THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE: A LITERATURE REVIEW

SLIMANE TICHTICH Mohammed Lamine[1]
KHAIAT Amira[2]
BOUCHAREB BOULOUDANI Khaled[3]
e-mail: m.slimanetichtich@univ-soukahras.dz[1]
e-mail: khaiat.mira21@gmail.com[2]
e-mail: boucharebkaled@gmail.com[3]

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between trust in colleagues, supervisors, and management, and the dimensions of organizational silence, such as defensive and deafening silence, across different sectors and regions. By analyzing data from previous studies in education, industry, and services in countries like Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey, and Afghanistan, the study provides insights into how trust affects organizational silence. Using secondary data analysis, statistical methods were employed to explore these relationships. The findings show significant disparities based on sector and geographic location. For example, a strong inverse relationship was found between trust in colleagues and defensive silence in Indonesia's education sector, while no significant impact was observed in South Korea's service sector. Trust in supervisors also had a notable effect on organizational silence, with variations depending on the sector. The study highlights the role of cultural and managerial differences and offers recommendations to enhance trust and reduce organizational silence.

Keywords: organizational trust, trust in colleagues, trust in supervisor, trust in management, organizational silence

JEL: O15, M54, L20

Introduction

This article addresses the critical issue of organizational trust and silence, two key factors influencing internal organizational dynamics. Trust, as defined by Meyer et al. (1995), is the belief in the ability, integrity, and intentions of indi-

---

[1] Senior Lecturer, PhD, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Souk Ahras, Algeria, ORCID: 0000-0003-0315-0066

[2] Lecturer, PhD, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Guelma, Algeria, ORCID: 0009-0005-5401-6475

[3] Senior Lecturer, PhD, Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, University of Guelma, Algeria, ORCID: 0000-0002-8691-0667

viduals or organizations, fostering greater cooperation and transparency. Conversely, organizational silence refers to individuals' reluctance to voice work-related opinions or concerns, often due to fear of negative consequences or a lack of trust in the environment.

The primary problem this study explores is the relationship between trust – specifically in colleagues, supervisors, and management – and organizational silence, focusing on behaviors such as defensive and deafening silence. Existing research, such as Halimiati (2023) and Korsad (2022), has investigated this relationship in different sectors and countries, revealing variations. For instance, Halimiati found an inverse relationship between trust in colleagues and defensive silence in Indonesia's education sector, while Korsad examined how trust in supervisors influences silence in South Korea and Turkey.

This study aims to fill the gap by analyzing how the relationship between trust and organizational silence varies across sectors and geographical locations. However, the study acknowledges certain limitations, including the challenge of generalizing findings across different cultural and managerial contexts. The expected results will provide comprehensive insights into how trust shapes organizational silence and offers practical recommendations for fostering a more transparent and communicative work environment to enhance organizational performance and relationships.

Literature review

Organizational trust and silence are vital topics in studying the dynamics within organizations. This part focuses on reviewing the literature on organizational trust, which includes trust in supervisors and senior management, and how this trust affects the behavior of individuals and the organization's performance. It also addresses organizational silence, which can have negative and positive dimensions, and how it affects the organization's development and protection from sensitive information. Reviewing these concepts provides a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between organizational trust and silence, focusing on the interaction between these two elements and how they affect the regulatory environment.

The concept of organizational trust

Organizational trust is a complex topic in which two key concepts overlap: trust in supervisors and senior management, and trust in the organization. Various studies have addressed multiple aspects of this trust, from defining it as the relationship between individuals and the organizational environment to analyzing how this trust affects the behavior of individuals and the overall work

environment. Ming-Chuan et al. (2018, p. 852) considered it a type of institutional trust, including trust in supervisors and the organization. This definition included two dimensions of trust: trust in the manager or supervisor and trust in the organization or senior management.

While both Kars and Inandi (2018, p. 148) consider that there are organizational characteristics that shape organizational trust and guide the behavior of its members in a certain way, they also create a safe atmosphere free from fear of punishment and constitute the credibility of the organization that members see, and rely on the belief that the organization will work for their benefit. It is noted that this definition highlights a work environment that creates organizational trust for us, characterized by credibility and positive expectations towards colleagues or the organization alike.

There is another set of definitions in which the owners tried to refer to all dimensions of organizational trust, including the definition of Al-Hertsi and Rebhi (2020, p. 267), which is considered by the trustworthy person's expectations that the trusted person (colleagues, supervisor, senior management) will harm certain desirable behaviors, what is noted on this definition is that it clarified the parties to the organizational trust process from colleagues, supervisor and management, but it was not clarified what kind of behaviors everyone desires.

In addition, it was defined by Taha (2023, p. 859) as positive expectations, beliefs, and feelings that an individual holds towards supervisors, colleagues, and senior management of their organizations. Through this definition, we note that organizational trust is the preconceived opinions and beliefs the person holds about what will happen in the future and the positive feelings that express happiness, satisfaction, and gratitude. He also clarified the parties to this trust from trusting colleagues, trusting a supervisor, and trusting the management, and this is confirmed (Gülden and Duygulu, 2018, p. 164), as he described it as a three-dimensional construction. First, the person is insulated against the actions of his colleagues who cannot control their behaviors, trusting in the goals and actions of the manager and adopting the organization's behaviors without discussion.

Fathi et al. (2022, p. 700) define it as the psychological environment created by all organization members, including managers, employees, and senior management. This definition shows that organizational trust refers to the general state of emotions, feelings, and relationships between members of the organization. If there is organizational trust, there is an environment that encourages cooperation and positive interaction, and vice versa if organizational trust is absent. This definition reduced organizational confidence in creating an appropriate environment and work atmosphere without addressing the parties concerned with this confidence.

The concept of organizational silence

Definitions of organizational silence are numerous and reflect different aspects of this complex behavior. From understanding it as withholding information essential to the organization's evolution to considering it as a defensive act resulting from fear of sanctions, organizational silence also includes its positive dimensions that may enhance protecting and preserving sensitive information (Pirie and Joseph, 2016, p. 7). Organizational silence is an act aimed at withholding honest opinions and behavioral, cognitive, and emotional assessments of organizational conditions from reliable employees in changing the situation in the organization. Through this definition, we understand that organizational silence hinders the organization's development by withholding information and assessments that contribute to the organizational development process.

Hawari and Bin Ahmed (2019, p. 153) believe that organizational silence is a deliberate behavior towards labor issues and everything that has to do with policies and job problems by not disclosing them due to fear of adverse reactions from officials, such as threats and imposing sanctions. This definition explains to us the most important reasons that lead employees to adopt organizational silence behavior, which is the fear of punishment by officials, whether moral punishment such as threats or physical punishment such as deduction from salary or denial of promotion, so the employee takes a defensive stance through organizational silence. This was confirmed by Poomnakar & Wadi (2016, p. 224), who considered organizational silence as the reluctance of employees to participate, provide opinions and suggestions to their superiors, and report current and expected problems for fear of adverse reactions by their superiors to this.

Al-Tai and Saker (2020, p. 61) added that it is a deliberate withholding of opinions and suggestions, whether with each other or the administration, either verbally or in writing. This definition clarifies the aspects of organizational silence, as it is either behavioral or written and is intended not to write reports to its officials about organizational problems or administrative errors.

Mkhmara (2020, p. 88) confirms this. He defines it as refraining from talking about work-related matters for fear of a negative interpretation, affecting his relationships with colleagues and his manager.

According to Ghalit (2020, p. 436), organizational silence did not arise out of a vacuum, but because of the interactions that contributed to the sensitization process, workers built exaggerated perceptions of the futility of speaking, as the voice did not get what it needed. Through this definition we find that the employee surrenders to the status quo based on specific experiences and patterns of interactions he has experienced. Hence, he sees that expressing his opinion is like not doing so because he did not change the existing situation, so he prefers organizational silence to acquiesce to it.

Mohsen (2019, p. 278) added that organizational silence cannot be harmful in all cases; as it deteriorates organizational performance, it also improves it. Positive organizational silence means that the employee, through his silence, protects the organization and his colleagues as well at work. This was confirmed by Moussa (2018, p. 2), who considered that there are many cases in which silence is required for confidential information, which must be withheld from others. Through his definition of organizational silence, he clarified a positive type of organizational silence, which is in the organization's interest because it protects its information, known as social silence.

Methods

This study adopted a systematic literature review methodology aimed at analyzing the relationship between organizational trust in its various dimensions and organizational silence in its dimensions. The selected articles were collected through the „Google Scholar" search engine for the period between 2016 and 2021, focusing on studies that included field data based on correlation coefficients between organizational trust and organizational silence.

Articles were selected based on the fulfillment of several criteria, which were combined into essential standards to determine their suitability for the study. These criteria included that the articles must contain field or experimental studies that rely on quantitative data, and focus on organizational trust in its dimensions such as trust in colleagues, supervisors, and management. It was also required that the articles study organizational silence with a detailed analysis of its dimensions, such as defensive silence and deafening silence, and rely on correlation coefficients to clarify the relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence.

The selected articles were analyzed based on several main criteria, including: the country where the study was conducted, the sector in which the study was applied, the gender of the sample participants, and their average age. These criteria allowed for a precise comparison between the results of the different studies in terms of the impact of cultural and organizational environments. For instance, sectors were divided into education, service, and industrial sectors to understand how the results varied based on the type of sector. Additionally, differences were analyzed between countries that included studies from regions such as Asia, Europe, and America to understand how national cultures and organizational policies influenced the relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence.

Moreover, gender and average age of the sample were considered in analyzing potential differences in trust and silence behaviors. Some studies indicated significant differences in silence behaviors between males and females, as well

as the impact of employee age on levels of trust in supervisors and management, which in turn affects organizational silence behaviors.

This methodology facilitated a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence in various work environments, which enabled the extraction of valuable conclusions on how to enhance trust and effective communication within organizations.

Presentation of studies that dealt with the variable of organizational confidence in its relationship to organizational silence:

Previous studies in this element review various aspects of the relationship between organizational trust and silence across several contexts and domains. Studies range from understanding the impact of trust in colleagues, supervisors, and management on defensive and deafening silence behaviors to the impact of such trust on intent to leave work and unproductive behaviors. The studies reviewed include sectors as diverse as education, industry, and services, providing multiple insights into how organizational trust affects the actions of individuals within organizations. These studies provide a strong foundation for understanding multiple dimensions.

Helmiati et al. (2018) study

The study was entitled Regulatory Confidence and Regulatory Silence: Predictors of Regulatory Commitment by Muhammad Rashid Abdullah and Others 2019 in Indonesia. It focused on the private higher education sector. Some 309 academics were selected, and data were collected through a questionnaire in 15 private institutions of higher education in Indonesia (Helmiati et al., 2018, p. 129). The study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and job satisfaction?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment?

The descriptive approach and the questionnaire were used for data collection; most respondents were male 51.45%, 1.94% had a PhD educational background, and 66.34% were between the ages of 25 and 45.

The study focused on the relationship between trust in colleagues and defensive silence, trust in colleagues and deafening silence, as well as trust in the supervisor and defensive silence, trust in the supervisor and deafening silence, as well as trust in management and its relationship to both defensive and deafening

silence. The relationship between trust in colleagues and defensive silence was estimated at -0.528, an average inverse relationship. Individuals work to assess the reliability of their colleagues at work before they reveal or withhold their ideas and suggestions about the workflow. Here, the greater the trust in colleagues and the higher the positive expectations towards their colleagues, the lower the percentage of defensive silence. In addition to the trust in colleagues and the silence of deference, where the relationship was strong -0.423, positive expectations towards co-workers make employees seek to express their opinions to change the situation in the organization.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence is strong and inverse, estimated at -0.641. When the employee has positive expectations towards his supervisor and is confident that his decisions are correct and fair, he has less defensive silence because he is not afraid to express his opinions.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and deafening silence is also an average inverse relationship estimated at -0.550. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the less deafening the silence, and the more the employee believes that expressing his opinion will improve the situation.

As for trust in management and defensive silence was estimated at -0.821, which is a strong inverse relationship. Management's reliance on a flexible organizational structure reduces the defensive silence of employees. The relationship between trust in management and deafening silence was estimated at -0.687, a strong inverse relationship. Taking employees' opinions and dealing with them reasonably reduces their deafening silence.

The existence of a strong inverse relationship between organizational confidence and organizational silence was estimated at -0.791. The greater the organizational confidence, the less organizational silence. The employee works to evaluate his interactions with the organization and individuals and decides whether to give his opinion or remain silent.

Kwon (2017) study

The study was under the title of The Influence of Leadership on the Intention to Leave Work and Unproductive Behaviors through the Mediating Role of Organizational Trust and Organizational Silence in South Korea in the industrial sector, 305 employees were selected in medium-sized manufacturers, and it aimed to study the structural relationship between authentic leadership and trust in bosses and organizational silence. The intention to leave work and unproductive behaviors at work (Kwon, 2017, p. 141), and this study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

• Is there a relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence?

- Is there a relationship between trust in the supervisor and deafening silence?
- Is there a relationship between trust in the supervisor and work turnover?

The study focused only on the relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence, trust in the supervisor, and deafening silence. As the relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence is a weak inverse relationship estimated at -0.308, workers do not rely much on evaluating their trust in their supervisor at work before they declare their ideas, suggestions, and concerns. The same applies to trust in the supervisor and deafening silence. The weak inverse relationship was estimated at -0.321. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the less deafening silence, but in a weak manner.

Saglam (2016) study

It was entitled The Impact of Organizational Confidence of Vocational School Teachers on Organizational Silence in 2016 in Turkey on the Education Sector. The research was conducted following the correlation survey model, where 293 teachers were selected from 5 vocational and technical secondary schools in the center of Ushak Province, Turkey (Saglam, 2016, p. 225). This study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and defensive silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and deafening silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and social silence?

The study focused on trust in management and organizational trust as a whole and their relationship to defensive silence, deference silence, and social silence, as well as organizational silence as a whole and its relationship to trust in management and organizational trust.

The relationship between trust in the administration and defensive silence was weak, as was the relationship between trust in the administration and deafening silence, estimated at -0.108 and -0.107, respectively. The greater the trust in the administration, the less defensive and deafening silence there is, but in a weak manner.

We find that the relationship between trust in management and social silence is a weak direct relationship estimated at 0.242. The greater the trust in management, the greater the social silence. When the employee is treated fairly, and the way to deal with him is flexible and positive, he works to protect his institution and colleagues from altruism.

We also note from the table that the relationship between organizational trust as a whole and defensive silence is estimated at -0.048, a result that goes to zero.

The same is true for deafening silence, which was estimated at -0.019. We find that organizational trust and social silence were weak positive direct relationships.

As for the relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence, it was a weak direct relationship estimated at 0.232.

Demet and Cevat (2017) study

It was entitled The Relationship between Interactive Justice and Manager Confidence and Organizational Silence Behavior, 2017 in Turkey, on the Education Sector in Primary and Secondary Schools. The survey method was adopted, as 4761 teachers were selected from 195 secondary and primary schools in Turkey (Demet and Cevat, 2017, p. 328). This study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a relationship between reactive justice and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between reactive justice and organizational silence?

The study focused only on the relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence as a whole, as the average inverse relationship was estimated at -0.401 (Demet & Cevat, 2017, p. 328)

The greater the trust in the supervisor, the less organizational silence. Teachers who have positive perceptions of their managers have less organizational silence, which allows them to express their opinions and suggestions and even report organizational problems because they trust the fairness of their decisions.

Mohammed et al. (2018) study

It was entitled The Impact of Regulatory Harassment and Trust in the Supervisor as Mediating Variables in the Relationship between Bad Supervision and Regulatory Silence in Jordan in 2018 on the Industrial Sector. Mohammed Al-Saeed Morsi relied upon a sample of 75 presidents and 215 subordinates from the employees of the East Delta Electricity Production Company (2018, p. 304).

The study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a relationship between poor supervision and regulatory silence?
- Is there a relationship between lousy supervision behaviors and the level of motivation for organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between trust in the supervisor and the level of motivation for organizational silence?

The study focused only on the relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence, and it found a solid inverse relationship estimated at

-0.672. The higher the employees' confidence in their supervisors, the less their organizational silence and the greater their motivation to express their opinions, ideas, and information (Mohamed et al., 2018, p. 304).

Dong and Chung (2021) study

It was entitled The Impact of Confidence in the Relationship between Organizational Silence and Behavioral Outcomes in South Korea in 2020 on the Services Sector, and the questionnaire was used to collect data on 231 individuals (Dong et al., 2021, p. 9).

The study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:
- Is there a relationship between trust in colleagues and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and job performance?
- Is there a relationship between organizational silence and deviant behavior?

The study focused on the relationship between trust in colleagues and organizational silence, and it found a weak inverse relationship with -0.020. The greater the trust in colleagues, the less organizational silence (Tong Dong and Woon Chung, 2021, p. 9).

Timuroglu and Aliogullari (2019) study

This study was titled The Effect of Regulatory Confidence on Regulatory Silence on Erzurum's research assistants. The questionnaire was used on a sample of 140 individuals (Timuroğlu and Alioğullari, 2019, p. 256).

The study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and organizational silence?
- Is there a relationship between organizational trust and contact distance?
- Is there a relationship between organizational silence and the dimensions of organizational trust (trust in colleagues, the supervisor, trust in management)?

The study focused on the relationship between organizational silence and organizational trust as a whole, as well as between organizational silence and the three dimensions of organizational trust (trust in colleagues, trust in the supervisor, trust in management).

The relationship between organizational trust and silence was a strong inverse relationship estimated at -0.797. The greater the organizational trust, the less organizational silence. During work, the employee evaluates the ways in which his colleagues, supervisor, and management deal with him. If the relationships are reciprocal, positive, compatible with his aspirations, and characterized by

flexibility, he expresses his views and suggestions and reports on organizational problems as soon as they occur.

This is confirmed by the results of the relationship between trust in colleagues and organizational silence, where an average inverse relationship was estimated at -0.366, and the relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence was estimated at -0.779, and the results of the relationship between trust in management and organizational silence were estimated at -0.741, which is also a solid inverse relationship (Timuroğlu & Alioğulari, 2019, p. 256).

Karabay et al. (2018) study

It was entitled Ethical Climate as a Mediator Between the Organizational Silence of Employees and Their Trust in the Leader: Applied Research on the Insurance Sector. A sample of 811 employees in various insurance companies in Istanbul was relied on in 2018 (Karabay et al., 2018, p. 78).

The study focused on some questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a relationship between trust in the leader and deafening silence behavior?
- Is there a relationship between trust in the leader and the behavior of defensive silence?
- Is there a relationship between trust in the leader and social silence behavior?

The study dealt with the relationship between trust in the supervisor and deafening silence, defensive social silence. The relationship between trust in the supervisor and deafening silence was a weak reverse relationship, as it was estimated at -0.310. The greater the trust in the leader, the less deafening the silence. A positive reciprocal relationship between the leader and the employees makes them believe they are influential in the organization.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence is also a weak inverse relationship, as it was estimated at -0.300. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the less defensive silence. The sense of job security makes the employee unrestricted and allows him to express his suggestions and opinions about the workflow comfortably.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and social silence is a weak direct relationship, as it was estimated at 0.160. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the greater the social silence because when the employee is included and listens to his concerns, the leader enhances his sense of belonging and loyalty to the organization.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence was weak, as estimated at -0.220 (Karabay et al., 2018, p. 78).

Akar (2018) study

The study was entitled Organizational Silence in Educational Organizations: A Comprehensive Analytical Study in Turkey in 2018. Comprehensive research was conducted using Turkish and English as the terms of organizational silence and employee silence. Some 31 studies met the selection criteria, and the total number of samples in these studies was 10095 (Akar, 2018, p. 1085).

The study focused on several questions, the most important of which are:

- Is there a statistically significant relationship between transformational leadership and organizational silence?
- Is there a statistically significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational silence?
- Is there a statistically significant relationship between trust in the manager and organizational silence?

The study dealt with the relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence, as the reverse relationship was weak, estimated at -0.250. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the less organizational silence. The employee who finds his supervisor at work acts pretty, appropriately, and predictably, which makes him express his thoughts and opinions clearly (Akar, 2018, p. 1085).

Discussing the results of previous studies

This study reviews the relationship between trust in colleagues, supervisors, and management and the dimensions of organizational silence across different sectors and geographies. The results illustrate the diversity of effects of organizational trust on behaviors such as defensive silence and deafening silence, identifying notable variations based on sector and study location. For example, the data indicate a marked inverse relationship between trust in colleagues and defensive silence in Indonesia's education sector. At the same time, a similar effect is not seen in South Korea's service sector. It also highlights cultural and managerial differences that affect how individuals deal with organizational silence, providing valuable insights to better understand organizational work dynamics.

Table 1: A comparison of previous studies

Trust	Researchers	Sector	Country	Males	Building Age	Experience	Defensive Silence	Deference	Social Silence	Organizational Silence
Trust in colleagues.	Dong and Chang	Services	South Korea	-	30.12	4.26	-	-	-	-0.02
Trust in Supervisor	Halimati et al.	Education	Indonesia	51.45%	40	5	-0.528	-0.423	-	-
	Korsad et al.	Services	Afghanistan	54.3%	29.37	5.14	-	-	-	-0.366
	Helmiati et al.	Education	Indonesia	51.45%	40	5	-0.641	-0.550	-	-
	Kwon Heik-ji	Industry	South Korea	61.6%	32.01	9.71	-0.308	-0.321	-	-
	Karabai et al.	Services	Turkey	53.8%	36.91	8.67	-0.300	-0.310	0.16	-0.22
	Demet and Cevat	Industry	Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.672
	Demet and Alma	Education	Turkey	38.9%	-	-	-	-	-	-0.401
	Korsad et al.	Services	Afghanistan	54.3%	29.35	5.14	-	-	-	-0.779
	Akar	Education	Turkey	-	-		-	-	-	-0.25
Trust in management	Helmiati et al.	Education	Indonesia	51.45%	40	5	-0.821	-0.687	-	-
	Saglam	Education	Turkey	54.37%	-	-	-0.108	-0.107	0.242	0.075
	Korsad et al.	Services	Afghanistan	54.3%	29.35	5.14	-	-	-	-0.741
Organizational Trust	Korsad et al.	Services	Afghanistan	54.3%	29.35	5.14	-	-	-	-0.797
	Helmiati et al.	Education	Indonesia	51.45%	40	5	-	-	-	-0.791

Source: Author

The relationship between the dimension of trust in colleagues and the dimensions of organizational silence

While few studies have delved into this relationship, our findings unequivocally demonstrate that trust in colleagues and defensive silence share an average inverse relationship in the education sector in Indonesia, with a correlation coefficient of -0.528. This insight sheds new light on the dynamics of trust and silence in organizational settings.

This result can be attributed to the fact that the education sector is sensitive and the most dynamic and yearly changing sector. Trust in colleagues depends on frankness, disclosure, and sometimes disclosure of personal or professional secrets. Building these relationships requires years of working together. Therefore, low confidence increases defensive silence. The teacher takes a defensive stance for fear of criticism or problems, and this is to preserve his image and reputation among colleagues and students.

The relationship between trust in colleagues and deafening silence in the same sector reached -0.423 an average inverse relationship. The less trust in colleagues, the more noisy the silence. The teacher reaches a stage where he does not express his opinion on reality. This can be attributed to the average age group in this study, which has reached 40 years. The accumulation of knowledge and experiences obtained at this age makes him surrender to reality, and he does not want to make a change in the workplace.

While we find the relationship between trust in colleagues and organizational silence almost to zero in the service sector in South Korea, where it reached -0.020, the service sector is based on dealing with the customer and maintaining the institution's reputation. Hence, the transfer of information is immediate and necessary, so we do not find a relationship between trust in colleagues and organizational silence.

These findings hold significant implications for HRM practitioners and senior management, providing them with actionable insights to foster trust and reduce organizational silence in their respective sectors.

The relationship between the dimension of trust in the supervisor and the dimensions of organizational silence

Regarding the relationship between trust in the supervisor and defensive silence, the average inverse relationship reached -0.641 among the sample of teachers in Indonesia, which is stronger than the relationship we find in the industrial sector in South Korea, where it reached -0.308, and in the service sector in Turkey, which reached -0.300.

These differences may be due to the difference in the sector in each study. In the education sector, there is more focus on academic results and evaluations. Expressing an opinion may expose them to negative evaluations. The teacher is silent towards his supervisor for fear of the consequences. As for the industrial sector and services, there is an inverse relationship, but in lesser proportions because the defensive silence here shows its results directly with customers in the two sectors. The employee works to avoid it, expresses his opinion, and presents the problems facing him on the table so that he can find an immediate solution.

As for the relationship between trust in the supervisor and deafening silence, it is noted that the reverse relationship is also medium, reaching -0.550 among teachers in Indonesia. The absence of a reciprocal relationship based on mutual profit and an effective communication system between the teacher and his supervisor increases deafening silence. It is noted that it is stronger than the relationship that we find in the industrial sector in South Korea, which reached -0.321, and in the service sector in Turkey, which reached -0.310, which may be due to the difference in the two environments. The communication system in South Korea is more effective than in Indonesia.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and social silence was a weak direct relationship estimated at 0.160 in the service sector in Turkey. The greater the trust in the supervisor, the greater the social silence. The relationship, which is reciprocal, positive, and based on a win-win, leads the employee to protect his institution out of cooperation and altruism and without being exposed to any kind of pressure.

The relationship between trust in the supervisor and organizational silence was inverse in all studies, but the intensity of this relationship varied from one study to another. The strongest inverse relationship was found in the service sector in Afghanistan, with a coefficient of -0.779, followed by the industry sector in Jordan at -0.672, then the education sector in Turkey at -0.401. A less intense inverse relationship also appeared in the education sector in Turkey, with a coefficient of -0.250, and finally in the service sector in Turkey at -0.220. This result can be attributed to the fact that this study's average number of years of experience was the largest compared to previous studies. With the accumulation of his years of experience, the employee can understand the most appropriate work method and when he should speak or remain silent. He also has more robust relationships with his supervisor, which enables him to reduce organizational silence and comfortably express his opinions and plans related to work. With the passage of time and the accumulation of experience, the employee may gain more confidence in his abilities and knowledge, which increases his confidence in his supervisor. The development of the professional relationship between the supervisor and the employee increases understanding and confidence, which

increases the employee's ability to express his opinions openly and share observations without hesitation, in addition to job stability, which enhances the desire of the employee to maintain a good relationship with his supervisor, which results in a more remarkable ability to express opinion.

The relationship between the dimension of trust in management and the dimensions of organizational silence

As for this relationship, the researchers also obtained correlation coefficients of varying strength, the strongest of which is the relationship between trust in the administration and defensive silence in the education sector in Indonesia, which amounted to -0.821, where it was more substantial than what was found in the education sector in Turkey, where the strength of the relationship reached -0.108, as well as the relationship between trust in the administration and deafening silence, as the most vital relationship was in the education sector in Indonesia, where it reached -0.687, while in the education sector in Turkey, it reached -0.107, which is a weak inverse relationship. This result can be attributed to the fact that the percentage of males in Turkey's education sector is greater than that of males in Indonesia's education sector. The way the sexes deal with organizational silence may be different. In some cultures, males are encouraged to speak more, while females are encouraged to be conservative.

We find that the relationship between trust in management and organizational silence as a whole was zero in the education sector in Turkey, where it reached -0.075, while we find that the strong inverse relationship in the service sector in Afghanistan reached -0.741.

As for the relationship between organizational confidence as a whole and organizational silence, the strong inverse relationship in the education sector in Turkey reached -0.797, as well, and a strong inverse relationship in the education sector in Indonesia reached -0.791, which is close results. The more organizational confidence as a whole, the less organizational silence. The employee works to assess the situations to which he is exposed, whether with his colleagues or with his supervisor or management and based on them, decides whether to remain silent and keep his opinions to himself or express and share his suggestions.

Conclusion

This study reviewed the relationship between organizational trust (trust in colleagues, supervisors, and management) and the dimensions of organizational silence across various sectors and geographical areas. The results showed that organizational trust played an essential role in determining organizational silence

behaviors, but its impact varied significantly based on the geographical and functional sectors.

For example, in the education sector in Indonesia, a strong inverse relationship was observed between trust in colleagues, defensive silence, and deafening silence, reflecting the sensitive nature of the sector and the need to build strong trusting relationships between individuals. In contrast, in the services sector in South Korea and Afghanistan, relations have been weaker, demonstrating the impact of a different work environment and organizational culture.

As for trust in supervisors, the results showed that this trust significantly affected defensive and deafening silence, with marked differences between sectors. In Indonesia's education sector, the inverse relationship was more pronounced, indicating the impact of performance appraisal and reporting on employee behavior. Conversely, relationships have been less severe in other sectors, such as industry and services.

The results were more mixed when it came to trust in management. The relationship between defensive silence and deafening silence was stronger in some cases and weaker in others, reflecting the impact of administrative policies and the cultural environment on how employees dealt with issues of organizational silence.

Overall, the study showed that organizational trust, in all its dimensions, played an essential role in determining levels of organizational silence. However, the impact of this trust varied based on the geographic and empirical sector, which indicated the importance of considering cultural and organizational contexts when analyzing organizational silence behaviors. Based on the findings, it is essential for managers and senior leaders to foster a culture of trust across all levels of the organization by implementing transparent and fair administrative policies that promote open communication and reduce fears of negative consequences when employees speak up. Supervisors and middle management should encourage trust-building activities, such as regular feedback sessions and creating safe opportunities for employees to voice concerns without fear of retaliation, helping to mitigate defensive and deafening silence. Additionally, HR professionals should develop training programs tailored to the cultural and functional contexts of each sector, emphasizing the importance of trust in building collaborative and communicative work environments. By applying these insights, organizations can reduce organizational silence and foster more dynamic, open communication channels, ultimately enhancing organizational responsiveness and effectiveness.

References

Abdo, A. F. S. & Taha, H. S. (2022). The effect of organizational trust on organizational performance: A study applied to MetLife Life Insurance Company, The Scientific Journal of Financial and Administrative Studies and Research, 13(3), pp. 700-728, available at: https://masf.journals.ekb.eg/article_229125_cb83c7756cd739469137a58a5119abce.pdf

Abdul, A. M. (2019). The role of ethical leadership in reducing organizational silence: An exploratory study of the opinions of a sample of employees in the Anbar Water Directorate, Tikrit Journal for Administrative and Economic Sciences, 15(48), pp. 262-286, available at: https://www.iasj.net/iasj/pdf/f052b-f048dbceb7d

AKAR, H. (2018). Organizational silence in educational organizations: A meta-analysis study, International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences, 9(32), pp. 1077-1098, available at: https://www.ijoess.com/DergiPdfDetay.aspx?ID=2222

Al-Hertsi, H. S. & Rebhi, K. (2020). The impact of dimensions of organizational trust on organizational alienation: An analytical study of the opinions of employees in the new Algerian Cannery, Journal of Economic Sciences, Management, and Commercial Sciences, 12(3), pp. 265-283, available at: https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/324/12/3/112781

Al-Tai, F. A. & Saker, A. A. (2020). The impact of organizational silence on the main capabilities of positive organizational behavior: An analytical study of the opinions of a sample of employees in the Karbala Police Directorate, Journal of Administration and Economics, 6(21), pp. 53-93, available at: https://www.iasj.net/iasj/pdf/d02d97242ed6a3a6

Boumnagar, M. & Wadi, A. (2016). The phenomenon of organizational silence in Algerian public institutions, Economic Visions Journal, 6, pp. 221-235, available at: https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/126/6/10/39909

Demet, Y. & Cevat, E. (2017). The relationship among interactional justice, manager trust, and teachers' organizational silence behaviour, Universal Journal of Educational Research, 5(3), pp. 325-333, available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2017.050304

Dong, X. T. & Chung, Y. W. (2021). The mediating effect of perceived and moderating effect of trust for the relationship between employee silence and behavioral outcomes, Psychological Reports, 124(4), pp. 1715-1737, https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294120942914

Ghelit, S. (2020). Organizational silence in Algerian institutions: The reality of educational institutions as a model, Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 7(1), pp. 431-451, available at: https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/39/7/1/146783

Gülden, B., & Duygulu, S. (2018). Nurses' organizational trust and intention to continue working at hospitals in Turkey, Collegian, 25(2), pp. 163-169, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2017.05.003

Helmiati, Abdillah, M., Anita, R., Nofianti, L., & Zakaria, N. (2018). Organizational trust and organizational silence, the factors predicting organizational commitment, International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7, pp. 126-131, http://dx.doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i3.35.29279

Houari, M., & Ahmed, M. B. (2019). Measuring the level of organizational silence among faculty members: A field study at Ahmed Zabana University Center – Relizane, Journal of Psychological and Educational Studies, 12(3), pp. 150-166, available at: https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/117/12/3/102089

Ismail, A. F. M. (2018). Determinants of organizational silence and its impact on burnout among support staff at Sadat City University, Journal of Contemporary Commercial Studies, 4, pp. 1-51, https://doi.org/10.21608/csj.2018.90439

Karabay, M., Şener, İ., & Tezergil, S. (2018). Ethical climate as a mediator between employees' organizational silence behaviors and their trust in leader, International Journal of Organizational Leadership, 7, pp. 70-83, http://dx.doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2018.60444

Kars, M., & Inandi, Y. (2018). Relationship between school principals' leadership behaviors and teachers' organizational trust, Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 18(74), pp. 145-164, http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2018.74.8

Kwon, H. G. (2017). A study on the structural relationship between authentic leadership, trust in superiors, organizational silence, turnover intention, and counterproductive work behaviors, The Korea Industrial Information Research, 22(4), pp. 131-147, http://dx.doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2015/v8iS7/69993

Mkhmara, K. K. (2020). Organizational silence behavior and ways to overcome it among high school teachers in the Jerusalem municipality: From their perspective, Al-Hikma Journal for Educational and Psychological Studies, 7(4), pp. 83-107, available at: https://www.asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/335/8/3/120402

Morsi, M. M. E.-S. (2018). The impact of organizational harassment and trust in supervisor as mediating variables in the relationship between poor supervision and organizational silence, Jordanian Journal of Business Administration, 14(2), pp. 285-316, available at: https://archives.ju.edu.jo/index.php/JJBA/article/download/101607/10848/105268

Pirie, S. & Joseph, W. (2016). Key determinants of organizational silence for non-standard workers, Management Decision, 54(6), pp. 1522-1538, http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MD-11-2015-0490

Sağlam, A. (2016). The effects of vocational high school teachers' perceived trust on organizational silence, Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4(5), pp. 225-232, http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v4i5.1474

Taha, I. M. A. (2023). The role of organizational trust as an interactive variable in the relationship between job characteristics and affective commitment, The Scientific Journal of Financial and Commercial Studies and Research, 4(1), pp. 844-913, available at: https://journals.ekb.eg/article_259989_a6ce11d-10b82fa31bfb4929a287e9d46.pdf

Timuroğlu, M. K., & Alioğullari, E. (2019). The effect of organizational trust on organizational silence: A study on Erzurum research assistants, Economic and Administrative Journal of Sciences, 33(1), pp. 243-264, available at: https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/atauniiibd/issue/43125/413007

Ming-Chuan, Y., Qiang, M., Sang-Bing, T., & Yi, D. (2018). An empirical study on the organizational trust, employee-organization relationship, and innovative behavior from the integrated perspective of social exchange and organizational sustainability, Sustainability, 10(3), pp. 850-864, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su10030864