International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences

Homepage: http://ijmres.pk/
Vol 10, No 2, 2020 March, PP. 119-128
E-ISSN: 2313-7738. ISSN: 2223-5604

WHY THEY KEEP SILENCE: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW

[1]Mohammad Abdul Haseeb, [2]Dr. Mohammad Daud Ali, [3]Shah Raza Khan, [4]Syed Imran Sahibzada

[1]PhD Scholar, Institute of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan
[2]Assistant Professor in Management Sciences, The University of Haripur, Pakistan. Corresponding Email: Email: dr.daud@uoh.edu.pk
[3]Iqra National University Peshawar, Pakistan.
[4]Lecturer Management Sciences, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Pakistan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: 10 Jul 2019
Revised: 14 Oct 2019
Accepted: 20 Mar 2019
Available Online: 20 Jun 2020

Keywords:
Organizational silence, employee silence, deviant behavior

JEL Classification:
F34, O57

ABSTRACT

It is of essential importance for organization to sense errors in their strategies and frameworks and to transform as per their needs. Subsequently, they apportion extraordinary amount of their budgets for such assessments yet these attempts regularly fail as the employees who are exposed to such lope holes directly, don't uncover or express any data with respect to these shortcomings. Therefore, organizational spending is worthless. This state of being expressionless observant towards organizational issues is named as "Organizational Silence". This study has assessed a large portion of the literature to find out antecedents such circumstances.

© 2020 The authors, under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0.

1. INTRODUCTION

The environment of organization is getting transformed at impenetrable rate. To stay informed concerning the pace of progress they need to use every one of their assets to adjust to the progressions abruptly. Thus, Organizations are requesting for ideal execution from their employees. Primarily, They spotlight actions like creativity and talking up (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1997). Thus, organizations need individuals who are not hesitant in information sharing, and who can support their own and their group convictions. Therefore we construe that organizations have understood that it is important for their prosperity to enable their employees to have free communication. Notwithstanding this, numerous workers protest that sharing of data and information are for the most part prevented inside their organization (Beer and Nohria, 2000). All the more particularly, one of the significant obstruction to change projects was observed to be absence of data, absence of trust and what Morrison and Milliken (2000) characterized as "organizational silence" that is accepted to be worker's decision of negation to impart their esteemed insights and concerns with respect to organizational procedures, frameworks and components. Organizational silence is a behavioral decision that can crumble or enhance organizational performance. Further It's difficult to allocate meaning to it which makes a baffling situation as by being silence the individual may show feeling of either endorsement or difference, in this manner pressurize both people and organizations (Bagheri, et al. 2012). The present study is an attempt to dig out the precursors of organizational silence from the literature through a systematic review.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Organizational silence

Researchers and specialists have settled upon the imperativeness of correspondence procedures for organizational achievement. (Snyder and Morris, 1984). Tsai et. al., (2009) supports this perspective that open correspondence are useful in constructing valuable work connections that has constructive effect on organizational and individual performance. In such manner, Quinn & Spreitzer, (1997) contend that for organizations to be successful, its compulsory upon them to take the obstructions that hamper their performance. Also, silence is one of them. For this matter, workers are accepted to be the primary performers and significant source creativity and innovation. Hassan (2013) explains on this perspective further as he expresses that current administrative methodologies are enriched with satisfactory measure of prospects for data stream and correspondence by advancing various instruments e.g. assessment meeting, grievance systems, personal meetings etc. Still, numerous employees still protest that they are regularly not permitted to share their thoughts candidly (Beer & Nohria, 2000). As the employees themselves are anxious of the circumstances when they would be termed as whistle blowers, losing partners' trust , and weak connection with organization. Specifically, one of the significant obstructions to change projects was "organizational silence" that is a condition of casing thoughts and conclusions about organizational

issues (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Pinder & Harlos(2001) sees silence as "withholding of any type of factual expression about individual's behavioral, subjective and/or emotional assessment of his or her organizational circumstances to people who are seen to be capable of changing or redressing"(p.334).

This demonstrates specialists aren't in assertion in regards to the intention and significance of silence and hence is conceptualized contrastingly by various scientists. As, Aylsworth (2008) contends that individuals used to link silence with "acceptance" and if there was an occurrence of silence it was assumed that everything is in right place, this idea no more remains constant as scientists have found that organizational results gets affected by silence in a great deal. Scott (1993) states that correspondence requires both argumentative components i.e. silence and voice. As, without both of them it's difficult to communicate as no one would listen or both will talk. Grice (1989) furthers this construct that successful communication requires four fundamental judgments of what to impart and what to withhold (amount, quality, importance, and clarity). In such manner Cage (1961) claims that "there is no such thing as supreme silence, something is continually happening that makes a sound" . Hollis (1970) puts it along these lines that the discourse we hear counteracts us to hear what we don't listen. Subsequently, all silence is not just the inverse of voice (Scott, 1993). In this regard, Webster's Collegiate Dictionary point outs that silence has numerous implications, it might be : the state of keeping silence; an abstaining from discourse or from making clamor; or inability to communicate ; and insensibility or lack of understanding. Further Silence is connected with numerous ideals: unobtrusiveness, respect for others, and decency (Dan et al, 2009). Similarly, Morrison & Milliken (2000) state that authoritative silence is an aggregate state, as the employees in organizations because of some apprehension of negative repercussions and the conviction that their conclusions are not rightful or valued thus adopt such behavior. Conversely, Pinder & Harlos (2001) conceptualize silence as individualistic way to deal with unfairness. Though, they conceptualize the construct contrastingly yet both accentuate on withholding of thoughts and expressions.

The ideas of voice and silence brought its beginning with the work of Hirschman (1970), as he accepts both these as reaction to employee disappointment. Further explaining the idea of voice he asserts that its any endeavor at all to change an awful situation, while silence was considered as the detached conduct that was equated with conviction. Later on, numerous researchers reproach the Hirschman's work for its shortsighted methodology toward silence. In such manner, Pinder & Harlos (2001) look at the relationship amongst voice and silence proposed by Hirschman (1970) to decide how employees show a feeling of disappointment. They contend that Hirschman's idea depends on straightforward twofold [either/or] approach, that perceives the disappointment of employees either when they raise their voice or exit. In such manner, Slade (2008) states that Hirschman gave insufficient consideration to organizational silence and the implications connected to it. That is, the idea did not consider those options that are beyond these two conditions, for example, ones who stay silence inside organization and are viewed as dedicated too. In such manner, Pinder & Harlos (2001) contend that silence isn't a basic construct rather a phenomenon that includes a "scope of feelings, reflections, and activities". This perspective has been embraced by different analysts also, as they contend that silence dependably doesn't mean underwriting. Cohen (1990) contends that silence may mean protest or difference as well as stem from absence of data, absence of chances for voice, and the conviction that voice might be futile or unsafe. Also, a few analysts put stock in integrationist view, where silence was combined with voice or exit. As, Stephen and Gwinner (1998) conducts an exploration in advertising domain and presumes that disappointed client may raise their worries about out of order merchandise and items before other imminent clients yet never pass on their grievances to the authorities. On the other hand, a few employees may join silence with way out as they leave organization without communicating their difference about issues (Parker and August, 1997). Further, they term it as "principled turnover".

In this regard, Donaghey (2011) argue that silence is the way toward withholding or hiding data and feelings about business related positive changes. However, Bagheri (2012) differentiate and state that silence is a behavioral decision that can either deteriorate or enhance organizational performance. On the other hand, in such manner Jensen (1973) contends that silences can be valuable also. Underlining the need to withhold, Turner et al. (1975) contends that withholding or stowing away of significant data is the need of great importance as it's not the dependably the best strategy to uncover or express everything genuinely. Strauss (1969) means the significance of silence further by indicating another point of view that concealment is the a vital part of society and social connections. Besides, Nyberg (1993) who contends that being expressive at all times is improbable as well as unfeasible. Rather, he approve the contention by expressing that hiding and withholding facts (silence) are vital in light of the fact that some measure of covering is key to great interpersonal connections. He uphold that nobody needs to know the greater part of someone else's thoughts that the sheer volume of inputs would overwhelm. So also, the vast majority would lean toward not to know each time that a dear companion or relative has a negative or

basic thought. Besides, Brown and Levinson, (1987) stress the estimation of silence in maintaining social standards about suitable versus inappropriate discussion.

Alternately, Tannen (1985) contend that subjectivity and uncertainty stem from silence as there is no discourse it's difficult to judge the expectations of the observer. In spite of the fact that its common and sensible for employees to keep flashed as by verbalization of their worries or raising a voice with respect to different issues would convey negative repercussions to them however such conduct undermine the worker's capacity to work in the organization. As, Tyler (1978) condenses, what is not said, is frequently more vital than what is said that might be some creative thought. In such manner, Dan (2009) states that authoritative silence at some point make organizational procedures deficient as they prompt wastage both as far as expense and exertion. Further, this very marvel can be uncovered in different structures, for example, aggregate silence in meetings, low levels of participation in planning, low levels of aggregate voice et cetera. Besides, the hesitance to talk up, and the silence or data withholding that it offers to soar up to, can possibly demoralize organizational leadership and harm mistake revision process and employee trust (Beer & Eisenstat, 2000). This demonstrates that silence is conceptualized in different understandings.

2.2 Conceptualization of Silence

Tannen (1983) argues about the procedure, how individuals conceptualize silence as good or awful is to choose whether something ought to be said or with held in the wake of figuring out if something qualifies saying or not. Concerning awful potential of silence, Bruneau (1973) states that "silence" is now and then utilized by higher authorities as a discipline tool against their subordinates. Yiannis (1998) embraces the same contention that disregarding subordinates or keep them holding up, both of which apparently include silence or the view of "silent treatment" by others. Additionally silence can be exhibited as preference as, Houck and Gass (1997) contend that occasionally we are unwilling and not able to address those whom we are one-sided with. Then again, the individuals who request for the positive way of silence, contend that silence permits open doors for self-assessment or self-disclosure (American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1993). Further, it additionally helps individuals by giving them an opportunity to contemplate over the announcements of other, investigate different options and arrive on the right spot (Bruneau, 1973). Additionally, notwithstanding such instability, we can "buy time" to consider salutation or other social gambits utilizing silence (Sifianou, 1997). In such manner, Jensen (1973) suggests that silence serves five dualistic capacities: (1) it both unites individuals and pushes them separated; (2) it can both mismanager and mend individuals; (3) it gives and conceals data; (4) it flags profound thought and/or no idea; and (5) it can pass on both consent and dispute. Other than these procedures there are obstacles to these procedures that lead to silence which might be called as the drivers or predecessors of silence.

2.3 Antecedents of organizational silence

Noelle-Neumann (1974), presents the "spirals of silence theory" that was a push to decide the causes and variables because of which different groups stay silent while others can impart all the more openly. The theory recommends that disagreeability of opinion inside group is the primary reason that propels individuals in particular meetings to accept silence. Neill (2009) furthers this perspective by expressing that as the majority in group is bolstered by and in like manner have the eagerness to stand up on their issues, then again the minority groups are constrained to keep it zipped because of the trepidation of disengagement. In their investigation, Pinder & Harlos(2001) highlight unfair circumstances as the key drivers to choices talk up or stay calm. Further, they contend that silence is a dynamic procedure which moves and transforms because of different individual and situational variables. Saville-Troike (1985) sees it from the point of view of attribution theory and underscores that social difference here and there lead to such practices as difference among social groups in their propensity to talk with outsiders can lead stereotyping and pessimistic attributions about people whose interpersonal styles are new. As, Sifianou (1997) states that in a few societies introverts are seen as respectful while discourteous in others. In such manner, Saunders (1985) contends that in few societies, voice and silence are utilized as scheme when there is indecisiveness about the outflow of feeling. Bok (1983) sees silence from another dimension as he recommend that privileged insights (purposefully hiding data) and the philosophical and moral issues connected with data or thoughts assume basic parts in choices whether to express it or with hold it. Differentiating concealment, (for example, competitive advantages, insider information, confidential information) with injurious covering, (for example, malicious fraud, buyer misrepresentation etc), Bok stresses the significance of utilizing individual judgment and good gauges in regular life for choosing what to express and what to withhold.

2.4 Organizational Factors

At the organizational level, numerous particular variables can add to spread of silence, for example, the organizational environment. Pinder & Harlos (2001) contended that in a few organizations workers are constrained to keep it quiet as there are codes of silence, organizational standards and practices that impede the stream of data

and revelation of issues. In this manner, organizational society impacts people to think and act in a specific way, which thus affects their moral values (Caldwell & Moberg, 2007). Argyris (1977) highlights that in a few organizations top-level supervisors trust workers are self-intrigued and conniving; they will then act in ways that verifiably and unequivocally demoralize upward communication. Moreover, top managers frequently make conditions helpful for organizational silence because of their conviction that administration knows best about most issues of organizational significance. Glauser (1984) additionally takes note of the pervasiveness of the conviction that directors should direct and control while subordinates must expect the part of unquestioning supporters. Argyris (1977) comparably takes note of that most directors expectation they should seem, by all accounts, to be in one-sided control. As, few people measure "organizational wellbeing" as far as harmony is there. They consider organization as more sound when there is a no differences and unity among and inside all positions.

Burrell & Morgan (1979) depict this conviction as a component of the "unitary perspective" of organizations. Leaders can make a moral organization through the way in which they act, center their consideration, allot rewards, utilize and reject employees (Sims & Brinkmann, 2003) and set models inside the organization (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005). Social learning hypothesis suggests that people in a meetings inside organization will be impacted by their role models to partake in deviant behavior(silence) (Appelbaum et al., 2005). Leaders in an organization therefore have a pivotal role to play in the development of a pervasive and moral society inside an organization (Rossouw & Van Vuuren, 2010). Moreover, Harlos' (1999) study uncovers both auxiliary and procedural relates of disloyal culture. Auxiliary corresponds included uncertain pecking orders of power (i.e. hazy reporting structures; Weber, 1947), high centralization (Pugh et al., 1968), and low formalization (i.e. insignificant institutionalization of employments and their conventions; Pugh et al., 1968), while procedural associates included authoritative leadership styles and poor communication(Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972). Morrison and Milliken (2000) distinguish an elaborated cluster of organizational elements that may make and encourage atmospheres of silence. These elements, include examples of organizational hierarchies and structures, demographic qualities, belief structures of top management and, procedures of collective sense-making and communication . Argyris & Schon (1978) propose that contend managers feel a concrete need to maintain a strategic distance from embarrassment, risk, and feelings of weakness or ineptitude. Subsequently, they will have a tendency to stay away from any data that may propose shortcoming. There is experimental proof that supervisors will be particularly prone to maintain a strategic distance from negative input from subordinates. Moreover, It has been demonstrated that when criticism originates from underneath, instead from above, it is seen as less exact and honest (Ilgen et al., 1979) and as all the more undermining to one's capability (Korsgaar et. al., 1998).

Organizational inaction, named "deaf ear syndrome" by Peirce et al. (1998). Certain organizations or groups in the organization may be more tolerant of silence behavior than others. This doesn't suggest that they effectively support such conduct, but instead that they are less strict than different organizations to punish or act against it (Mikulay et al., 2001). Also, they advocate extra elements that account silence behavior in organizations e.g. group norms and risk factors. Further organizational variables that could bring about employee aberrance to organizational dissatisfaction, work stressors, weak approvals for guideline breach, and absence of control over the workplace and organizational changes (Henle, 2005). Appelbaum et al. (2007) points out organizational citizenship behavior as an extra element prompting silence conduct, and found that employees with less citizenship behavior will probably deviation. In this regard, Richard (2003) calls attention to the strategy that organizations regularly don't allow political space for voice. Thus, where there is no protected, political space for voice, silence can come about. Besides, a majority of employees don't comprehend or have the political abilities valuable for organizational morals viability. In his work on organizational learning, Argyris (1977) noticed that there are capable standards and protective schedules inside organizations that frequently keep employees from saying what they know.

2.5 Personal factors

Employees' propensity towards a certain behavior depends upon their assessment of the circumstance as favorable or unfavorable (Mikulay et al., 2001). In such manner, Henle (2005) recognizes an indicator of silence behavior, to be specific individual based point of view, which shows that it is not the environment that impacts the person to show certain behavior, but instead their personality. One personal reason behind organizational silence is that individuals fear of talking up about issues. As per Elliot (2010) certain personality characteristics are more apparent in personal deviations, for example, fraudulent acts and embezzlement than other personality attributes. People with deviant behavior will probably be to have a Type A personality (Henle et al., 2005). Moreover, Elliot (2010) brings up Conscientiousness; one Big Five personality attribute as driver of silence behavior. Research demonstrates that perceptible organizational equity could have a part in employee silence (Tangirala and Ramanujam, 2008). As Colquitt & Greenberg (2003) state, employees work for the organization till they believe there is equity in distribution of assets, In addition to attitude of management towards workers. Thus if they sense

any injustice this could bring about withdrawal or could prompt a few states of mind that can create negative results for the organization (Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lar, 2010).

Sims (2002) has found a relationship between silence behavior and employment performance, commitment. People who are more faithful and attach to their organization or employment will probably comply with the doctrine of the organization and settle on moral choices. Moreover, employees who show commitment to their organization are likewise most drastically averse to stop their occupations, or withhold exertion in the work environment but instead would remain silent. McCabe et al. (2006) inspected the relationship between deviant behavior and sex-orientation. They found no distinction in the impression of ethics amongst men and ladies when sexual orientation alone was checked. Notwithstanding, in situations where the relationship amongst sexual orientation and individual ethical elements was analyzed, it was contended that men acknowledge financial corruption (as a type deviant behavior) as more ethical than ladies see it to be. Roxas & Stoneback (2004) conduct a study to inspect the significance of sexual orientation across societies in ethical leadership. They report that in many nations guys were less ethical than females except China where inverse was observed to be valid..Another key component that exudes silence is Locus of control (Martinko et al., 2002). As, it is as an personality quality that impacts people to make external or internal attributions (Martinko et al., 2002). People with an inside locus of control will probably assume responsibility for their own particular fate. (Martinko et al., 2005). Storms & Spector (1987) testify that people with external locus of control react to dissatisfaction by adopting deviant behavior more readily than those with an internal locus of control. Similarly, they never uncover issues as they have "fear of reprisal" (Morrison & Milliken,2000) Furthermore they distinguish some fears that influence an individual's choice to stay silent. These fears are: Damaging one's image, being seen negatively, harmed relationship, and negative effect on others. Rosen & Tesser (1970) state that one impetus behind why individuals are some of the time silence about their reservations might be what psychoanalyst have named the 'mum effect'. Research on the mum effect demonstrates that people have a general hesitance to pass on adverse data on account of the inconvenience connected with being the conveyer of bad news (Conlee and Tesser, 1973). In organizations, there is confirmation that workers are particularly uncomfortable passing on data about potential issues or issues to those above them (O'Reilly, 1974). Thus, the progressive relationship amongst subordinate and manager seems to strengthen the mum effect. Recently, scientists investigate elements that may make individuals willing to convey up the chains or to "sell" issues to higher management. Saunders et al. (1992) found that employees' eagerness to voice business related concerns and recommendations to their managers relied upon how receptive and responsive they saw their managers to be.

Research on whistle blowing moreover highlights the dangers (real and perceived) connected with pointing out issues. Informants are now and then seen as double crossers and can endure negative profession results as an aftereffect of their pointing out organizational wrongdoing. Research proposes that employees gauge these costs while considering to talk up about issues and concerns (Dutton et al.,1997). Stigmas are particular traits that are seen as individual defects inside a social setting (Goffman, 1963). People with invisible stigmas can hide their character keeping in mind the end goal to maintain a strategic distance to avoid certain responses and isolation, but this concealment can incur significant damage on these people through mental stress (Pachankis, 2007).Employees with invisible stigmas constitute a moderately huge extent of the workforce. For instance, gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered employees make up somewhere around 4 and 17 percent of the workforce (Gonsiorek and Weinrich, 1991), and it is assessed that up to 42 percent of people them are in the workforce (McNeil, 2000). Employees may likewise be stigmatic about their religion and financial class (Sanchez and Schlossberg, 2001).

Besides, employees sometimes narrow conceptualization of morality and thus they seem it moral that if they themselves aren't involved some unethical behavior though we observe that other are acting immorally (Richard, 2003).Moreover, Sometimes, our companions being involved in the deviant behavior is a hindrance as we don't want to annoy our friends thus remain silent.

2.6 Underlying Theories

2.6.1 EVLN Model

This study is hypothetically taking into account Hirschman (1970) EVLN model. That states employees in dissatisfactory circumstances may respond in four ways it is possible that they leave the organization (Exit or Silence), raise voice, stay in the organization and sit tight to for the conditions to show signs of improvement (Loyalty), and they are connive of the circumstance (Neglect). The model initially included just two alternatives: exit and voice. The additional alternatives of loyalty and neglect have less strong hypothetical establishments. It is difficult to extend this model to the work environment, since it was considered to portray an organization with clients (Naus et. al., 2007). The work of Farrell (1983) and Rusbult et. al. (1988) has cleared up these ideas by offering two informative structures: productive/ruinous and dynamic/latent. This logical device structures the open

deliberation, despite the fact that there is no accord even on the double classes proposed. The principal, which contradicts voice and devotion (as helpful practices) to exit and disregard (as dangerous practices), may appear to be oversimplified. The way out alternative was at first resisted by Hirschman (1970) as a client's reaction when disappointed with the execution of an organization offering him an item. It includes disjoining ties with the organization. Rusbult et. al. (1988) expand the defiition of way out to incorporate the craving to leave and along these lines the selection of a specific conduct and state of mind. For Naus et. al. (2007), this mental end makes the utilization of typology simpler when contemplating disappointment at work. A worker can't generally act as though he were leaving because of his view of a troublesome occupation market, so the augmentation of way out to incorporate the considered leaving and maybe arrangements to do as such permit us to coordinate more subtleties of reality into the model. Naus et. al. (2007) do as such by presenting authoritative criticism as a uninvolved dangerous reaction in the relationship and have changed the model to EVLNC.

We will just utmost our center to the more mind boggling and ruinous choice i.e. EXIT (silence).

2.6.2 Natural components

Natural speculations of aberrance see wrongdoing and freak conduct as a type of emotional instability brought about by obsessive variables that are particular to specific sorts of people (Renato, 1997). They accept that a few people are "conceived crooks" who are organically not quite the same as non-culprits. The fundamental rationale is that these people have a mental and physical mediocrity (Gibson, 2002), which causes a powerlessness to learn and take after the principles. This thusly prompts criminal conduct.

2.6.3 Lombroso's Theory

Cesare Lombroso was an Italian criminologist of the mid to late 1800s. He disposes of the Classical School that contends that wrongdoing was a normal for human instinct and rather expresses that such practices were acquired from guardians (Gibson, 2002). From this conviction, he constructs up a hypothesis of abnormality in which a man's real constitution shows regardless of whether an individual is a "conceived criminal." Or would act in freak way. These "conceived hoodlums" are a return to a prior phase of human development with the physical cosmetics, mental abilities, and senses of primitive man (Mazzoni, 1996). In constructing up his hypothesis, Lombroso watched the physical attributes of Italian detainees and contrasted them with those of Italian fighters. He reasoned that the lawbreakers were physically distinctive. The physical qualities that he used to recognize detainees incorporated an asymmetry of the face or head, substantial monkey-like ears, extensive lips, a wound nose, inordinate cheekbones, long arms, and intemperate wrinkles on the skin (Gatti and Verde , 2012). Lombroso pronounced that guys with five or a greater amount of these attributes could be set apart as conceived hoodlums. Females, then again, just required as few as three of these attributes to be conceived hoodlums. Besides, he included that tattoos were markings of conceived crooks since they remained as confirmation of both godlikeness and harshness to physical agony. A human widespread is a quality, trademark, or conduct that exists crosswise over societies, paying little heed to the subtleties of a given connection. A well known case of a general is the familial lust unthinkable (Mausdley and Monaham, 2004). Exempting a little number of little groups, every single human society have a forbidden against inbreeding in some structure. When offenders are set apart as cruel or unnatural, people in general has permit to think about an individual sentenced a wrongdoing as totally not at all like whatever is left of society; a radical new scope of disciplines are approved, including genuine social trashing.

2.6.4 Mental Factors

Mental speculations of aberrance utilize a degenerate's brain science to clarify her inspiration and impulse to abuse social standards. From various perspectives, mental speculations of aberrance mirror natural clarifications, just with an additional accentuation on cerebrum capacity (Farrington, 1999). While authentic organic clarifications, for example, those gave by the Italian School, utilized natural characteristics from the entire body (e.g., jutting jaws, substantial ears) as signifiers of a natural affinity for criminal conduct, today's mental speculations of aberrance utilize the science of the cerebrum (as far as the structure of the mind, levels of neurotransmitters, and psychiatric determinations) to clarify abnormality (Lykken, 1995). There are a few major suspicions that all mental hypotheses on abnormality have in like manner. To begin with, the individual is the essential unit of investigation in mental hypotheses of abnormality. That is, singular people are exclusively in charge of their criminal or degenerate acts. Second, an individual's identity is the major motivational component that determines conduct inside people. Third, crooks and degenerates are seen as anguish from identity lacks. Hence, violations result from unusual, broken, or improper mental procedures inside the identity of the individual (Murry, 1998). At long last, these imperfect or strange mental procedures could be brought on from an assortment of things, including an ailing personality, wrong learning, uncalled for molding, and the nonattendance of fitting good examples or the solid nearness of improper good examples.

2.6.5 Learning Theory

Learning hypothesis depends on the standards of behavioral brain research, which speculates that an individual's conduct is found out and kept up by its results or rewards (Bandura, 1973). Akers and Sellers included, people in this manner learn degenerate and criminal conduct by watching other individuals and seeing the prizes or results that their conduct gets (Akers, 2004). For instance, a person who watches a companion shoplifting a thing and not getting got sees that the companion is not being rebuffed for their activities and they are compensated by getting the opportunity to keep the thing he or she stole. That individual may will probably shoplift, then, in the event that they trust he or she will be remunerated with the same result. As indicated by this hypothesis, in the event that this is the means by which freak conduct is grown, then taking ceaselessly the prize estimation of the conduct can take out freak conduct .

2.7 Sociological Factors

2.7.1 Marking Theory

Under marking hypothesis the center movements from the degenerate individual to the social procedure by which a man comes to be named as freak and the results of such naming for the person. This perspective rose in the 1950s from the compositions of Edwin Lemert (1972). From that point forward, numerous different sociologists have explained on the marking approach. Naming scholars take note of that in spite of the fact that we as a whole break rules every once in a while, we don't as a matter of course consider ourselves freak—nor are we so marked by others. Be that as it may, a few people, through a progression of circumstances, do come to be characterized as degenerate by others in the public eye. Incomprehensibly, this naming procedure really realizes more freak conduct.

2.7.2 Technique

Distinctive catchphrases were utilized to discover related articles/material from various information premises. As a matter of first importance, "authoritative silence" was Google which yielded 12 papers from open sources. At that point "workers silence conduct" was looked and another 3 papers were found. At that point as the underlying writing proposed that silence is some type of freak conduct so a quest for papers identified with "degenerate conduct" was embraced identified with silence which earned 3 papers. Besides, the writing recommended that "silence" certainly implies absence of correspondence. So writing on "Authoritative Communication" was additionally examined. Other than this, as correspondence is one of the key components to upgrade execution and organizational framework through amendment of blunder through change, subsequently writing with respect to this measurement was additionally investigated.

3. CONCLUSION

The above literature has identified various drivers of this sort of behavior that has been bifurcated into organizational and personal factors. The former include codes of silence, organizational norms and practices (Pinder and Harlos, 2001), organizational (Caldwell & Moberg, 2007), Managers belief about employees as they are self-interested (Argyris, 1977), “unitary view” (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) ,deviant role models in organizations (Appelbaum et al., 2005),structural and procedural unjust situation(Pinder and harlos, 1999), patterns of organizational policies and structures, demographic characteristics, belief structures of top management teams, and processes of collective sense-making and communication (Morrison and Milliken , 2000), fear of negative feedback (Argyris and Schon, 1978) , organizational inaction (Peirce et al. 1998),organizational tolerance (Mikulay et al., 2001), organizational frustration, job stressors, weak sanctions for rule violations, lack of control over the work environment and organizational changes (Henle, 2005) and employees tenure (Appelbaum, 2007).

Similarly on the personal level literature points out various factors that include Fear of losing job (Henle ,2005),type of personality specifically type A personality and conscientiousness (Elliot, 2010),perception of organizational justice (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008), job satisfaction and, loyalty and organizational commitment(Sims, 2002), gender (McCabe et al., 2006), Locus of control (Martinko et al., 2002),sexual harassment (Stockdale, 1996), Damaging one's image, being labeled or viewed negatively, damaged relationship, retaliation or punishment and negative impact on others(Morrison and Milliken, 2000),Mum effect (Rosen and Tesser, 1970), intolerant of criticism and dissent (Redding, 1985), approach to boss (Saunder et al., 1992), stigmas(Goffman, 1963),Narrow conceptualization of ethics and implicated friends (Richard , 2003).

REFERENCES

Akers, R.L. & Sellers, C.S. (2004) *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application.* Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing.

Andersson, L. M. and Pearson, C. M. (1999). 'Tit for tat? The spiralling effect of incivility in the workplace'. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 452–71.

Appelbaum, S. H., Deguire, K. J., & Lay, M. (2005). The relationship of ethical climate to deviant workplace behaviour. *Corporate Governance*, 5(4), 43-55.

Argyris, C. (1977). 'Double loop learning in organizations'. Harvard Business Review, 55,5, 115–29.

Argyris, C. and Schon, D. (1978). Organizational Learning.Reading. MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ashford, S. J., Rothbard, N. P., Piderit, S. K. and Dutton, J. E. (1998). 'Out on a limb: the role of context and impression management in selling gender-equity issues'. Administrative Science Quarterly, 43, 23–57

Ashforth, B. E. and Humphrey, R. H. (1995). 'Labeling processes in the organization: constructing the individual'. In Cummings, L. L. and Staw, B. W. (Eds), Research in Organizational Behavior.Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 413–61.

Aylsworth, J. (2008). Change in the workplace: organizational silence can be dangerous, *Organizational Psychology examiner*, www.examiner.com

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Engle-Wood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall..

Banerjee, A. and Somanathan, R. (2001). 'A simple model of voice'. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 189–227.

Beer, M. and Eisenstat, R. (2000). 'The silent killers of strategy implementation and learning'. Sloan Management Review, 41, 29–40

Beer, M., and Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review*, 133-41.

Bok, S. (1983). Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation. New York: Vintage Books.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. New York: Cambridge University Press.

C. Mazzoni. (1996). *Saint Hysteria: Neurosis, Mysticism, and Gender in European Culture*. London: Cornell University Press.

Cage, J. (1961). Silence; lectures and writings. Middletown, CT: Weslayan University

Cakici, A. 2008. A research on issues, causes and perceptional results of silence at organizations, *Cukurova University Journal of Social Science*, 17(1), 117- 134.

Creed, W. E. D. and Scully, M. A. (2000). 'Songs of ourselves: employees' deployment of social identity in workplace encounters'. Journal of Management Inquiry, 9, 391–412.

D. P. Farrington, A criminological research agenda for the next millennium. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43(2),* 1999, 154-167.

Detert, J.R., Edmondson, A.C. (2005). No exit, no voice: The bind of risky voice opportunities in organizations. *Academy of Management Proceedings*

Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M. and Lawrence, K. L. (2001). 'Moves that matter: issue selling and organizational change'. Academy of Management Journal, 4, 716–36.

Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., Hayes, E. and Wierba, E. E. (1997). 'Reading the wind: how middle managers assess the context for selling issues to top managers'. Strategic Management Journal, 18, 407–25.

Edmonson, A. C. (1999). 'Psychological safety and learning behaviour in work teams'. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44, 350–83.

Eisenberg, A. (1984). 'Ambiguity as strategy in organizational communication'. Communication Monographs, 51, 227–42.

Eliason, M. J. (1997). 'Out in the heartland: Lesbian, academics, and Iowa'. In Mintz, B. and Rothblum, E. D. (Eds), Lesbians in Academia: Degrees of Freedom. New York: Routledge.

Ellis, A. L. and Riggle, E. D. B. (1996). 'The relation of job satisfaction and degree of openness about one's sexual orientation for lesbians and gay men'. Journal of Homosexuality, 30, 75–85.

Farrell, D. (1983).Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 596-607.

Gatti, U., and Verde, A.,(2012). "Cesare Lombroso: Methodological Ambiguities and Brilliant Intuitions," *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 35(1),* 2012, 1182-89.

Gibson, M. (2002). *Born to Crime: Cesare Lombroso and the Origins of Biological Criminology,* Italy: Praeger Publishers.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Grice, P. (1989). Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hasan Karaca. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of deviant workplace behavior. *European*

Henle, C.A., (2005).Predicting workplace deviance from the interaction between organizational justice and personality. *Journal of Managerial issues*, 17(2).247-263.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970).*Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hollis, J. (1970). Harold Pinter: The poetics of silence. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Isen, A. M., Shalker, T. E., Clark, M. S. and Karp, L. (1978). 'Affect accessibility of material in memory and behavior: a cognitive loop?'. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 112.

Isenberg, D. J. (1980). 'Levels of analysis of pluralistic ignorance phenomena: the case of receptiveness to interpersonal feedback'. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 10, 457–67.

Janis, I. L. (1982). Groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jensen, J. V. (1973). Communicative functions of silence. ETC, 30, 2249-257.

Johannesen, R. L. (1974). 'The functions of silence: a plea for communication research'. Western Speech Journal, 2, 25–35.

Kahveci, G. 2010. Relationships between organizational commitment and organizational silence in elementary schools (Unpublished Master Thesis), Firat University, Elazig,

Katz, F. and Kahn, R. (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kowalski, R. M. (1996). 'Complaints and complaining: functions, antecedents, and consequences'.Psychological Bulletin, 119, 179–96.

LePine, J. A. and Van Dyne, L. (1998). 'Predicting voice behaviour in work groups'. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 853–68.

LePine, J. A., Erez, A. and Johnson, D. E. (2002). 'The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviour: a critical review and meta-analysis'. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,52–65.

Lykke, D. (1995) *The Antisocial Personality: The scope of the problems*. In C. J. Patrick (Ed), Handbook of Psychopathy. New York: Guilford Press.

Meyerson, D. (2001). Tempered Radicals: How People Use Difference to Inspire Change at Work. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Miceli, M. P. and Near, J. P. (1992). Blowing the Whistle: The Organizational and Legal Implications for Companies and Employees. New York: Lexington Books.

Morrison, E., and Milliken, F. (2000). Organizational silence: a barrier to change and development in pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4),706-25.

Murray, H. A. (1998) *Explorations in Personality Disorder*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Naus, F., Iterson, A. V., & Roe,R. (2007). Organizational cynicism: Extending the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect model of employees' responses to adverse conditions in the workplace. *Human Relations, 60*(5), 683-718.

Neill, S. (2009). *How Social Media is Challenging the Spiral of Silence Theory in GLBT communities of Color*: School of Communication, American University Washington, D.C.

Nkomo, S. M. (1992). 'The emperor has no clothes: rewriting "race in organizations" '. *Academy of Management Review*, 17,3, 487–513.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, *24*(2), 43-51.

Nyberg, D. (1993). The Varnished Truth: Truth-telling and Deceiving in Ordinary Life. Chicago: University of Chicago.

O'Reilly, C. A. III, Caldwell, D. F. and Barnett, W. P. (1989). 'Work group demography, social integration, and turnover'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 21–37.

O'Hara, J. (1998). Rape in the military. Maclean's, May 25, 15-21.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Parker, L. E. (1993). 'When to fix it and when to leave: relationships among perceived control, self-efficacy, dissent, and exit'. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 949–59.

Parker, L., & August, D. (1997). Silent dissenters: A model for exploring the source and consequences of principled turnover. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA.

Pinder, C. and Harlos, H. (2001). Employee silence: quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 20, 331-69.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B. and Bommer, W. H. (1996). 'Transformational leader behaviours and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviours'. *Journal of Management*, 22, 259–98.

Quinn, R., and Spreitzer, G. (1997). The road to empowerment: seven questions every leader should answer. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26(2), 37-50.

Read, W. (1962). 'Upward communication in industrial hierarchies'. Human Relations, 15, 2–16.

Redding, W. C. (1985). 'Rocking boats, blowing whistles, and teaching speech communication'. Communication Education, 34, 245–58.

Renato, M.E. (1997). *In Cesare Lombroso. —A Brief Biography: The History of Brain and Mind Localization*. Turin, Italy: George Publishers Inc.

Richard N., (2003), Why Do We Remain Silent in the Face of Unethical Behavior? *The Politics of Ethics: Methods for Acting, Learning, and Sometimes Fighting, With Others* In Addressing Ethics Problems in Organizational Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rusbult, C., Zembrodt, I., & Gunn, L. (1982). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(6), 1230-1242.

Sarafino, E. P. (1996). Principles of Behavior Change. New York: Wiley.

Saunders, D. M., Sheppard, B. H., Knight, V. and Roth, J. (1992). 'Employees voice to supervisors'. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 5, 241–59.

Saville-Troike, M. (1985). The place of silence in an integrated theory of communication. In: D. Tannen & M. Saville-Troike (Eds), Perspectives on Silence (pp.3-18). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Schmitt, E. (1992). Wall of silence impedes inquiry into a rowdy navy convention. The New York Times, June 14, 1, 34.

Scientific Journal , 23(9).

Scott, R. L. (1993). 'Dialectical tensions of speaking and silence'. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 79, 1–18.

Sims, R. L. (2002). Ethical rule breaking by employees: A test of social bonding theory. Journal of Business Ethics, 40(2), 101-109.

Slade, M.R. (2008). *The adaptive nature of organizational silence: a cybernetic exploration of the hidden factory* : George Washington University.

Smith, S.M. and Shafer, D. R. (1995). 'Speed of speech and persuasion: evidence for multiple effects'. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 1051–60.

Snyder, R.A., and Morris, J.H. (1984). Organizational communication and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 461-465.

Stockdale, M. (Ed.) (1996). Sexual harassment in the workplace (Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks,CA: Sage Publications.

Wharton, A. S. (1992). 'The social construction of gender and race in organizations: a social identify and group mobilization perspective'. Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 10, 55–84.

Withey, M. J. and Cooper, W. H. (1989). 'Predicting exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect'. Administrative Science Quarterly, 34, 521–39.