by Tokgöz (2021), it was determined that there was a significant difference between loneliness levels and organizational silence only in the emotional sub-dimension according to age. In addition, Karabay & Erbay (2021) stated that variables such as gender, age, and seniority did not significantly affect organizational silence. All these findings indicate that teachers' age does not influence organizational silence levels and its sub-dimensions.

As stated by Kahveci and Demirtaş (2013), schools are the institutions that feel the greatest need for self-improvement and productivity in the field of education. Organizational silence that schools may encounter can negatively affect this development and production process. Among the factors related to management, distant relations with superiors, lack of support, hidden beliefs, and resistance to different ideas can contribute to changes in organizational silence levels. The study is specific to the Sincan district of Ankara province. The data are limited to teachers working in secondary schools in the Sincan district, who voluntarily participated in the research, seeking answers to predetermined questions, where the dependent and independent variables are the organizational silence scale items. An important issue for school administrators and teachers is achieving

organizational success and expected efficiency. In this context, it is crucial for employees to express themselves. Teachers' perceptions of negative silence may positively impact professional and organizational commitment. Therefore, it is necessary to develop effective communication strategies within the school. Organizing effective communication workshops in schools for employees to express themselves can be viewed as part of this process. Strengthening relationships between teachers and administrators is one key to enhancing commitment and achieving organizational success. In this regard, increasing the variety and frequency of social activities among teachers can aid in improving relationships. The fact that school administrators value teachers' opinions and suggestions and involve them in decision-making processes is a significant indicator of effective communication and organizational commitment.

Statement of Researchers

Researcher's contribution rate statement:

The authors contributed equally to this article.

Conflict statement:

The authors disclosed no potential conflicts of interest concerning this article's research, authorship, or publication

Data Availability Statement:

The data supporting this study's findings are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethical Considerations:

This research was approved by the Çankırı Karatekin University Ethics Committee's dated 04.07.2024, decision number: 42

Author's Biography

Gülsüm Güvenç, she was born in 1981 in Ankara. She completed her undergraduated education between 2000 and 2004 at Gazi University, Kırşehir Faculty of Education, Department of Science Teaching. In 2024, she received her master's degree in Educational Administration and Supervision at Ahmet Yesevi University. She is currently working as a Science Teacher at the Ministry of National Education. She has been involved in various projects throughout her professional experience.

REFERENCES

- Akgül, A. (2005). Statistical analysis techniques in medical researches SPSS applications. Ankara: Emek Ofset.
- Alagöz, E. (2020). Examining the relationship between primary school teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and their perceptions of organizational silence and organizational trust (Thesis No. 659401) [Master's Thesis, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12436/2411>
- Alparslan, A. M. & Kayalar, M. (2012). Organizational silence: Silence behaviors and their organizational and individual effects. Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 6, 136-147. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/181776>
- Arılı, M. & Nazik, M. H. (2001). Introduction to scientific research. Gazi Kitabevi.
- Aslan, İ. & Çınar, S. O. (2023). A qualitative research on school principal-induced organizational silence according to teacher perceptions. Siirt Education Journal, 3 (2), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.58667/sedder.1226276>
- Ayık, A. (2007). School culture created in primary schools and the effectiveness of schools (Thesis No. 210539) [Doctoral dissertation, Atatürk University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=kKKBzEJHTKxS1h1dOZXTKg&no=NeOTOykotDWgNMaEVwSglg>
- Bediroğlu, M. (2020). Examining the relationship between organizational silence and fear of negative evaluation in teachers (Thesis No.640910) [Master's Thesis, Gazi University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=8QhPIY3jYPoOKR8KiO6v6A&no=Rmm6b8CbDRp0c90fTq51tg>
- Bildik, B. (2009). The relationship between leadership styles, organizational silence and organizational commitment (Publication No. 333223) [Master's Thesis, Gebze Institute of Technology Institute of Social Sciences]. YÖK Open Science. https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/621875/yokAcikBilim_333223.pdf?sequence=-1&isAllowed=y

- Bozgöz, İ. (2020). Examining the relationship between the positional power sources used by school administrators and teachers' organizational silence behaviors [Master's Thesis]. Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University.
<https://openaccess.izu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12436/2541/659453.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Can, A. (2014). Quantitative data analysis in scientific research process. Ankara: Pegem A Publishing.
- Canbaz, S. & Çoruk, A. (2022). The relationship between organizational justice and organizational silence perceptions of primary and secondary school teachers. Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of Faculty of Education, 12(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.52826/mcbuefd.1350200>
- Ceviz, T. (2017). Examining the relationship between work integration and organizational silence behaviors of secondary school teachers (Thesis No. 485973) [Master's Thesis, Gazi University]. YÖK Thesis Center. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=84YYGPKNpxx20036OwM3DQ&no=NKMehs7oufA-Fixu4Q_gOA
- Çağan, M. H. (2024). The relationships between informal relationships among teachers, organizational trust, organizational silence, organizational happiness. (Thesis No. 849280) [Doctoral dissertation, Fırat University]. YÖK Thesis Center. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=weFMBHaUra8rsS5wi2bmHLAUVxm67ZNMCOjyHyDGj7EwVFkqhbTn2Sr5ND_GgM80
- Çakıcı, A. (2007). Silence in organizations: Theoretical foundations and dynamics of silence. Çukurova University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 16(1), 145-162. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/cusosbil/issue/4376/59941>
- Çakıcı, A. (2010). Employee silence in organizations: Why do we prefer to be silent? Ankara: Detay Publishing.
- Çavuşoğlu, S. & Köse, S. (2019). Adaptation of organizational silence scale into Turkish. Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 19(2), 365-387. <https://doi.org/10.11616/basbed.v19i47045.485266>
- Çiçek Sağlam, A. & Yüksel, A. (2015). Organizational Organizational Structure of Teachers and Administrators Working in High Schools Views on Silence. Turkish Studies - International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 10(7), 317-332. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.8089>
- Dal, H. (2017). Teachers' views on organizational silence in secondary education institutions (Thesis No. 470019) [Master's Thesis, Hacettepe University]. YÖK Thesis Center. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=tak_o1Ou8wfjklCm9hycQ&no=blcfsVSHShc2uGdQ4L1Yg
- Demiralay, M. & Çuhadar, M. (2022). The mediating role of emotional commitment in the effect of employee workplace well-being on silence for the benefit of the organization: A research on the health sector. Journal of Business Research, 14 (4), 3158-3176. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2022.1555>
- Demirtaş, Z. & Demirhan, N. B. (2023). Organizational silence levels of teachers working in kindergartens. Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 10(2), 151-171. <https://doi.org/10.33907/turkjes.1096497>
- Doganay, E. (2022). The relationship between leader-member interaction and organizational silence and organizational health [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Dicle University. <https://hdl.handle.net/11468/9179>
- Dönmez, E. (2016). The relationship between organizational socialization and organizational silence [Master's Thesis]. Pamukkale University. <https://hdl.handle.net/11499/1041>
- Dyne, L. V., Ang, S. & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. Journal of Management Research, 40(6), 1359-1392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00384>
- Eroğlu, A. H. Adigüzel, O. & Öztürk, U. C. (2011). The vortex of silence and commitment dilemma: The relationship between employee silence and organizational commitment and a research. Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 16(2), 97-124. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/194484>
- Faiz, S. (2023). The relationship between classroom teachers' perceptions of school climate and organizational silence (Thesis No. 792616) [Master's Thesis, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University]. YÖK Thesis Center.

- https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=G_oj1rKE4SgJUkomyAKpR2ZFCugNwv7BMxSMQv-GayexTyhN_jwGUopvjy15enpG
- Girgin, S. (2020). The relationship between school administrators' conflict management styles and teachers' organizational silence levels according to teachers' perceptions (Thesis No. 698754) [Doctoral Thesis, Istanbul Okan University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=tqUiYt63sTQLTpozMj92QtJA13GquK8Nv3eYSmP0rsQy-LAUbhxot2v4KEP2rIIT>
- Göven, E. K. & Şentürk, İ. (2019). The relationship between organizational silence and organizational commitment in primary schools. Eskişehir Osmangazi University Journal of Social Sciences, 20, 1223-1247. <https://doi.org/10.17494/ogusbd.555471>
- Gürgül, G. (2024). A research on the effect of organizational silence on Munzur University employees (Thesis No. 851426) [Master's Thesis, Munzur University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=cr4SkWLaRMhkDRBjgthpsUdMKyDoeQD1NtiL1oyf68-S4FuUi-BPkeObobbEyaln>
- Gürer, A. & Deniz, N. (2018). Examination of employee silence in terms of demographic characteristics. Third Sector Social Economic Review, 53(1), 91-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15659/3.sektor-sosyal-ekonomi.18.02.871>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2013). Multivariate Data Analysis: Pearson Education Limited. <https://www.drnishikantjha.com/papersCollection/Multivariate%20Data%20Analysis.pdf>
- İşler, M. & Akçadağ, T. (2023). A form of response in teachers: Silence. Journal of Sustainable Education Studies, 4(4), 243-260. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/seader/issue/80540/1256189>
- İşleyici, K. (2015). Examining the relationship between organizational justice and organizational silence: Zonguldak province example (Thesis No. 384696) [Master's Thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=sY7m19PfcL6F1NUw-cr80FvUAHnzZwFndgTXtlenEElaxuXUzcOWj0Mdy07WSmcH>
- Kaihan, J. (2023). A research to determine the effect of organizational motivation on employees' silence [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Selçuk University. <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12395/52029>
- Kahveci, G. & Demirtaş, Z. (2013). Development of organizational silence scale for teachers. Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 12(43), 167-182. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/70428>
- Kalay, F. Oğrak, A. Bal, V. & Nişancı, Z. N. (2014). The relationship between mobbing, organizational silence and organizational cynicism: A sample application. Sakarya Journal of Economics, 3(2), 1-18. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/319592>
- Karabay, G. & Erbay, E. Ö. (2021). Examining the predictive power of leadership types on organizational silence in teachers. Yaşadıkça Education, 35(1), 78-87. <https://journals.iku.edu.tr/yed/index.php/yed/article/download/244/182/1930>
- Karaca Güzel, F. & Göksoy, S. (2023). The relationship between organizational silence training experienced in secondary education institutions and school culture. International Journal of Lifelong Education and Leadership, 9(2), 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.25233/ijlel.1235484>
- Karadağ, E. (2023). The relationship between manager communication competence and communication anxiety with organizational silence (Thesis No. 851861) [Doctoral Dissertation, Anadolu University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=cr4SkWLaRMhkDRBjgthpsaD9rpaE9ED2nUOLYxIVpwcr2ABQv2tEMa4ZbD7WBg4y>
- Karagöz, S. (2020). The relationship between kindergarten teachers' accountability and organizational silence behaviors (Thesis No. 648631) [Master's Thesis, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University]. YÖK Thesis Center. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=f10Kw4p1rmMDotyKRdYv1Mirr4yJnk5d_1Z5aWbX4X_GdmEFvVP0HRXSDOINdv4r
- Karasar, N. (2014). Scientific Research Method. 26th Edition. Nobel Academic Publishing.
- Karayel, O. (2024). The relationship between school principals' ethical leadership behavior and teachers' organizational silence (Thesis No. 852025) [Master's Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University]. YÖK Thesis

- Center.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=cr4SkWLaRMhkDRBjqthpsRj9wfTQxKfE6HhpW-2BQojSECP3olxb5wkt6myHXyQA>
- Kocabaş, İ. & Karaköse, T. (2005). The effect of school principals' attitudes and behaviors on teachers' motivation: Private and public school examples. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1), 79-93.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/256405>
- Macit, G. & Erdem, R. (2020). A conceptual examination of organizational silence. *Manisa Celal Bayar University Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(2), 93-114. <https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.539307>
- Mantı, M. (2020). The relationship between organizational stress and organizational silence behaviors in academicians [Master's Thesis]. Pamukkale University.
<https://gcris.pau.edu.tr/bitstream/11499/35187/1/mustafa%20mant%C4%B1.pdf>
- Morrison, E. W. & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management review*, 25(4), 706-725. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259200>
- Ozan, M. S. & Yolcu, F. S. (2024). Is silence always golden? Evaluating the concept of strategic silence through the ambiguous reputation of public organizations. *Journal of Public Administration*, 57(1).
<https://ammeidaresi.hacibayram.edu.tr/>
- Öner, A. Y. (2022). Sound and hearing in spatial experience: The case of Zimoun [PhD Thesis]. Anadolu University.
<https://earsiv.anadolu.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11421/26766/681620.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Özçakal, S. & Demirhan, G. (2023). Conflict management, organizational silence and organizational citizenship behavior in educational institutions. *Third Sector Social Economy*, vol.58, no.3, 2361-2377.
<http://doi.org/10.15659/3.sektor-sosyal-ekonomi.23.09.2228>
- Özkan, Ç. K. (2022). The effect of toxic leadership behaviors on organizational silence (Thesis No. 757505) [Master's Thesis, Beykent University]. YÖK Thesis Center.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=RsTBl6RWK25OBMIKtlgYYWMxe1CJkFcZSBcR0wys9Z3ezfTjPtyvQNzeTjFo9Lbc>
- Pekel, A. (2023). Academician views on organizational silence and exclusion (Tez No.831354) [Master's Thesis, Amasya University]. YÖK Thesis Center.
https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=S2eMu1TlwY_v4mYv58xAr2QAjkisjA490AGj6LvdbdDASdjZWomUcD5AmHHFZ_Xa
- Pinder, M.Ö. and Harlos, K.P. (2001), "Employee silence: Silence and consent as responses to perceived injustice", *Personnel and Human Resource Management Research (Personnel and Human Resource Management Research, Volume 20)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Leeds, 331-369.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301\(01\)20007-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-7301(01)20007-3)
- Robbins, S., Judge, T. A., Millett, B. & Boyle, M. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. Pearson Higher Education AU.
https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=-C7iBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Soysal, R., Karabela, E., Karabela, S., Alparslan, A. & Alparslan, H. (2024). Examining the opinions of classroom teachers about organizational silence perception. *ENTIS-Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), 116-124.
<https://entisdergi.com/index.php/sosyal/article/view/71>
- Şenel, T. & Buluç, B. (2016). The relationship between school climate and school effectiveness in primary schools. *Turkish Science Research Foundation*, 9(4), 1-12. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/227981>
- Taşkıran, E. (2010). The role of organizational justice in the effect of leadership style on organizational silence and a research. (Thesis No. 273496) [Doctoral Dissertation, Marmara University]. YÖK Thesis Center.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=veR1mHu9yoWjwcVUjCEoPAKDu4mWrSVQVka6s8QcqweBseQPymxBenyikyXjyvu>
- Tokgöz, B. (2021). The relationship between high school teachers' loneliness levels in business life and organizational silence levels (Thesis No. 668403) [Master's Thesis, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=9MiDp3x86xrwjpi5-14w-anzhj0z3autTnEEtelstKmpOhYmG7d11w-oh3syhll>

- Tekin, M. (2024). A research to determine the relationship between organizational silence, job satisfaction and job stress of employees in the electricity distribution sector (Thesis No. 855850) [Master's Thesis, Munzur University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=cr4SkWLaRMhkDRBjqthpsZrtTbx809yrfY6HaWQlj1opKviP6bceXokXmluQ5Cj>
- Üçok, D. & Torun, A. (2015). A qualitative research on the causes of organizational silence. *Journal of Business and Human*, 2 (1), 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.95591>
- Ünlü, Y. (2015). The relationship between organizational justice perceptions and organizational silence levels of primary and secondary school teachers. (Publication No. 10091889) [Master's Thesis, Sakarya University]. YÖK Open Science. https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/435222/yokAcikBilim_10091889.pdf?sequence=-1
- Yapça, C. E. (2024). Determination of organizational silence levels of primary school teachers. *International QMX Journal*, 3(2), 1187-1201. <https://qmxjournal.com/index.jsp?mod=tammetin&makaleadi=&makaleurl=8c9d9a4c-9356-4bf3-9f77-385fc2775189.docx&key=75341>
- Yaşar, T. (2021). The relationship between organizational silence and organizational commitment level: a research on female teachers (Thesis No. 699233) [Master's Thesis, Yıldız Technical University and Istanbul Aydın University]. YÖK Thesis Center. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=tqUiYt63sTQLTpozMJ92Qk75C8dkCibXHKVvZb2VhELkViHzKtHkijwXuzh0M3eV1>
- Yeşilaydın, G. & Bayın, G. (2015). A literature review on research on organizational silence in Turkey. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(4), 103-120. <https://doi.org/10.18037/ausbd.54497>
- Yılmaz, A. (2021). The quest for silence: A reading of Wittgenstein. *Uludağ University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences*, 22(41), 1491-1504. <https://doi.org/10.21550/sosbilder.883259>
- Yılmaz, O. & Aytaç, T. (2022). Examining teachers' perceptions of organizational silence according to various variables: A meta-analysis study. *Western Anatolian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 13(2), 761-791. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2173171>