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Based on a recent line of research, results suggest that organizations can be intolerant of dissent and that employees, in general, are reluctant to speak up about organizational problems (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Sprague & Ruud, 1988; Vakola, & Bouradas, 2005). I argue that dissent in organizations is not always a feasible option, and members of cultures with higher power distance are typically reluctant to express irritations, complaints, and contradictory opinions. In order to understand when and why employees express dissent, it is crucial to examine not only how and why dissent occurs, but also to detect how and why it does not occur (muted dissent). Thus, defining, measuring, and modeling muted dissent was the aim of this study.

In phase 1, constant comparative analysis revealed four general dimensions of muted dissent: disengaged, supportive, defiant, and protective. The protective construct was defined by three sub-themes (relational, instrumental, and face threat). Phase 2 consisted of study1, study 2, and study 3 aimed at developing and validating a Muted Dissent Scale.

In study 1, measures of muted dissent were developed, and a pilot study was conducted to test the performance of items. In study 2, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to examine factor structure and reduce the number of items. The EFA suggested a six-factor structure of muted dissent: disengaged, supportive, defiant,
protective, relational, instrumental, and face threat. This finding provided a multifaceted structure for the Muted Dissent Model. Study 3 sought to test whether these factors were distinct and a second-order factor structure exists for a more parsimonious model. CFA results suggested that protective was a second-order factor defined by relational, instrumental, and face threat. Muted dissent measures showed strong support for construct reliability and construct validity. The latter was examined using rigorous tests of construct validity. The findings revealed strong support for convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) indicated that muted dissent factors were significantly associated with validation measures (organizational justice, organizational commitment, upward dissent, and job satisfaction).
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CHAPTER 1: PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

Diversity in the workplace can take many forms. One form is diversity of ideas and opinions. While diverse opinions can have positive outcomes, they can also have negative outcomes for both the employees and the organization. This possibility is because diverse opinions can lead to disagreements over goals and the appropriate strategies/tactics for achieving those goals. The idea of expressing dissatisfaction about workplace related issues or workplace concerns is called “organizational dissent” (Kassing, 1997).

Employees might observe what they define as an instance of wrongdoing by management or by someone in authority, but decide to not talk about it publicly. Instead, they might compliment or even praise an organization’s management. These employees might assume that speaking up will make no difference and/or that speaking up will result in negative repercussions (Detert & Burris, 2007; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003). However, other employees might be more direct in their expression of dissent. This reality has led scholars to study why and how people express dissent (see, for example, Avtgis, Thomas-Maddox, Taylor, & Patterson, 2007; Garner, 2009; Goodboy, Chory, & Dunleavy, 2009; Gorden, 1988; Gossett & Kilker, 2006; Hegstrom, 1990; Kassing, 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b; Payne, 2007).

Kassing (1997) defined organizational dissent "as the expression of disagreements and contradictory opinions that result from the experience of feeling apart from one's
organization” (p. 311). The phrase “contradictory opinions”, as employed in this definition, implies an emphasis on a verbal perspective toward dissent expression.

Additionally, Kassing (1997) proposed a model for expressing organizational dissent. He argued that employees typically choose from three strategies for the expression of dissent: upward dissent (expressing dissent directly to an audience that is assumed to have responsibility or to be in a position to take effective action, e.g., managers), lateral dissent (expressing dissent to less effective audience members, e.g., coworkers when employees feel a safeguard against retaliation), and displaced dissent (expressing dissent to ineffectual audience members, e.g., non-work friends and family members, when high levels of retaliation are perceived by employees as being realistically possible).

More recently, Kassing (2011a) provided three necessary conditions for dissent to take place. First, he argued that dissent must be expressed to someone. Second, dissent must entail disclosure of disagreement. Third, dissent must be expressed against organizational policies and/or practices. It is understood from these three conditions that dissent must be intentional and that verbal expression is central to the communication of disagreement. Kassing’s perspective is based on Western culture with respect to communication values. It is, perhaps, for that reason that he privileges verbal forms of dissent. Alternatively, while dissent is an intentional behavior, the act of silence can communicate both intentional and nonverbal behaviors. Significantly, silence, as a response to conflict and/or disagreement, plays a normative role in many cultures (see, for example, Huang, Vliert, & Vegt, 2005). Hence, difficulties arise when an attempt is made to understand dissent behavior in other cultures.
In this study, I argue for the need to further explicate dissent, operationalizing it to more broadly include other (i.e., nonverbal) forms of objection and protest behaviors. I also argue for the need to better understand the reluctance to express dissent. While traditionally labeled as “silence,” in this research, I prefer to think of this as muted dissent and will, eventually, shift from using the word “silence” to using the label “muted dissent”. This is due to the fact that muted dissent is pervasive within organizations and can hinder constructive dissent expression. In this Chapter (as well as in Chapter two) the words “silence” and “silent” will be used when contextually or theoretically appropriate, but as I move forward more into initial data collection and conceptualization of what is occurring, the concept of “muted dissent” will become more appropriate.

Most definitions of dissent emphasize the verbalization of dissent (e.g., Garner, 2009; Kassing, 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b) and neglect other channels for “voicing” one’s dissent. The exception to this trend is Gossett and Kilker (2006) who studied online dissent through counterinstitutional web sites. These are websites that are developed to create a platform for employees to express workplace frustrations, grievances, oppositions, and complaints. However, the verbal expression of dissent in an organization is not always a feasible option. In particular, members of cultures with a high power distance will typically be reluctant to express irritations, complaints, and contradictory opinions. In order to understand when and why employees express dissent, it is crucial to empirically examine not only how and why verbal dissent occurs, but also to detect how and why it does not occur (i.e., muted dissent).
In the following section, I argue as to why Kassing's (1997) model of organizational dissent should be modified to include “muted dissent” as a fourth dimension and propose the need to explore other dimensions of dissent that might exist in other, i.e., non-Western, cultural settings. I also argue that studying organizational muted dissent is equally as important as studying organizational verbal dissent, and I propose that these two constructs should be integrated into a single theoretical model.

Epistemological Importance of Dissent and Muted Dissent

Despite the fact that organizations exercise different forms of control over organizational members (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985), research has indicated that employees prefer a sense of autonomy and freedom of expression within their organization (Gorden, Infante, & Graham, 1988; Kassing, 1997). Organizational freedom of expression, in general, and dissent expression, in particular, are imperative for the success of individual employees and for the organization's success as well (Avtgis et al., 2007; Garner, 2009; Graham, 1986; Hegstrom, 1990; Kassing 1997, 2011a; Redding, 1985). This fact stimulated researchers to critically examine and suggest safe and effective upward strategies for dissent expression (Kassing, 2002), dissent messages (Garner, 2009), and counterinstitutional web sites (Gossett & Kilker, 2006). Central to the research concerning dissent in the workplace is that dissent expression facilitates individual and organizational change and development. While this is true, research has consistently shown that management impedes upward communication and is often hostile to employee dissent (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). This paradox between organizational views of voice and silence is the central focus of this study.
Although scholars and practitioners have each promoted idealistic views concerning effective, open communication channels, constructive dissent expression, open-door policies, and town hall meetings, practice suggests that reality is otherwise. Research in the West and in the East suggests that organizations can be intolerant of dissent and that employees, in general, are reluctant to speak up about organizational problems (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Sprague & Ruud, 1988; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). In brief, studies show that most employees are afraid to speak up about issues or problems they encounter in the workplace (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Interestingly, these studies have been primarily conducted in Western, low context cultures. Presumably, employees in collectivistic countries that subscribe to high power distance in relationships will be even more reluctant to voice their complaints and/or contradictory opinions to top management. This view is supported by Morrison and Milliken (2000) who argued that employees from high power distance cultures should be more likely to express uncritical agreement with the acts of those in authority.

In a major study with a sample of participants obtained from 24 countries, Huang et al. (2005) found that employees from high power distance cultures tended to report higher levels of employee silence. Botero and Van Dyne (2009) also found power distance in a collectivistic setting had a negative relationship with voice behavior. Such expositions lead to questioning the applicability of existing dissent models and measurement instruments in high context cultures. I argue that silence (i.e., the voluntary muting of one’s voice) should not be simplified and/or neglected in theoretical models of dissent and voice.
Because it can be risky to express dissent and there might not be safe communicative channels to protect organizational members from the risk of creating a negative impression and/or incurring management retaliation, scholars have studied organizational silence in order to explore the antecedents, motives, and consequences of silence in organizations (see, for example, Kish-Gephart, Detert, Treviño, & Edmondson, 2009; Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). Although Kassing (1997) epistemologically acknowledged, in his model, that neglect can take the form of displaced dissent where organizational members express dissent to external members, such explanations tend to overlook the fact that there is always an expression of dissent externally; hence, this prevalent pattern limits the ontological nature of suppressive communicative acts within organizations. The fact is that muted dissent is pervasive within organizations and can hinder constructive dissent expression. While the study of dissent in organizations would be more convincing if both muted dissent and dissent were studied more systematically, an argument needs to be made as to whether it is possible to study muted dissent and dissent together, or are they simply distinct constructs?

Problems with the Dis/Similar Nature of Dissent and Muted Dissent

In this section, I acknowledge the fact that the choice of whether to express dissent or remain silent is situational. I also argue in favor of scholars who call for the integration of silence and dissent in the literature. This approach will justify my efforts to modify existing dissent models by systematically integrating “muted dissent” under the
theoretical explanation for dissent. I present these points by introducing current debates concerning the nature of the voice and silence constructs and their conceptual dis/similarities.

According to recent research, while intentional silence does not imply the absence of voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003), there is still some debate as to whether silence and voice should be viewed as opposite ends of a single continuum (Morrison, 2011). Researchers who suggest that silence and voice are polar opposites of this proposed continuum argue that, when an employee is concerned about organizational practices or has important information to share, he/she can either express dissent or remain silent. This fact indicates that high levels of voice imply a low level of silence (Morrison, 2011). Although silence and dissent are oppositional, the factors that influence one also influence the other (Morrison, 2011). As a result, many studies have treated voice and silence as serving as the endpoints of a continuum (e.g., Frazier & Bowler, 2009; Harvey, Martinko, & Douglas, 2009; Milliken & Lam, 2009; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison, Wheeler-Smith, & Kamdar, 2011; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005).

Other scholars have argued that the presence of intentional silence does not necessarily mean the absence of voice or vice versa (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Supporters of this view indicate that silence and dissent are two different and distinctly separate constructs (e.g., Brinsfield, Edwards, & Greenberg, 2009; Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Kish-Gephart et al., 2009).
Morrison (2011) presented several arguments concerning the distinct nature of voice and silence, and then offered counterarguments to those claims. First, she noted that the supporters of this view (i.e., the view that voice and silence are distinct) argue that voice is a deliberate choice, while silence can be an automatic avoidance response, a habitual behavior, or a deep state of disengagement and resignation. For instance, Kish-Gephart et al. (2009) argued that "silence driven by higher intensity fear should be conceptualized as a more automatic response that neither requires, nor often involves, conscious recognition of alternatives or weighing of costs and benefits" (p. 167). According to this view, silence is an automatic response process that is quite different from the intentional expression of a point of view (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009). Similarly, Pinder and Harlos (2001) argued, "A person may be silent in circumstances that are either positive or negative without his or her conscious awareness" (p. 335). However, Morrison (2011) offered a counterargument that most definitions of silence have been conceptualized as an act of withholding information and not simply the failure to speak. To Morrison, this revised definition means silence encompasses both choice and awareness.

The second argument that Morrison (2011) noted from the literature that treats voice and silence as distinct is the co-existence of both constructs. For example, an employee can engage in high levels of voice, but at the same time, he/she might withhold specific types of information. Morrison offered a counterargument to this claim by suggesting that, while it is true an employee can express his/her voice about some concerns and remain silent with respect to other issues, this perspective does not mean
that voice and silence are orthogonal constructs. Instead, she argued for the "need to recognize that voice and silence are rarely absolute" (p. 380). In other words, it is rare to see complete voice or complete silence because individuals show significant variations of expression over time and across issues (Morrison, 2011). She went on to offer other reasons for considering voice and silence as polar opposites. The advantage of doing so, she maintained, is to integrate both voice and silence literature. Similarly, Ashford, Sutcliffe, and Christianson (2009) called for integrating both literatures on voice and silence, arguing that these two constructs should not be studied separately but should be treated as "different sides of the same coin" (p. 178). Accordingly, Morrison (2011) argued in favor of viewing silence as "failure to voice" and "as existing along a single continuum" (p. 380).

This study integrates voice and silence by adopting what Pinder and Harlos (2001) called an integrationist view. This view emphasizes that "the boundaries between the concepts are indistinct, and that the human mind can accommodate speech and silence simultaneously" (p. 340). Constructively, acknowledging that both voice and silence are inseparable does not mean they are binary opposites, but they can co-occur. This view is supported by Acheson (2008), who stated that, “Inseparability, of course, does not necessitate a dichotomous relationship" (p. 536). Furthermore, Knoll and Van Dick (2012) argued, "findings from research on voice behavior should not be transferred to the problem of employee silence easily" (p. 352). However, they went on to claim that the knowledge gained from one of these constructs (either voice or silence) can provide clues and factors that facilitate our understanding of the other. That is why treating voice and
silence as inseparable serves to develop deeper insights to better understand the breadth and depth of these constructs.

Historically, silence is considered a complex concept (Jaworski, 1993; Tannen, 1985). Muldoon (1996) regarded silence as a “slippery topic.” Essentially, studying a behavior that cannot be easily observed or that is absent is more difficult than studying a more overt behavior (Johannesen, 1974). Due to the covert and ambiguous nature of silence, Muldoon argued for studying silence by uncovering its relationships with auditory qualities (e.g., voice). This view is also supported by Bruneau (1973) who noted that "silence can only be defined by language" (p. 20) and that it is hard to understand an unknown by itself. He went on to explain, "It follows, then, that significations of various loci, intensities, durations, and frequencies of imposed silences are possible because of their interdependence with speech" (p. 18). The interdependence between speech (verbal dissent) and silence has led me to integrate both in this study.

Basically, there is no absolute silence; individuals always maintain internal assent and dissent dialogues. Bruneau (1973) contended that, "absolute silence, then, is impossible: even when not speaking aloud, man carries on a continuous interior monologue" (p. 17). This view supports Morrison's (2011) call for integrating both voice and silence literature into a new comprehensive paradigm. While silence has been implicitly indicated in Kassing’s model, the aim of this study was to examine muted dissent more explicitly, integrating silence with dissent literature and suggesting one possible approach to operationalizing dissent in this way. With this approach, I do not mean to imply that the presence of silence means the absence of voice. Instead, I argue
that, just as the three dimensions of Kassing’s model (upward, lateral, and displaced dissent) can co-exist with varying degrees of silence and, in actuality, do occur concurrently, so do silence and dissent. Moreover, Bruneau (1973) noted "there appears, however, to be more signification in silence than in speech" (p. 18). This fact further supports the need to operationally investigate muted dissent as a form of organizational dissent and to explore other unstudied dimensions of dissent.

Problems with the Existing Dissent Models

The classic model of Exit-Voice-Loyalty (EVL), developed by Hirschman (1970), suggests that, when members experience problems and deteriorating conditions within their organization, they might choose to exit the organization or to give voice to those problems or to remain silent (but loyal) to the organization. Hirschman did not specifically pay attention to silence as much as he did to the concepts of exit, voice, and loyalty. He treated silence as a necessarily constructive and passive behavior that he classified under his concept of loyalty. He did not attempt to define silence, but he did acknowledge that, while loyal employees speak up and voice their concerns, others stay and "suffer in silence, confident that things will soon get better" (Hirschman, 1970, p. 38). He basically viewed this form of silence as a passive behavior identified by low levels of involvement.

Rusbult, Zembrodt, and Gunn (1982) expanded the EVL model to romantic relationships and included neglect as a fourth dimension, making the model Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect (EVLN). They defined neglect as "ignoring the partner or spending less time together, refusing to discuss problems, treating the partner badly emotionally or
physically, criticizing the partner for things unrelated to the real problem, just letting things fall apart, (perhaps) developing extrarelationship sexual involvements” (p. 1231). This model was later employed in explorations of organizational voice (e.g., Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992). For Rusbult et al. (1982), neglect is characterized as a lack of caring combined with avoidance. Building on that, Farrell (1983) suggested that silence is a key element of neglect and inaction. Because Kassing positioned displaced dissent as a key characteristic of neglect, I suggest adding “muted dissent” as another dimension in any organizational dissent model that aims at covering a more comprehensive and comprehensible spectrum of both available and viable options for dissent due to the imperative nature of silence behavior. This approach is necessary because, when we simply equate silence with loyalty (e.g., Farrell, 1983), or equate silence with displaced dissent (e.g., Kassing, 1997), the paradigm neglects the deeper cognitive, affective, and communicative significance of muted dissent. One might argue that muted dissent is not a characteristic of dissent because it does not meet the conditions that qualify as displaying the presence of dissent, as indicated earlier (see Kassing, 2011a). However, these conditions should be revisited as new forms and options of dissent expression become more popular (especially in light of the diverse workforce brought on through globalization), and factors that hinder dissent (and/or favor muted dissent) become more salient.

In their study of how the RadioShackSucks web site functions as a platform for dissent expression, Gossett and Kilker (2006) raised crucial aspects of a different form of dissent dynamics. They studied counterinstitutional web sites that function as platforms
for dissent expression. Through such sites, dissent takes place virtually and can occur anonymously, with employees voicing their dissent and/or workplace frustrations, views about organizational problems, and other concerns in a public online space with less fear from retaliation or negative repercussions. Their findings suggest new dynamics of dissent expression and question the transferability of Kassing's dissent model. For instance, online dissent is not vocally expressed. Moreover, because contributors to counterinstitutional web sites are typically anonymous, audiences of the dissent (upward, lateral, and displaced) become elusive. In other words, when dissent is expressed via a website, management might have access to what was said but has no access as to who said what. As a result, the decision as to lateral, upward, or displaced is no longer under the “speaker’s” control. With the pervasiveness of social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Linkedin), organizations are adapting new and different forms of organizational practices concerning dissent expression. Dialectically, the essential questions to be asked are: In light of the emergence of counterinstitutional websites that permit the anonymous expression of dissent, how are dissent and muted dissent within an organization to be understood? What do the results from Gossett and Kilker’s (2006) study say about the need to extend Kassing’s model to include deeper analyses of other forms of objection?

As we have seen from the literature, views of dissent have mainly relied on discursive acts, resulting in the need for scholars to develop models accordingly (e.g., Garner, 2009; Graham, 1986; Kassing, 1997). Meanwhile, although relying on discursive acts is helpful for the purpose of operationalization, most studies of organizational dissent have relied on self-report measures and the perceptions of employees. Also, while
organizational silence is elusive and, clearly, it is not easy to study what is not spoken, this predicament does not mean discursive dissent has an operationalization advantage. The following suggestion is central to understanding the efficacy of operationally redefining silence in a more comprehensive paradigm involving crisscrossed spectrums of silence and dissent expression:

Employee dissent must be sought at the margins—at the margins of organizations, at the margins of discourse, at the margins of experience. These are the unmanaged spaces in organizations, spaces which for certain periods of time are beyond the surveying gaze of organizational controls. (Gabriel, 1999, p. 195)

One way to study dissent at the margins of discourse and experience is to systematically consider silence—or muted dissent—as a more important dimension of dissent than is displaced dissent. For example, Gossett and Kilker (2006) suggested, "members who appear to be silent within the internal confines of the organization may have instead selected an external channel for voicing their concerns, one where they have more control over anonymity and the structure of the discussion" (p. 83). This fact clearly suggests the interdependent nature of different forms and audiences of dissent and the act of silence. Moreover, psychoanalytic approaches toward theories of dissent at the workplace allow “for the coexistence of dissent and compliance” (Gabriel, 1999, p. 193), implying the possible simultaneous existence of dissent and silence, where organizational members can exercise silence, even if they appear to be complying and/or consenting. Fineman and Gabriel (1996) argued that, "orders may be obeyed willingly or unwillingly; they may equally be obeyed grudgingly, inaccurately, ritualistically or sarcastically. In all
of these cases, compliance and resistance can coexist in the same form of behavior” (p. 87).

The findings of Gossett and Kilker (2006) urge scholars to study dissent and voice by considering "spaces outside the formal boundaries of the organization" (p. 82). By outside the boundaries of the organization, they did not mean mere displaced dissent as suggested by Kassing (1997). The authors urged researchers not to limit the study of dissent and member voice to discursive acts within a social institution. As seen in parliamentary procedural use of hand-raising to indicate aye/nay, silence can convey both agreement and dissent as well as the legal concept of nolo contendere in which a defendant “does not accept or deny responsibility for the charges but agrees to accept punishment” (Nolo Contendere, 2013). This fact can also be seen from Jensen's (1973) study of the communicative functions of silence. He outlined that silence has five communicative functions: (1) silence unites people and pushes them apart; (2) silence can both harm and heal people; (3) silence can offer and hide information; (4) silence can provoke deep thought and/or no thought; and finally, (5) silence can convey both assent and dissent. Essentially, all five functions can create a continuum of expression for operationally defining and examining organizational silence and dissent.

Gossett and Kilker (2006) noted, "rather than classify this discourse as evidence of member neglect or latent dissent, researchers should consider the ways in which external communication channels can also serve as mechanisms for member voice and articulated dissent" (p. 82). This fact supports my claim and aim to examine more closely muted dissent as an essential dimension in any dissent model because the presence of a
specific form of silence can trigger or provide predictability power for any internal or external channels that might serve as alternatives through which organizational members might express dissent.

Why Consider Silence?

According to Van Dyne et al. (2003), employee silence, while pervasive, has received little attention from researchers (see, also, Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001). The crux of the dilemma is that, even when silence is recognized and studied by researchers, most of those researchers have assumed that silence is a simple, unitary construct (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

Both employee dissent and employee involvement are imperative for organizational success (Kassing, 1997). However, dissent expression is not always a viable option. Argyris (1977) contended that organizations have powerful norms and games that often stop employees from expressing what they know. Similarly, Morrison and Milliken (2000) asserted that "organizations are generally intolerant of dissent" (p. 706), resulting in employees avoiding speaking up about organizational problems. Although silence is a powerful force that can result in organizational decline, silence has not yet received the rigorous empirical research attention that it deserves (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; see, also, Pinder & Harlos, 2001).

The Problems with Organizational Silence in Communication Studies

In the previous sections, I justified the need to extend the existing dissent models by systematically considering the construct of muted dissent and how the pervasiveness of silence in organizations can be an obstacle to constructive dissent. A basic objective of
this study is to design an instrument that taps into organizational muted dissent as well as a more universal paradigm for predicting non-typical forms of dissent expression. To do that, the conceptualization and operationalization of organizational muted dissent must be supported by empirical evidence. This goal will be accomplished by employing an exploratory sequential design method. In phase one, I will inductively investigate the transferability of Kassing’s organizational dissent model to a non-Western setting. (While my primary focus will be on muted dissent, as this research will break with tradition by exploring dissent in a non-Western culture, other dimensions might emerge as well.)

Organizational silence is a fairly new concept. In recent years, there has been an increasing amount of literature on organizational silence in management literature (see, for example, Kish-Gephart et al., 2009; Milliken & Morrison, 2003; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003). In the field of communication studies, silence has received wide attention from scholars focused on a variety of contexts (e.g., instructional communication, interpersonal relationships, and romantic relationships); however, silence in organizational communication has received little attention with the exception of work by Ryan Bisel and his colleagues (Bisel & Arterburn, 2012; Bisel, Kelley, Ploeger, & Messersmith, 2011). These studies, all of which are recent, have either focused on a thematic analysis of the antecedents of organizational silence (Bisel & Arterburn, 2012), or on treating organizational silence from the perspective of the “MUM effect” (Bisel et al., 2011). To my knowledge, there is no extant instrument that explores organizational silence from a communication theory point of view. Therefore, there is a need for
instrument development. That is another significant aim of this study. I argue that the systematic and inductive analysis of organizational silence (muted dissent) and its dimensions will open the possibility for new theoretical explanations of dissent in organizational settings. I firmly believe that this study will significantly add to our understanding of cultural communicative practices, especially because this study is based in a collectivistic setting (specifically, Oman).

The Problem with Cultural Studies

As the world economy grows, and as companies explore new markets and strive to go global, it becomes imperative to study how organizations deal with employees who come from a variety of cultural backgrounds. There is ample reason to suppose that the behavior proposed as the focus for this research—organizational dissent and silence (muted dissent)—is very much influenced by an employee’s cultural background. Historically, studies related to organizational dissent and silence have been undertaken almost exclusively within U.S. organizations, and most conceptual definitions of dissent reflect western cultural values. Formally, verbal dissent and muted dissent practices in organizations arguably function differently in other countries in terms of processes, tactics, gender differences, national culture, and government regulations. For example, directly expressing dissent to management could be considered rude in some cultures, leading to the occurrence of silence as the normative behavior within those cultures. Essentially, knowing the processes and mechanisms of dissent expression will help organizations provide better solutions that satisfy both individuals’ and organizations’ needs for new and innovative approaches to open dialogue. Additionally, knowing the
processes associated with the behavior of muted dissent will add to our understanding of
dissent avoidance in collectivistic contexts.

Synthesis

Organizations have different communication dynamics and different motives
associated with work. Instrumental needs are one thing, but relationships in the
workplace also matter. People often avoid dissent and giving voice to grievances due to
the perceived negative consequences of such actions. Cloven and Roloff (1993) argued
that investigations should occur as to why people avoid communicating grievances and
interpersonal irritations. They suggested that, "investigations of decisions to avoid
communicating grievances are needed to complement recent research on expressed
complaints and confrontation processes" (p. 200). This study is in response to Cloven and
Roloff’s call for research that might help us to better understand the act of avoidance (i.e.,
muted dissent) as part of the dissent process.

In brief, the aim of this study is to investigate employee silence behavior and
consider its ramifications for freedom of expression and dissent in the workplace. I argue
that examinations of organizational suppressive communication should enhance our
understanding of different dissent communication mechanisms and the possibility of
extending dissent models to account for wider practices of organizational protest,
objection, complaint, and disagreement.

In order to advance our understanding of the scope and nature of organizational
dissent, I intend to investigate “muted dissent” through a two phase approach. Phase one
of this study, with its emphasis on qualitative data, will explore the organizational dissent
experiences of selected Omani employees. Among the issues explored are the communicative strategies that employees perceive to be safe or risky when considering whether to express dissent and factors that govern their (the employees’) choice of responses to situations that prompt dissent on their part. With this purpose, I propose the following research question:

RQ1: What are the different attitudes about communicating dissent that are either perceived to be safe or risky by employees operating in a collectivistic/high power distance culture and what factors govern their choices?

As I argued earlier, there is a clear need to study muted dissent systematically due to its pervasiveness as a form of employee dissent behavior. As a result, I propose examining the nature and the implications of organizational silence and its impact on organizational dissent. With this overarching goal, I propose the following research question:

RQ2. What are the antecedents of and dimensions of organizational muted dissent?

Summary and Preview of Chapters

So far, this Chapter has focused on previous conceptual definitions of organizational dissent and organizational silence. Specifically, literature pertinent to organizational dissent was reviewed, resulting in identifying several gaps in dissent models. An argument to examine organizational silence was made in order to enhance our understanding of different dissent communication mechanisms. Most importantly, this Chapter introduced the reader to the rationale of the study. As was pointed out in this
Chapter, knowledge gained from studying silence serves our understanding of employee dissent. Chapter Two provides a comprehensive overview of literature related to employee dissent and silence.

Chapter Three begins by describing the two phases of this research and the reasons for employing a mixed-method design. The Chapter, then, describes the research methodology used in phase of one of the study.

Chapter Four presents findings of the exploratory study in phase one. This Chapter also offers a discussion of these findings. Building on these findings and the discussion, the Chapter presents suggestions to fill gaps in the dissent research and suggests an extension of existing models pertinent to dissent and silence. The proposed model of employee muted dissent will then be tested quantitatively (phase two of the study) by constructing a scale to measure organizational muted dissent as demonstrated in Chapter Five.

Specifically, Chapter Five presents the process that was taken to generate items of muted dissent scales as well as methods and findings of study 1 and study 2 of phase two of the research. The Chapter presents how the measures were tested through a pilot study (study 1). Finally, Chapter Five discusses method and findings of study 2. That study was conducted to examine the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and scales refinement.

Chapter Six reports the method and findings of study 3 of the second phase that aimed at testing Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). This Chapter reports Research Questions and Hypotheses and findings. The
Chapter also reports findings of construct reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and nomological validity.

Finally, Chapter Seven presents a discussion section by reporting theoretical and practical implications of employee muted dissent. The Chapter addresses limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Organizational Dissent

*Forms of Workplace Dissatisfaction*

Organizational members can have different reactions to the various organizational practices that they observe, especially those practices considered to be inappropriate. For example, imagine two employees who observe wrongdoing at work, such as harassment, discrimination, corruption, or other organizational misconduct. While one of those employees might respond to these observations by noting the problems and offering what is hoped will be received as appropriate and constructive feedback, the other might fail to speak up. Research and industrial reports suggest that it is not uncommon for employees to refrain from speaking about their frustrations over wrongdoing at work and that silence is particularly evident when it comes to speaking with those who are in a position to make changes (e.g., Bisel, & Arterburn, 2012; Greenberg & Edwards, 2009; Gurchiek, 2006; Kassing, 1997; Trinkaus & Giacalone, 2005).

In explaining the silence of employees who confront what they (the employees) define as organizational wrongdoing, it is important to note that it is possible for organizations to exercise power that serves to suppress employee feedback and disagreement. Organizations, through their structure and day-to-day practices, might or might not provide a common ground between organizational authority and employees that allows the latter to express their thoughts and ideas, and to bring forth information that they believe should be shared concerning questionable organizational practices. When such a common ground exists, then employees might feel themselves encouraged
to exercise voice and communicate any disagreement they might experience with respect to organizational policies. In the absence of a common ground (or when that common ground is not trusted), employees might decide to enact their disagreement through silence. An employee might observe a wrongdoing by management or authority but decide to not talk about it publicly. Rather than complaining, the employee might compliment or even praise management (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

One of the reasons for keeping silent could be a perception that management is intolerant when it comes to organizational dissent (Sprague & Ruud, 1988). Other reasons are based on the assumption that speaking up will make no difference and/or that speaking up can result in negative repercussions (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Several scholars have argued for upward information flow for better organizational performance (Dutton & Ashford, 1993; Floyd & Wooldridge, 1994; Glauser, 1984; Gorden, 1988; Hegstrom, 1990; Kassing, 2002, 2005). While scholars emphasize open channels of communication for greater employee empowerment (e.g., Spreitzer, 1995), it seems paradoxical that employees continue to report dissatisfaction surrounding their efforts to communicate their issues to authority (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).

Employees voice their opinions, ideas, and thoughts, and engage in other forms of response when they experience dissatisfaction with practices that they witness in their organization. Voice refers to a large set of communicative behaviors, including: agreement, argument, offering suggestions, and providing support (Gorden, 1988). According to Kassing (1998), organizational dissent is "a unique subset of employee voice that entails the expression of disagreement or contradictory opinions in the
workplace” (p. 184). So, when employees communicate their disagreement or contradictory opinions about work related practices and issues, they are essentially engaging in organizational dissent (Kassing, 1997, 1998).

Kassing (2011b) acknowledged that organizational dissent can take different forms, such as whistle-blowing. While whistle-blowing involves public disagreement and presenting contradictory ideas to external organizational audiences about internal organizational policies and issues (Redding, 1985; Stewart, 1980), Kassing (1998) positioned organizational dissent as "an antecedent to whistle-blowing because whistle-blowers tend to air their complaints within organizations initially and only turn to public, external sources when they find organizations unresponsive to their concerns" (p. 184). Historically, Redding (1985) suggested that boat-rocking and whistle-blowing are a few examples of the expression of dissent.

This study focuses on organizational dissent. The reason behind focusing on organizational dissent in particular is that it resides in a middle territory on the continuum between voice (a broader behavior) and whistle-blowing (a very specific behavior) (Kassing, 1998).

**Dissent Motives**

There are several reasons why employees engage in dissent. First of all, employees want to communicate their opinions at work (Kassing, 1998). Moreover, some organizations utilize dissent as a form of organizational participation. As members of organizations become more involved in organizational issues, they might exercise more dissent due to their wider engagement with organizational practices (Kassing, 1998).
Furthermore, when employees identify wrongdoing or limitations by management, they might engage in dissent (Kassing, 1998). So, it is imperative to understand how and why employees express dissent. It is also important to understand the content of dissent. This need is imperative because "understand[ing] what employees say when they do choose to voice dissatisfaction is a step toward helping organizational members better express themselves at work" (Garner, 2009, p. 198).

**Factors Influencing Dissent**

Recently, several factors triggering or influencing dissent have been studied empirically. For example, some factors that influence organizational dissent are: verbal aggressiveness (Kassing & Avtgis, 1999), locus of control (Kassing & Avtgis, 2001), freedom of speech and organizational identification (Kassing, 2000a), superior–subordinate relationships (Kassing, 2000b), organizational-based self-esteem (Payne, 2007), organizational justice (Goodboy et al., 2009), and workplace experience (Kassing & DiCioccio, 2004).

**Outcomes of Dissent**

Research on organizational dissent suggests that dissent expression to both coworkers and management is associated with work engagement (Kassing, Piemonte, Goman, & Mitchell, 2012). Recent research also indicates that dissent expression is related to employee burnout (Avtgis et al., 2007; Kassing et al., 2012). Moreover, studies have shown associations between emotional organizational outcomes, like procedural justice, and dissent expression (Goodboy et al., 2009; Kassing & McDowell, 2008). Some research suggests that many organizations punish organizational members for expressing
dissent (Waldron & Kassing, 2011). Also, organizations look at employee feedback and
grievance activity as unnecessary when that feedback challenges the authority, and this,
in turn, negatively affects employee performance and evaluation (Klaas & DeNisi, 1989).

However, there can be positive outcomes of dissent expression, such as
improvement in organizational decision-making (Hegstrom, 1990; Janis, 1982; Redding,
1985). Expressing dissatisfaction at work has also been found to increase perceptions of
procedural justice (Avery & Quinones, 2002), and while dissent expression entails taking
risks, dissent expression has been linked to job satisfaction (Avtgis et al., 2007; Lutgen-
Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011). Historically, Spencer (1986) also found that
speaking up was linked to lower levels of turnover intentions.

Definitions of Organizational Dissent

The early definitions of organizational dissent go back to Hirschman's (1970)
model of exit-voice-loyalty (EVL). He argued that, when employees are dissatisfied, they
either exit by escaping dissatisfaction through resigning, or they might choose to voice
their dissatisfaction by trying to change the status quo of organizational conditions.
He argued that employees with high levels of loyalty will stay, yet remain silent, and/or
voice their dissatisfaction, while those with low levels of loyalty are more likely to leave
the organization.

This model was expanded by Farrell (1983) who added the concept of “neglect”
(exit-voice-loyalty-neglect). Farrell argued that, when employees are not satisfied, an
organization can experience decline. Another choice employees have is to choose to
express their dissatisfaction through neglect, as shown in absenteeism and lateness.
Dissent can be positioned as either a positive or a negative practice. For example, Sprague and Ruud (1988) described the range of views concerning dissent, which has been viewed as "a moral obligation, a political right, an enlightened management practice, a minor inconvenience, or a punishable violation of loyalty" (p. 190). Analogously, Redding (1985) conceptualized dissent in the spirit of helpfulness, arguing that dissent should be constructive and helpful.

Historically, Graham (1986) defined principled organizational dissent as "the effort by individuals in the workplace to protest and/or to change the organizational status quo because of their conscientious objections to current policy or practice" (p. 2). He argued that principled dissent stems from organizational members’ evaluations based on an impersonal system of values. Unlike Kassing's model, Graham's (1986) typology of principled dissent acknowledges silence as a form of response to organizational decline. Graham suggested three dimensions of voice in his typology: silence, internal criticism, and external reporting (e.g., whistle-blowing).

The aforementioned definitions do not all emerge from communication lenses. One of the prominent scholars who conceptualized and operationalized dissent from a communication lens is Jeffrey Kassing. He defined organizational dissent, "as the expression of disagreements and contradictory opinions that result from the experience of feeling apart from one's organization" (Kassing, 1997, p. 311). He conceptualized dissent as a multi-step process that can involve expression to different audiences. The following section summarizes Kassing's dissent model.
Organizational Dissent Model

Kassing (1997) proposed a model describing the expression of organizational dissent. He argued that employees choose from among three strategies for the expression of dissent: articulated (upward), antagonistic (lateral), and displaced. The following section discusses each of the three strategies for the expression of dissent and explores some reasons as to why employees choose particular audiences to whom they address their dissent.

Upward Dissent

This strategy is defined as a way of "sharing concerns directly and openly with management, supervisors, and corporate officers" (Kassing, 1998, p. 207). Employees express upward dissent when dissent is communicated to someone perceived to be an effective audience. The dissenter believes his/her dissent will be received as constructive and that there will be little or no retaliation by authority. In other words, upward dissent is positioned as constructive feedback. Typically, employees engage in upward dissent when they perceive themselves as having a high-quality relationship with their supervisor (Kassing, 2011b).

Several factors have been found to explain why employees use upward dissent or dissent that is directly expressed to managers, supervisors, and/or organizational officers. For example, Kassing (1998) found that workplace freedom of speech correlated positively with upward dissent ($r = .36, p < .001$). He found a positive correlation ($r = .23, p < .02$) between employee satisfaction and upward dissent. Moreover, employee commitment correlated positively with upward dissent ($r = .14, p < .05$). Other
constructs, like supervisory relationships, perceptions of top management, and perceived personal influence, were found to correlate positively with upward dissent.

Organizational identification was also found to positively correlate with upward dissent (Kassing, 2000a). According to Kassing, employees who reported high levels of organizational identification reported more upward dissent and less lateral dissent. Moreover, employees who reported having a high quality relationship with their supervisor reported having expressed upward dissent (Kassing, 2000b). Some cognitive factors have been found to correlate with upward dissent. For example, Payne (2007) found that employees who reported high levels of organization-based self-esteem similarly reported using an upward dissent strategy more than those who reported having a low or moderate level of organization-based self-esteem.

Several strategies have been proposed for the expression of upward dissent. For example, upward dissent can be expressed through a direct-factual appeal (Kassing, 2009). This approach can involve “supporting one's dissent claim with factual information derived from some combination of physical evidence, knowledge of organizational policies and practices, and personal work experience” (p. 316). Another strategy for expressing upward dissent is through solution presentation by "providing solutions to address the dissent-triggering issue rather than or in addition to evidence" (p. 316). Other strategies can be more face threatening, like repetition, circumvention, and resignation (Kassing, 2005). For instance, "when employees continually repeat dissent claims across time, repetition occurs; when they use the threat of resignation as a form of leverage to induce supervisory action, threatening resignation transpires" (p. 316).
Kassing (2002) defined circumvention as "expressing one’s dissent to someone higher in the chain of command than one’s immediate supervisor" (p. 196).

Other dissent strategies have been suggested. Among those strategies are:

* ingratiation* ("making [the] other person feel important"), *exchange* ("offering to do something in exchange for the other person's action, reminding them of past favors"), *coalitions* ("getting assistance from the audience, recruitment attempts, asking audience if they feel the same way about the dissatisfaction issue"), *pressure* ("checking up on the audience, being a nuisance"), *inspiration* ("appeals to values or morals, messages to instill confidence of efficacy, emotional appeals"), *venting* ("describing emotions felt because of an issue or event"), *asking for information* ("requesting information, asking what the audience would do in such circumstances"), and *humor* ("using humor to informally convey dissatisfaction") (see Garner, 2009, p. 200, for more details).

**Lateral Dissent**

If an employee believes that his/her expression of dissent will be understood as adversarial, he/she might engage in lateral/latent dissent rather than upward dissent. When Kassing first developed his model, he called this type of dissent *antagonistic* dissent, believing it is "the aggressive expression of dissent to ineffectual audiences within organizations to gain some personal advantage or to vent personal frustrations" (Kassing, 1998, p. 209).

However, later he argued it would be more accurate to call it *latent* dissent. Kassing (1998) went on to say, "the term latent, rather than antagonistic, more accurately reflects the final set of items comprising this dimension" (p. 211). Recent articles reveal
the term *lateral* is in wider use than “latent”. Lateral dissent takes place when, "employees believe that they possess comparatively poorer quality relationships with their supervisors, when their organizations are comparatively intolerant of employee feedback" (Kassing, 2011b, p. 227). In this case, employees express their dissent to their coworkers.

Some factors were found to influence employees to use a lateral dissent strategy. For example, Goodboy et al. (2009) found that, when organizations provide employees with information about decision-making dynamics, employees engage more in lateral dissent. However, employees rely less on lateral dissent if they perceive high levels of organizational justice (Goodboy et al., 2009). Surprisingly, employees who perceived/experienced high levels of emotional exhaustion, feelings of failure, and isolation from coworkers did not report using lateral dissent (Avtgis et al., 2007).

*Displaced Dissent*

Displaced dissent is the third strategy for expressing dissent as articulated by Kassing (1997). Displaced dissent is "conceptualized as the verbal expression of dissent to either coworkers or to nonwork friends, spouses/partners, and family members" (Kassing, 1998, p. 212). Kassing (1997) argued that employees use this strategy to express their dissent if they feel that their dissent will be perceived as adversarial and will also lead to retaliation. Here dissent is expressed to audiences who are not effective in responding to the dissent (Kassing, 1998). For example, employees who use this strategy express dissent to family members and friends who are not part of the organization.
(Kassing, 2011b). According to Kassing (2008), employees who share displaced dissent might do so due to a lack of organizational commitment.

Alternatively, employees might avoid upward and lateral dissent and engage in displaced dissent. While the audience of displaced dissent cannot bring about a change in the conditions that prompted the dissent, employees find this line of communication a safe strategy for expressing their workplace frustrations. Several factors have been found to correlate with displaced dissent. For example, Kassing (1998) found that employees with low levels of organizational commitment tended to express displaced dissent. Moreover, Kassing and DiCioccio (2004) found that employees with less work experience reported having high levels of displaced dissent.

The aforementioned model of dissent (upward, lateral, and displaced) has received wide attention among U.S. organizational communication scholars. Almost all studies, as a review of literature indicates, have been conducted in the U.S.. Interestingly, the dissent model, as proposed by Kassing (1997), was developed based on theories that reflect individualistic cultural values. The following section highlights theories that Kassing (1997) utilized to develop his model. The discussion in this section also covers the problematic nature of Kassing’s model.

Critique of Previous Models

Kassing’s dissent model was developed based on three theories: 1) the theory of unobtrusive control (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985); 2) the theory of independent-mindedness (Infante & Gorden, 1987); and 3) the Exit-Voice-Loyalty (EVL) model of employee dissatisfaction developed by Hirschman (1970). The theory of unobtrusive...
control was used to understand when and why employees experience dissent at work and to define the causes of dissent (Kassing, 1997). The EVL model was used to help interpret variations in employees' reactions to work dissatisfaction (Kassing, 1997).

The theory of independent-mindedness was developed in an individualistic culture. According to Kassing (1997), "U.S. organizations should foster independent-mindedness by encouraging individualism through the communicative act of argumentation. Argumentation entails disagreeing and expressing contradictory opinions (i.e., expressing dissent)" (p. 317). The theory of independent-mindedness was a major theory adapted by Kassing to develop his dissent model. The theory of independent-mindedness was used to develop a model of dissent because the theory explains “why American employees feel a need to express their dissent, and provides the impetus for assuming employees will act and express their dissent” (Kassing, 1997, p. 315). The problem with this approach is that it fails to take into account that employees from collectivistic cultures might not feel a need to directly or verbally express dissent. In other words, their needs can be manifested through different communicative dynamics than are employed by individualistic employees. Even if a collectivistic employee has a need to express dissent, cultural norms can restrain him/her from doing so. In support of this argument, research has shown that organizations can be intolerant of dissent and organizational members, in general, are reluctant to speak up about organizational complaints and concerns (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Sprague & Ruud, 1988; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Studies show that most employees are afraid to speak up about issues or problems that they encounter in the workplace (Morrison & Milliken, 2000).
Morrison and Milliken (2000) argued that employees from higher power distance cultures will more likely express uncritical agreement with the acts of those in authority. Similarly, in a major study with a sample including individuals from 24 countries, Huang et al. (2005) found that employees with a higher power distance tended to exhibit higher levels of employee silence. These findings bring into question the theory of independent-mindedness and, hence, undermine the transferability and applicability of Kassing's (1997) organizational dissent model. Basically, there is a need to account for other possibilities, other alternatives that employees might choose when they face the dilemma of whether or not to express dissent. I therefore argue in favor of modifying Kassing’s model to consider other forms of dissent.

As a guide to thinking about forms of organizational dissent that might be guided by something other than the principles of individualism, it is appropriate to interrogate, more fully, the cultural differences that might influence how someone responds to instances of perceived organizational wrongdoing. Hofstede (1980) proposed four dimensions of cultural variability: masculinity-femininity, uncertainty avoidance-acceptance, individualism-collectivism, and power distance (high vs. low). Hofstede's dimensions of collectivism/individualism and power distance are particularly relevant to dissent literature, especially the power distance dimension. This fact is because the expression of dissent from subordinates to those in authority is defined by an imbalance of power dynamics. Hofstede (1997) defined power distance as the degree “to which less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally” (p. 28).
As we have seen, studies related to organizational dissent have been undertaken almost exclusively within the U.S. culture. One of the few exceptions is a study conducted by Croucher et al. (2009). They studied the relationship between argumentativeness and organizational dissent in American versus Indian organizations. They found that nationality has a significant influence on the relationship between argumentativeness and lateral dissent, and argumentativeness and displaced dissent. Croucher et al. (2009) claimed that "Indian organizations . . . may rely more on authoritarian power structures where leaders are influential and unchallenged and employees exhibit a strong sense of loyalty to organizational power structures" (p. 187). This sense of loyalty in a collectivistic setting can have different ramifications. As we demonstrated from Hirschman's (1970) EVL work, loyalty has two functions. Hirschman noted that loyalty can encourage an employee to stay and voice his/her concerns (i.e., exercise voice) or stay and suffer in silence (i.e., engage in loyalty). Essentially, I hypothesize that the latter is more likely to occur in a collectivistic setting. Croucher et al.'s (2009) findings support this argument because their findings did not suggest an effect on upward dissent for Indian organizations, but did for lateral and displaced dissent. This fact further supports my argument for the need to consider more covert means of dissent expression.

Moreover, based on a review of the literature concerning Kassing's three dimensional dissent model, it is apparent that there is a lack of studies investigating whether the three strategies (upward, lateral, and displaced) are expressed differently in different cultures. I am unaware of any published studies that have investigated whether
collectivists and individualists are different in the ways in which they employ these three types of dissent expression (upward, lateral, and displaced). For instance, people from collectivistic cultures (e.g., Oman) have a tendency to show unquestioning respect for individuals of higher status and higher power. Therefore, I argue that employees from Oman (collectivists) will rely less on upward dissent due to respect of status, age, and power.

I also believe dissent can be expressed covertly, where dissent is expressed implicitly through different forms of nonverbal communication (e.g., silence). Kassing (1997) argued that "dissent cannot be completely absent" (p. 32). As a result, even if employees do not verbally voice dissent, this absence does not mean they do not exercise dissent. Individuals who express displaced dissent might show high levels of silence within the organization. This fact justifies a need to investigate other types of responses toward organizational disagreements and dissatisfactions. As I argued earlier, these three dimensions might not be the only options in a collectivistic setting. Thus, I propose the following research question to capture a wide range of employee narratives and their experience of organizational dissent in order to investigate other forms of responses to organizational dissatisfaction.

RQ1: What are the different attitudes about communicating dissent that are either perceived to be safe or risky by employees operating in a collectivistic/high power distance culture and what factors govern their choices?
Critique of Previous Definitions

As can be seen from previous studies, verbal communication is a common theme among previous definitions of organizational dissent. However, researchers have called for consideration of other forms of dissent (e.g., Gossett & Kilker, 2006). These authors suggest that organizational members who choose to keep silent within the organization might have, instead, selected other channels of dissent expression. This possibility indicates the importance of studying silence within organizations, its antecedents and its consequences. This type of study is important because an employee might decide to refrain from speaking up and choose silence over overt dissent due to his/her feelings of being an out-group member and, thus, apart from his/her organization. Interestingly, the same factor can also cause an employee to speak up and express dissent (Kassing, 1997).

Kassing (1997) argued that an employee expresses dissent when he/she feels apart from his/her organization. He stated, "dissent mandates a separation or distancing from the majority" (Kassing, 2011a, p. 29). I argue that a person can express dissent without being distanced from the majority and without feeling apart from his/her organization. For example, Kassing (2000a) found a significant positive relationship between articulated dissent and organizational identification. This connection indicates that the more a person identifies as part of the organization, the more likely he/she will show loyalty.

Another problem with Kassing's approach is that it fails to recognize the nature of dyadic dissent. I argue that dissent can happen within dyadic interaction only and can happen without experiencing feelings of separation from the majority. In addition to this
possibility, an employee might express dissent to a manager, but be supported, in that dissent, by a majority of organization members. An example of this fact would be where employees might organize a collective dissent through strikes and protests. Here, the majority are united for collective action. Therefore, I suggest reconceptualizing dissent in terms of power imbalance and not in terms of Kassing’s proposed distancing from the majority.

Moreover, the context of dissent on which Kassing based his conceptualization is that of organizational dissent. However, the weakness of his displaced dissent is that this takes place in a non-organizational context. In addition to that, historically research has failed to produce a relationship between displaced dissent and other constructs (e.g., Kassing, 1998; Kassing & Avtgis, 1999). As a result, Kassing (2000b) excluded the displaced dimension from his revised organization dissent scale. He justified the change by explaining "the displaced dimension was excluded because it historically failed to produce hypothesized relationships" (p. 63).

I agree with Kassing, but for a slightly different reason. I believe displaced dissent should not be conceptualized as part of organizational dissent because it takes place outside the context of the organization. One might argue that even whistle blowing takes place outside of the organization, and yet it is part of organizational dissent. Another might argue that employees participate in strikes, protests, and walk-outs that, typically, occur outside of formal organizational boundaries. I respond by counter-arguing that whistle blowing and walk-outs are organizational acts because they are publicly exercised; hence, these actions are salient to organizational members. This stands in
contrast with displaced dissent that is an expression of workplace dissatisfaction through venting to family members and non-work friends. While I agree that displaced dissent is a form of dissent outside organizational boundaries, I consider this form of dissent to resemble “neglect” in the EVLN model (Farrell, 1983; Rusbult et al., 1982). To me, neglect is one dimension of silence. With this in mind, the main study for this project is to investigate dimensions and forms of silence. As previously discussed, historically Farrell (1983) considered silence a key element of neglect and inaction. Because displaced dissent mandates silence and inaction within organizations, I will consider displaced dissent to be a consequence of silence along a continuum of silence expression choices.

It is worth noting that I do not regard upward dissent, lateral dissent, and silence as independent responses to organizational disagreements and complaints. Instead, I argue that they can exist and occur concurrently. For example, an employee can express upward dissent, but at the same time express his/her work frustration to family members and non-work friends. Analogously, an employee can fail to speak up within his/her organization while expressing dissent to family members. In such cases, I regard this behavior (displaced dissent) as a subset or form of silence. This fact emphasizes the need to explore different forms of silence.

Organizational Silence

When employees lack the opportunities to address their concerns to management, they often express them to their coworkers (lateral dissent) who are defined, by Kassing (1997, 2011b), as an ineffectual audience. However, these employees (i.e., those who
express lateral dissent) might still want people in the organization to hear their issues (Kassing, 2011b). This pattern results in discussing these issues in private among coworkers, and rarely reaching the effective audience (i.e., authority). In doing so, the climate of dissatisfaction is reinforced (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Senge et al. (1999) used a “silo” metaphor to describe how organizations operate where the lack of interaction and the presence of a suppressed dissent culture in organizations create separate silos. When employees express lateral dissent as a form of emotional venting (Kassing, 2011b), this action creates two different silos: employees among themselves and the authority. These two silos are far from open dialogue. Senge et al. (1999) pointed out that this fact is due to norms that have already been created where supervisors realize that a pattern of fear and silence are organizational norms. In their conceptual model of silence, Morrison and Milliken (2000) outlined different organizational behaviors that create and reinforce silencing norms, including management processes, culture, decision-making processes, and employee attitudes. This outline guides me to investigate different meanings of silence and how silence can help us better understand dissent.

Silence is a communicative act that one can choose to enact. However, individuals might also have limited choices or no choice but to enact silence. This situation would be an example of authority that intentionally or unintentionally imposes silence on others. According to Bruneau (1973), "Silence appears to be a concept and process of mind which is imposed by each mind on itself and on the minds of others" (p. 17). The reason I argue for the integration of both dissent and silence literatures is because they are interrelated, although they are two distinct constructs. Silence has been operationalized as
a distinct construct not only in organizational studies, but also in studies in other disciplines. For example, research on conversation analysis has treated silence and speech as two distinct constructs (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Wilson & Zimmerman, 1986). Silence has also been studied as a distinctive construct, more specifically, as a predictor or a measured variable (e.g., Hasegawa & Gudykunst, 1998; Johnson, Pearce, Tuten, & Sinclair, 2003; Wagener, Brand, & Kollmeier, 2006).

While silence and speech are popularly considered to be polar opposites, this binary thinking fails to uncover the full range or depth of meanings of silence (Acheson, 2008). While speech and silence are not opposites, they are inseparable (Acheson, 2008). Picard (1952) argued that speech and silence "belong together" (p. 16). I support the need to integrate dissent and silence literature; however, this approach does not mean I imply the opposite nature of voice and silence. I particularly appreciate the paper and print metaphor by Bruneau (1973), who said "silence is to speech as the white of this paper is to this print" (p. 18). Silence is an intentional act, with this intentionality governed by both individual and external forces. Because silence is a complex construct and there are misconceptions of the nature of silence and its effects on organizational performance, I intend to closely examine the occurrence of silence to better understand this phenomenon in collectivistic organizations.

Bruneau (1973) argued that "a major misconception preventing intellectual focus on silence is the common, basic assumption that silence is completely other than speech, its foreign opposite, its antagonist" (p. 18). He went on to add "an extreme, contrasting misconception is that speech is silence and silence is speech—that it is futile to
distinguish them” (p. 18). Studies of organizational voice, dissent, and dissatisfaction usually treat silence as equating with Hirschman's (1970) loyalty (see, also, Farrell, 1983). The implication of this view is that silence is treated as an endorsement. However, silence not only signifies endorsement, but objection as well (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). Parker and August (1997) also viewed silence as an objection. They argued that silent dissenters exercise silence and/or exit as a form of response toward dissatisfaction and they labeled this tendency “principled turnover”.

**Previous Definition of Employee Silence**

Pinder and Harlos (2001) defined employee silence as the "withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual's behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his or her organizational circumstances to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress" (p. 334). They went on to suggest two conditions for breaking silence: (1) communication that intends to change circumstances, and (2) communication that is directed toward organizational members who are perceived to be capable of making change or mitigating those circumstances. Both of these conditions address organizational dissent as conceptualized by Kassing (1997). For example, the first condition is similar to Kassing's idea of triggering agent. When a triggering agent occurs, effectively raising ethical concerns or suggesting a threat to self and others, then dissent takes place. The second condition is similar to Kassing's dissent expression to an effectual audience. In this case, Kassing's upward dissent comprises effectual dissent. This connection between silence and dissent is a good example to support my argument that, although dissent and silence are two different constructs, they can and should be
studied together. It is worth noting that Pinder and Harlos (2001) studied silence to develop a theory based on a particular form of workplace wrongdoing, that of injustice.

Morrison and Milliken (2000) defined organizational silence as a collective phenomenon in which employees "withhold their opinions and concerns about organizational problems" (p. 707). They went on to suggest that a climate of silence in an organization is characterized by two shared beliefs: "(1) speaking up about problems in the organization is not worth the effort, and (2) voicing one's opinions and concerns is dangerous" (p. 714). The latter is a major factor that stops employees from speaking up. The authors outlined factors that influence a climate of silence, including organizational policies and structures, and implicit managerial beliefs and managerial practices. These contextual factors influence the way employees view speaking up (e.g., as dangerous or futile) creating a climate conducive to various degrees of silence expression.

Knoll and Van Dick (2012) defined silence based on a bottom-up perspective where employee motives toward silence contribute to and reinforce its occurrence in an organization. They defined silence as a "state in which employees refrain from calling attention to issues at work such as illegal or immoral practices or developments that violate personal, moral, or legal standards" (p. 349).

**Forms of Silence**

*Psycholinguistic, Interactive, and Socio-Cultural Silence*

There is a need to understand different meanings for and the scope of silence. This fact is due to the meaningful nature of silence and that "both the sign-material and its absence are equally meaningful" (Enninger, 1991, p. 4). Bruneau (1973) suggested
three forms of silence: psycholinguistic silence, interactive silence, and socio-cultural silence.

Psycholinguistic silence includes hesitations in speech and non-lexical pause sounds, like "uh". Pauses, hesitations, and other unintentional gestures in psycholinguistic silence have a limited explanatory role in employee silence.

Interactive silence is defined as "pausal interruptions in dialogue, conversation, discussion, debate, etc. They can be related to affective, interpersonal relationships between people as well as to the exchange of information and/or problem solving" (p. 28). The pauses of interactive silence are longer than psycholinguistic pauses. Pauses and other nonverbal communicative acts in interactive silence are usually intentional and are communicated with intended meanings. Bruneau stated, "lengthy interactive silences appear to allow each participant a chance to make inferences and judgments about the many possible meanings of a message (including the meaning of the silences)" (p. 29).

Although interactive silence has not been widely studied as a form of organizational silence, even fewer researchers have attempted to study interactive silence in organizational settings. Locke and Anderson (2010) conducted two laboratory studies and found that, when leaders exercise power by conveying nonverbal messages, like eye contact, posture, and vocal volume, this approach resulted in stifling followers’ voices. These nonverbal cues, whether sent intentionally or unintentionally, resulted in subordinates tending to speak less. Interaction silence can also function to seek or attract the attention of others (Bruneau, 1973). According to Bruneau, interactive silence can be common in a supervisor-subordinate relationship. He went on to say that, "the use of
initial silencing strategy by authority or perceived silencing strategy by the subordinate, appears to help assert or reassert interpersonal and group power” (p. 31).

The final form of silence as suggested by Bruneau (1973) is socio-cultural silence. He defined this as the silence that is "related to the characteristic manner in which entire social and cultural orders refrain from speech" (p. 36). While Western culture is characterized by sounds and speech, both general and lengthy interactive silences are common in Eastern cultures (Bruneau, 1973). This fact supports my argument against the theory of independent-mindedness (Infante & Gorden, 1987) that is tailored to individualistic cultures. This is because not all members of all cultures experience the same feeling of and need to express their dissent in the same way.

Essentially socio-cultural silence can exist among members in a national culture, socio-political culture, and other institution (e.g., religious institutions) (Bruneau, 1973). Morrison and Milliken (2000) provided a good example of how socio-cultural silence can be pervasive among organizational members and authority. Hence, the focus of this study is on socio-cultural silence in organizations and how these organizations create a culture of silence.

*Acquiescent and Quiescent Silence*

Pinder and Harlos (2001) suggested two forms of employee silence. The first one is *acquiescent silence*. This form of silence is based on submission and resignation. Employees exhibiting acquiescent silence are characterized by less consciousness in their silence, unwillingness to change, and tolerance for the status quo. They regard their state of silence as normal, have low levels of stress, and are not motivated to suggest or to find
new alternatives to their concerns at work (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). Given this description, Pinder and Harlos argued that acquiescent employees are less likely to either give voice to any concerns or to quit.

The second type of silence, according to Pinder and Harlos, is *quiescent*. This form of silence constitutes an active way of withholding concerns and ideas so as to protect self. This is silence based on fear. Unlike acquiescent employees, quiescent employees are more likely to break their silence in order to change the status quo. Moreover, quiescent employees can be angrier and more aggressive than acquiescent employees (Pinder & Harlos, 2001).

*Acquiescent, Defensive, and ProSocial Silence*

Drawing on the work of Morrison and Milliken (2000), and Pinder and Harlos (2001), Van Dyne et al. (2003) suggested three forms of silence: *acquiescent, defensive,* and *prosocial*. They did not view these three types of silence as an absence of voice. They defined acquiescent as "withholding relevant ideas, information, or opinions, based on resignation" (p. 1366). This is a passive form of silence that is similar to *acquiescent* silence described by Pinder and Harlos (2001). This form of silence is also similar to *neglect* in the EVLN model (e.g., Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992). Organizational members who employ acquiescent silence are disengaged; they do not make efforts to speak up, do not get involved, and do not attempt to change the problem or issue. They do not speak up due to the belief that speaking up makes no difference (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Additionally, other employees choose to withhold their opinions due to "low self-efficacy assessments about personal capability to influence the situation" (p. 1366).
The second form of silence as suggested by Van Dyne et al. (2003) is defensive silence. Unlike acquiescent silence, defensive silence is more proactive. The authors defined defensive silence as, "withholding relevant ideas, information, or opinions as a form of self protection, based on fear" (p. 1367). They went on to explain that defensive silence is based on fear of speaking up and fear of negative consequences for raising concerns to change the status quo. The authors contended that the MUM effect (Rosen & Tesser, 1970) is an example of defensive silence. “MUM” is an acronym for "keeping Mum about Undesirable Messages to the recipient" (Rosen & Tesser, 1970, p. 254). The MUM effect takes place when people abstain from delivering bad news so as to avoid negative consequences and personal discomfort. Morrison and Milliken (2000) argued that people often remain silent due to the fear of speaking up which is a common characteristic in defensive silence.

The third, and final, form of silence as suggested by Van Dyne et al. (2003) is ProSocial silence. ProSocial silence occurs when employees "withhold work-related ideas, information, or opinions with the goal of benefiting other people or the organization—based on altruism or cooperative motives" (p. 1368). This form of silence is an other-oriented communicative behavior. An example of this form of silence is when an employee has concerns for others and decides to withhold information to protect them but is not concerned about personal negative consequences that might arise from speaking up. In such a case, he/she can be deemed to engage in a ProSocial silence.

As we have seen, acquiescent, defensive, and prosocial silence are common, general forms of silence. In addition to these three forms, Knoll and Van Dick (2012)
proposed opportunistic silence as a fourth form of employee silence. They argued that employees who engage in opportunistic silence withhold information due to self-interest and advantage to themselves. The authors argued that, with opportunistic silence, employees seek a self-oriented advantage while accepting harm to others. For example, remaining silent to avoid additional work, to avoid giving away status or power, or to distort, disguise and mislead others for self-advantage can all be considered forms of opportunistic silence. This type of silence is similar to deviant silence where an employee remains silent intentionally with the goal of harming others (Brinsfield, 2009; Greenberg, Brinsfield, & Edwards, 2007). While these forms of silence help better explain the scope of silence behavior, they are not broad enough to account for all forms of silence. For this reason, Detert and Edmondson (2011) proposed implicit theories to understand silence.

**Implicit Theories as Forms of Silence**

Detert and Edmondson (2011) suggested five implicit theories to explain why employees refrain from speaking up to top management. By “implicit theories,” they meant "taken-for-granted beliefs about the risk or inappropriateness of speaking up" (p. 462). Ross (1989) defined implicit theories as:

schema-like knowledge structures that include specific beliefs regarding the inherent stability of an attribute, as well as a set of general principles concerning the conditions likely to promote personal change or stability. These theories are implicit in that they encompass rarely discussed, but strongly held beliefs. (p. 342)
Detert and Edmondson (2011) build on this definition of implicit theories by suggesting five implicit theories that restrain employees from speaking up. The first implicit theory they suggested is "presumed target identification" (p. 467). This taken-for-granted belief leads employees to assume that, if they speak up to higher managers, management will interpret voice and dissent as personal criticism. The second implicit theory the authors identified is "a perceived need to have solid data, polished ideas, or complete solutions" (p. 467). This view indicates that employees avoid speaking up if they lack any data or proof to support their argument. This implicit theory can also mean that employees refrain from speaking up if they cannot offer a constructive solution to the problem. The third implicit theory involves "don't pass the boss upward" (p. 467). This is consistent with a circumvention strategy in expressing upward dissent (Garner, 2009; Kassing, 2005). Although it is one of the strategies for expressing upward dissent, employees hold a belief or a taken-for-granted assumption that, in doing so, one challenges and questions the work of his/her boss or can embarrass his/her boss in front of his/her superiors (Detert & Edmondson, 2011). Embodying these taken-for-granted assumptions results in employees avoiding speaking up.

The fourth implicit theory, as suggested by Detert and Edmondson, is "don't embarrass the boss in public" (p. 467). This assumption encourages employees to keep silent during public meetings and speak up to a supervisor only on a one-on-one basis. This assumption makes employees take-for-granted that, if speaking in public, the boss will feel embarrassed in front of other staff. This fact might lead the employee to refrain from speaking up, instead choosing to voice concerns to the boss in private. The problem
with this view is that speaking one-on-one might not be as effective as speaking in a public meeting if effective decision makers are present in that meeting. The final implicit theory focuses on "negative career consequences for speaking up" (Detert & Edmondson, 2011, p. 467). This factor is consistent with the perception that speaking up leads to negative results (Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Morrison et al., 2011; Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003), leading to quiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001), and defensive silence (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

**Antecedents of Organizational Silence**

Several reasons for avoiding speaking up have been suggested in recent silence literature. In their inductive exploratory study of silence, Milliken et al. (2003) identified several reasons for silence. For instance, they found that fear of being labeled negatively (e.g., as a tattletale, a troublemaker, or a complainer) was one of the major factors for silence. Another major reason they suggested was that employees expressed fear of damaging relationships. They noted that employees did not speak up due to the belief that speaking up makes no difference or that the target will not be responsive. This finding is consistent with *acquiescent silence* (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003) as discussed above.

Moreover, Milliken et al. (2003) further found organizational members choose to keep silent due to the fear of retaliation, perhaps losing their job or not getting a desired assignment or promotion. This fear of negative consequences is similar to the aforementioned quiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) and defensive silence (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Also, other employees avoid speaking up due to the concern that
speaking up can have a negative impact on others, like embarrassing someone or troubling someone (Milliken et al., 2003; see, also, Van Dyne et al., 2003 and their concept of ProSocial silence). Other factors that influence silence have also been suggested, like individual characteristics (lack of experience and/or lack of tenure), organizational characteristics (hierarchical structure and unsupportive culture), and poor relationship with supervisor (unsupportive supervisor, lack of a good relationship) (Milliken et al., 2003).

Additionally, Vakola and Bouradas (2005) found that top management attitudes toward silence, supervisors' attitudes toward silence, and communication opportunities were associated with employee silence behavior. Bisel and Arterburn (2012) conducted inductive research using a constant comparative analysis. They found five reasons (themes) for employee silence: (a) predicting harm to themselves, (b) constructing the supervisor as responsible, (c) questioning their own expertise, (d) predicting supervisors’ deafness to their complaints, and (e) constructing the timing as inopportune. Constructing the supervisor as responsible and constructing timing as inopportune are two new reasons that Bisel and Arterburn contributed to the silence literature.

Outcomes of Silence

Expressing dissent entails taking risks that can result in any one (or more) of several outcomes. For example, speaking up can lead to low levels of job satisfaction and job commitment (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Speaking up can also impact stress and depression at work (Cortina & Magley, 2003). Due to the risks associated with speaking up, researchers found that employees fail to address ethical issues (Claphan & Bouradas,
More importantly, reluctance to express dissent affects innovation and can hinder organizational learning and development (Argyris & Schön, 1978). Moreover, deliberate withholding of concerns can prevent the detection and avoidance of organizational decline (Hirschman, 1970). In their interviews with senior executives and employees in small organizations, Fortune 500, and government bureaucracies, Perlow and Williams (2003) found that silence invokes a high psychological price for employees. Silence in organizations generates feelings of humiliation, anger, and resentment; silence kills creativity, degrades productivity, and contaminates every interaction. These outcomes of stifled dissent, or employee silence, are essentially influenced by feelings of fear and the imbalance of power in organizations.

**Fear, Power, and Silence**

A common theme in all of these antecedents of silence is “fear”. Employees have both experienced and perceived fear of being labeled negatively as a troublemaker or a complainer. The fear of unknown negative consequences also plays a significant role (e.g., negative appraisal, loss of promotion, and loss of job). Issues of power dynamics and control play a big role in predicting silence behavior. For example, Dutton and Ashford (1993) found that an individual's willingness to speak up to top management (for the purpose of selling an issue) depends on that individual’s perceived power. In general, a power imbalance privileges some and marginalizes others. Perlow and Repenning (2009) summarized this fact in a general sense: "In many organizations, when people perceive a difference with one another they do not fully express themselves" (p. 195). This difference can involve positional power, cultural background, education, age, and/or
gender. This view is also supported by Meares, Oetzel, Torres, Derkacs, and Ginossar (2004), who maintained that "some workers enter organizations with more power (based, in part, on their cultural backgrounds) and thus these individuals have more privilege to talk (or not talk) about issues of mistreatment in the organization" (p. 5). These cited studies indicate how power and fear can affect the way employees express dissent or refrain from expressing dissent. In the following section, I draw on the concept of the chilling effect (Cloven & Roloff, 1993) and punitive power (Lawler & Bacharach, 1987) to understand why people withhold complaints and remain silent in their relationships and in organizations.

**Chilling Effect, Dissent and Silence**

The concept of the chilling effect has been explored in courtship relationships (Cloven & Roloff, 1993; Solomon, Knobloch, & Fitzpatrick, 2004; Solomon & Samp, 1998), and has not been applied to the study of organizational relationships. That does not, however, mean that the theory of the chilling effect is irrelevant to organizational relationships. In this section, I discuss the concept of the chilling effect, its relationship to punitive power, and how the chilling effect is related to employee silence.

Cloven and Roloff (1993) noted that, sometimes, people avoid confrontation because they define their irritations and concerns as unimportant. They went on to say that individuals can be restrained from expressing concerns and complaints due to fear of negative repercussions. For example, criticizing a partner can result in the escalation of conflict and result in regretted disclosures that harm the relationship (Cloven & Roloff, 1993). Cloven and Roloff (1993) argued, "fear of confrontation or conflict escalation is
associated with power dynamics within a relationship" (p. 199). This notion of power
dynamics combined with the suppression of complaints is what they call “the chilling
effect”. They explicitly defined a chilling effect as "the tendency for a partner's power to
quell the expression of interpersonal complaints" (p. 200). Cloven and Roloff’s concept
of the chilling effect shares common characteristics with Morrison and Milliken's (2000)
c climate of silence.

Cloven and Roloff (1993) argued that the act of withholding "interpersonal
irritations could also perpetuate relational power disadvantages" (p. 200). This implies
that the chilling effect is based on communicative forces associated with both parties;
both parties enforce and reinforce the suppression of complaints. This is also true in
organizational silence where suppression of dissent is not triggered only by top-down
forces, but also by bottom-up forces where employee behaviors and cognitive factors
reinforce the existence of a climate of silence. This view is supported by Gabriel (1999):

Unlike earlier generations of workers who had no delusions about the stark
realities of the workplace, many of today’s workers imagine themselves
exercising their freedom of choice over their employer as they do over goods in
the marketplace. In so doing, they make themselves vulnerable to the
organization’s totalitarian controls, which demand total suppression of dissent and
criticism. (p. 186)

*Power and the Chilling Effect*

Cloven and Roloff (1993) noted that power in interpersonal relationships is driven
by an individual's capability to control the rewards and costs a partner experiences. They
went on to say "people form relationships to gain access to desired resources, and interpersonal associations are managed toward maximizing rewards and minimizing costs" (p. 200). Due to this process of rewards and costs evaluation, an individual decides how to communicate his/her irritations and concerns. Cloven and Roloff contended that individuals should be responsive to "the perceived concerns of partners who control the distribution of rewards and costs within their relationships" (p. 200). For instance, if a powerful target supports and provides rewards to a partner or withholds costs, then the partner will probably make communication decisions to encourage the target to continue doing so (Cloven & Roloff, 1993). The way partners make such decisions depends on their perceptions of their partner's power. The chilling effect depends on how partners perceive each other's power and on whether an individual decides to withhold grievances and irritations from his/her partner (Cloven & Roloff, 1993). Two types of power in interpersonal relationships have been suggested: dependence power and punitive power (Cloven & Roloff, 1993; Lawler, & Bacharach, 1987).

**Dependence power.** One form of power in interpersonal relationships that was described by Cloven and Roloff arises from having other possible alternatives to a relationship and/or poor levels of commitment to a relationship. This is “dependence power” in the sense that one party can have other alternatives or can live independent from a relationship, but the other party is characterized by his/her dependence on this relationship. Because the independent party has this form of control over the relationship, he/she is more likely to exit the relationship (Rusbult et al., 1982). Lawler and Bacharach (1987) defined dependence power as:
the power of A over B is a function of the value B places on the outcomes received in the relationship with A and level of these (or substitutable) outcomes that can be gotten from other actors. . . . The level of alternatives (weighted by the value) constitute the opportunity costs of staying in the relationship with A. (p. 447)

*Punitive power.* Punitive power occurs when an individual is perceived to have the capability of doing harm. Lawler and Bacharach (1987) pointed out that "the punitive form of power is based on the 'retaliation' costs that one actor can levy on the other, that is, the ability to administer additional costs beyond simply withdrawing some existing benefit supplied to the other" (p. 447). Punitive power can influence individuals to withhold irritations from their partner (Cloven & Roloff, 1993; Lawler & Bacharach, 1987)

Similarly, the relationship between subordinate and supervisor is governed by the calculation of rewards and costs. This is true among co-workers as well. Although research on the chilling effect has focused exclusively on dating relationships, I argue that it has an important influence on the reasons why organizational members keep silent and withhold the expression of dissent within organizational settings. This is because management is perceived to have positional power where they can control rewards and punishments. This fact is one of the reasons why employees avoid expressing dissent to management—due to the fear of retaliation (Kassing, 1997).

Drawing on the findings of this study, work on the chilling effect in courtship relationships (Cloven & Roloff, 1993), and the notion of punitive power (Lawler &
Bacharach, 1987), I attempt to understand employee dissent and silence based on the notion of the chilling effect. Table 1 provides a comparison between the chilling effect and employee silence.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Relationship between Chilling Effect and Employee Silence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Chilling Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal and Romantic Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Behavior Dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enacted Behavior</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relationships</th>
<th>The Chilling Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withholding Irritations and complaints</td>
<td>Withholding views, opinions, complaints, and disagreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Relationship</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Romantic</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Subordinate-supervisor</th>
<th>Work relationship</th>
<th>Personal Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximizing Rewards</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Relationship Continuity</th>
<th>Appraisals &amp; Performance</th>
<th>Training Nominations</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Allowances</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Previous Operationalizations of Silence

As discussed in the literature, research on organizational silence has primarily been focused on conceptual and theoretical or qualitatively-derived concepts (see, for example, Bisel & Arterburn, 2012; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). However, none of the previous studies attempted to quantitatively study the nature and pervasiveness of silence (Brinsfield, 2009), although recently there have been a few exceptions (e.g., Brinsfield, 2009; Knoll...
Quantitative measures of employee silence help to test, triangulate, and generalize different forms of employee silence. Knoll and Van Dick (2012) outlined the benefits of silence measurement to quantitatively assess different forms of employee silence. They explained:

> With an instrument available for the distinct assessment of different forms of employee silence it would be possible (a) to test the hypotheses made in the conceptual papers, (b) to triangulate existing findings that draw upon qualitative data using single cases or small samples, and (c) to examine the generalizability suggestions following survey studies that use unidimensional conceptualizations.

(p. 350)

The following section discusses about some attempts that have been made to develop organizational silence instruments to measure and predict organizational silence.

*Previous Scales on Organizational Silence*

According to recent research, silence in organizations is an intentional behavior (e.g., Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003). Glenn (2004) supported the view that silence can be intentional and deliberately unspoken. Because employees remain silent intentionally, it becomes easier to understand and measure this discretionary behavior. Therefore, several attempts have been made to operationalize employee silence. For example, Vakola and Bouradas (2005) built on the conceptual framework developed by Morrison and Milliken (2000) by creating two scales that measure supervisors’ attitudes toward silence and employee silence behaviors. However, the authors did not
attempt to measure the deeper dimensions of silence. Van Dyne et al. (2003) suggested preliminary items to measure acquiescent, defensive, and prosocial silence. It is worth noting that they did not test or validate these items. They recommended five items to test acquiescent silence: ("This employee is unwilling to speak up with suggestions for change because he/she is disengaged"; "This employee passively withholds ideas, based on resignation"; "This employee passively keeps ideas about solutions to problems to him/herself"; "This employee keeps any ideas for improvement to him/herself because he/she has low self-efficacy to make a difference" and "This employee withholds ideas about how to improve the work around here, based on being disengaged").

The authors also suggested five items to measure defensive silence: ("This employee does not speak up and suggest ideas for change, based on fear"; "This employee withholds relevant information due to fear"; "This employee omits pertinent facts in order to protect him/herself"; "This employee avoids expressing ideas for improvements, due to self-protection"; and "This employee withholds his/her solutions to problems because he/she is motivated by fear"). Additionally, they suggested five items to measure prosocial silence: ("This employee withholds confidential information, based on cooperation"; "This employee protects proprietary information in order to benefit the organization"; "This employee withstands pressure from others to tell organizational secrets"; "This employee refuses to divulge information that might harm the organization"; and "This employee protects confidential organizational information appropriately, based on concern for the organization").
Brinsfield (2009) investigated silence motives and developed a six-factor model including: deviant, relational, defensive, diffident, ineffectual, and disengaged silence. Deviant silence implies intentionally remaining silent so as to harm others. Some of the items to measure deviant silence include: ("to purposefully harm another individual"; "to retaliate against the organization"; and "to purposefully harm the organization") (Brinsfield, 2009). Relational silence is the second factor. With relational silence, people keep silent to avoid harming relationships at work. Some of relational silence items include: ("I do not want to harm my relationship with another individual"; "I did not want to create tension with co-worker"; and "[I wanted] to protect my relationship with another individual").

Defensive silence is the third silence motive as suggested by Brinsfield. Defensive silence is similar to quiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) and is consistent with defensive silence as proposed by Van Dyne et al. (2003). Some items that Brinsfield used to measure defensive silence included: ("I felt it was dangerous to speak up"; "I felt it was risky to speak up"; and "I believed that speaking up [might] negatively impact my career"). Speaking through lack of self-confidence or hesitation to act is the fourth motive suggested by Brinsfield. He labeled this factor as diffident silence. Diffident silence occurs when an individual has doubts and uncertainties about a situation. Some examples of diffident silence include: ("I did not feel confident enough to speak up"; "To avoid embarrassing myself [I did not speak up]"; "I was unsure what to say"; and "I felt insecure").
The fifth silence motive as suggested by Brinsfield is ineffectual silence. This motive is consistent with the climate of silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) that contends that speaking up is not worth the effort because management will not take any action. So, employees remain silent because speaking up adds no value. It is also similar to acquiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). Some items intended to measure this factor include: ("I do not believe my concerns would be addressed"; "management did not appear interested in hearing about these types of issues"; "no one was interested in taking appropriate action"; and "I did not think it would do any good to speak up").

The sixth, and final, silence motive as outlined by Brinsfield is disengaged silence. This form of silence overlaps with the acquiescent dimension of silence as suggested by Van Dyne et al. (2003). However, disengaged silence differs from acquiescent silence in that the former does not focus on self-efficacy (Brinsfield, 2009). Some of the items for disengaged silence include: ("The issue did not personally affect me"; "I did not care what happened"; and "I did not want to get involved"). While ineffectual silence shares common characteristics with disengaged silence, empirical evidence suggests they are distinct (Brinsfield, 2009). However, the items used to measure ineffectual and disengaged silence raise questions of validity; therefore, there is a need to validate, conceptually and statistically, the distinct nature between these two factors.

The most recently developed instrument to measure employee silence was developed by Knoll and Van Dick (2012). The authors drew on the work of Brinsfield
(2009), Milliken et al. (2003), and Van Dyne et al. (2003) to generate items for their measure. Their scale included four forms of silence: quiescent, prosocial, acquiescent, and they introduced opportunistic silence as the fourth type of silence. The authors suggested three items to measure quiescent silence: "I remained silent because of fear of negative consequences"; "I remained silent because I fear disadvantages from speaking up"; and "I remained silent to not make me vulnerable in the face of colleagues or superiors"). They also suggested three items to indicate prosocial silence: "I remained silent because I do not want to hurt the feelings of colleagues or superiors"; "I remained silent because I do not want to embarrass others"; and "I remained silent because I do not want others to get into trouble").

Knoll and Van Dick (2012) proposed three items to measure opportunistic silence: "I remained silent to not give away my knowledge advantage"; "I remained silent because of concerns that others could take an advantage of my ideas"; and "I remained silent because that would mean having to do avoidable additional work"). Finally, they measured acquiescent silence using the following three items: "I remained silent because I will not find a sympathetic ear, anyway"; "I remained silent because my superiors are not open to proposals, concerns, or the like"; and "I remained silent because nothing will change, anyway").

Synthesis

While scholars have made substantial progress in understanding the correlates and predictors of silence, far less is known about these antecedents in collectivistic settings. Moreover, all studies reviewed so far suggest three general themes as to why employees
refrain from speaking up and instead remain silent. The first theme centers around the belief that speaking up will be unproductive and/or futile (Bisel & Arterburn, 2012; Milliken et al., 2003; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). The second common theme focuses on avoiding harming others, embarrassing others, and/or troubling others (Detert & Edmondson, 2011; Milliken et al., 2003; Van Dyne et al., 2003). The third common theme concerns the fear of negative repercussions (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005).

The third theme is common among almost all researchers. Some researchers have identified the nature of these negative consequences (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Milliken et al., 2003) while others treat negative consequences in a general sense. This leads me to investigate the nature of these negative consequences as well as other dimensions of organizational silence. Milliken et al. (2003) maintained that "there is much that we do not know about why people often remain silent" (p. 1456). While several conceptual and theoretical efforts have focused on employee silence (e.g., Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003), there have been calls for quantitative research to test these conceptual studies (e.g., Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). All of these reasons lead me to propose the following research question:

RQ2. What are the antecedents of and dimensions of organizational muted dissent?
Summary of Research Questions for Phase One

RQ1: What are the different attitudes about communicating dissent that are either perceived to be safe or risky by employees operating in a collectivistic/high power distance culture and what factors govern their choices?

RQ2: What are the antecedents of and dimensions of organizational muted dissent?

Chapter Summary

This Chapter has demonstrated that, while voice and silence are two distinct constructs, research indicates that they inform each other. In addition to that, the Chapter presented factors that enable and constrain employees from expressing workplace dissatisfaction and frustration. Moreover, the Chapter offered suggestions about employing the concept of the chilling effect (Roloff & Cloven, 1990) to further our understanding of dissent and silence behaviors in the workplace. Furthermore, the Chapter addressed the pervasive nature of silence and indicated a lack of theoretic understanding of employee silence at work (e.g., Milliken et al., 2003; Van Dyne et al., 2003).

In response to the calls made in this Chapter, this study contributes to previous theory and research on dissent and silence by undertaking a two-phase study. Phase one is aimed at answering the two research questions proposed in Chapter Two. The methodology used to answer these research questions is described in Chapter Three. As explained earlier in this Chapter, while there have been several efforts intended to develop conceptual and theoretical frameworks of employee silence (e.g., Morrison &
Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003), little progress has been made to test these conceptual studies quantitatively (e.g., Edwards & Greenberg, 2009). Therefore, phase two of this study (as described in Chapter Six and Seven) will be undertaken to quantitatively test the conceptual framework established by the phase one findings, discussed in Chapter Four, by developing a scale to measure employee muted dissent (silent dissent).
CHAPTER 3: QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY

Study Design

This research unfolded in two phases. The main goal of phase one was to conduct an exploratory study to discover how organizational members describe and respond to organizational dissent in the workplace. This phase of the study also sought to explore the antecedents and dimensions of organizational silence that function as obstacles to the expression of dissent. The second phase of the research was directed toward the construction of a scale to measure organizational silence based on the themes that emerged during phase one. Studying organizational dissent from both a qualitative and a quantitative approach overcomes the limitations of methodological biases. In doing so, this research enjoys the advantages attendant with methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1978).

A mixed-method design was used in this study. While there are different mixed-method approaches (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009), this study employed exploratory sequential design as per the guidelines suggested by Creswell and Plano Clark (2011). This design has also been called a quantitative follow-up design (Morgan, 1998) and an instrument development design (Creswell, Fetters, & Ivankova, 2004).

Several reasons justify the use of this method. First, the study is based in Oman in the Middle East. The database of articles pertinent to voice and organizational dissent did not yield any studies that have been conducted on organizational dissent and workplace silence in Oman. The lack of prior research on organizational dissent in Oman raises questions concerning the applicability of Kassing’s model and the relevance of constructs...
currently associated with organizational dissent and, thus, justifies the use of an exploratory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Second, Oman is a collectivistic culture. As such, Omani employees should be more reluctant to express dissent than employees from an individualistic culture. As a result, the extant validated instruments that have been used to assess organizational dissent in Western organizations might not be appropriate for the Omani culture. An exploratory sequential design provides the researcher with an opportunity to validate (or invalidate) his/her subjective judgments as the exploratory phase allows for the discovery of new dimensions and the questioning of previously established dimensions.

These justifications for using an exploratory sequential design are supported by Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) who contended that the exploratory sequential design is conducted when "the researcher does not know what constructs are important to study" (p. 87) and “the researcher identifies new emergent research questions based on qualitative results that cannot be answered with qualitative data" (ibid.). They went on to state that the purpose of exploratory sequential design is to develop and test an instrument where qualitative data inform quantitative data. If findings suggest that organizational members are reluctant to express dissent due to the antecedents of silence behavior, the warrant for a new instrument will be clear, as there is no existing instrument that assesses silence at the workplace. This fact further supports the use of an exploratory sequential design (Creswell & Clark, 2011). The next section describes the method used for phase one of the study.
Participants

Data were collected from participants from the Middle East in Oman, a country that is considered to be collectivistic (Hofstede, 1980). A sample of 24 adults who work full time in the private sector in different industries participated in the study. As Oman is a gender segregated society, it was difficult to conduct cross-gender interviews. I was able to elicit the involvement of five female participants. Two of the women were interviewed face-to-face; the remaining three preferred to receive and respond to questions electronically. One of the three women who answered questions electronically identified herself as working in the public sector, so her responses were excluded from the study. This yielded a final sample of 23 participants.

Participants were from different industries, including oil and gas, banking, telecommunications, petro chemical and agriculture, electricity, information technology, tourism, port industry, medical sector, civil society, and media communication and design. The participants ranged in age from 24 to 37 years old ($M = 31, SD = 2.9, MD = 31$), and held a variety of organizational positions, ranging from senior managers and middle managers, to general employees, including blue-collar workers.

The average tenure in their current position was 4.6 years ($MIN = 1, MAX = 9$) and average overall work life experience was 8 years ($MIN = 2, MAX = 16$). Fifteen (65%) participants reported having a bachelor of science degree, 5 (22%) had a master’s degree, 1 (4%) had a community college degree, and the remaining 2 (9%) had a high school diploma. Sixteen (70%) participants were interviewed in English and the remaining 7 (30%) were interviewed in Arabic. All participants were interviewed by the researcher. It
is worth noting that the average length of the face-to-face interviews was approximately 1 hour. The longest interview lasted about 120 minutes. All 21 face-to-face interviews resulted in a total of 22 hours and 8 minutes of interview time.

**Sampling**

Purposeful sampling was used because participants were wanted who met specific criteria (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). The goal of the study was to look at dissent behavior at all levels of hierarchy in Oman organizations. The purposeful sampling yielded participants from different organizational hierarchies including blue-collar workers (a crane operator and a technical operator), general staff (a production measurement specialist, a senior marketing specialist, a civil engineer, a legal advisor, an inventory analyst, a marketing specialist, a sales and applications specialist, and a personnel representative), middle managers (a contract supervisor, an assistant manager, a private account manager, a health safety and environmental advisor, an electrical engineer, and a project specialist), and senior managers (a corporate marketing executive, an operations manager, a chief manager, an HR manager, an account manager, a head of an HR section, and a marketing director). Because some participants held managerial titles without having subordinates who report directly to them, I defined a supervisor as an individual who had at least one subordinate who reported directly to him/her. The final sample was comprised of 9 (40%) supervisors and 14 (60%) non-supervisors. Two participants (9%) were from semi-private sectors, and 21 (91%) were from the private sector. Participants were selected based on the following inclusion criteria: more than 20 years old, works in
a private sector or semi-private sector (50% government and 50% private company), lives in Oman, and has at least 2-years of work experience. All participants were Omanis.

Interview Procedures

The study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ohio University (see Appendix A). Data were collected in Oman for a period of one month from December 24, 2012 to January 27, 2013. Participants read the consent form. Two versions of consent forms were prepared: an English version (see Appendix B) and an Arabic version (see Appendix C). Participants were informed that participation was voluntary and that they could refuse to answer questions they were not comfortable answering. They were also informed that they could stop the interview at any time.

The participants were asked if the interview could be tape-recorded. Five participants preferred not to be tape-recorded (including the two women who provided their responses electronically); the remaining 18 interviews were tape-recorded. The reviewers for the University’s IRB were concerned about the potential risks and discomfort participants might experience given they were being asked to talk about their dissatisfactions with, criticisms of, and complaints about management, so they suggested that interviews should occur in a confidential location other than participants’ place of work. As a result, face-to-face interviews were conducted in a location that was convenient for the participant but that was outside his/her workplace. Participants were informed that the purpose of the interview was to explore how they responded to workplace frustrations, their contradictory opinions (if any) with respect to organizational policies and practices, and how they expressed disagreement to management and
coworkers. Participants were assured that their privacy would be protected, the collected data would be used only for the purposes of this study, and any communication occurring during the interview would not be shared with their management or any other member of their organization. Participants were encouraged to share their stories and describe situations that happened to them regarding their voice and dissent behavior and not to merely offer opinions. They were also asked to not disclose the real names of other individuals in their narratives so as to protect other people's privacy. Participants were assured that the researcher would personally transcribe the interviews. The interviews continued until the point of theoretical and data saturation was reached (Glesne, 2011; Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Patton, 2002).

*Interview Protocol*

Because this is an exploratory study, semi-structured interviews were used. The questions were designed in such a way as to help participants share their experiences about their voice and silence behavior in the face of organizational dissent. This approach is in line with the purposes of qualitative interviews, i.e., to understand the social actor's experience (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011) and to "enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341).

The interview schedule was designed based on widely accepted interview practices as suggested by Glesne (2011), Lindlof and Taylor (2011), and Patton (2002). For example, Glesne (2011) suggested looking at interviewing as "the process of getting words to fly" (p. 102). She went on to claim that this can be accomplished by developing a clearly defined topic, designing questions that fit the topic, using consummate skill
when asking questions, and pitching the questions to knowledgeable respondents. 

Glesne's articulation of three common types of interview approaches (*structured*, *semistructured*, and *unstructured* or conversational interviews) gave me a clear indication as to which was more suitable for the purposes of my research.

Patton (2002), on the other hand, suggested three general alternatives for open-ended interviews: the informal conversation interview, the general interview guide approach, and the standardized open-ended interview. Others have suggested other forms of interviews, such as ethnographic interviews, informant interviews, respondent interviews, narrative interviews, and focus group interviews (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

All of these approaches to interviewing are similar despite their different labels. For this study, the semistructured interview was adopted. According to Glesne (2011), in a semistructured interview questions can emerge during interview process, and these questions can replace pre-planned questions.

The semistructured interview allows the researcher to explore and learn about alternative explanations based on the interviewee's answers. This approach is consistent with Patton’s (2002) *interview guide* approach. For example, I developed an interview guide with a list of questions that I wanted to explore (see Appendix D for the interview protocol). By following Patton's (2002) interview guide, I was able to cover pre-established questions and ask more questions that led to new insights not thought about prior to being in the field. These new insights became the main themes of this research as explicated in the findings section. For example, in addition to interview questions as indicated in Appendix D, other questions emerged as the interviews unfolded with those
questions focusing on power, gender, cultural values and norms, and questions about the Arab Spring and how this changed the dynamics of dissent behavior in Omani Organizations.

In brief, because this was an exploratory phase, interview questions were not limited to dissent practices only, but included questions that sought to understand silencing events that the participants had experienced. For example, questions were asked that sought to understand dissent behavior like: "Can you share an example of a time when you raised an issue to management about issues that you find you do not agree with?"; and "Do you have a specific example of a time when you had a contradictory dialogue with your boss? Can you tell me about it? What messages did you use to express your dissatisfaction or disagreement?". The transferability of Kassing's (1997) organizational dissent model to a collectivistic context was of prime interest. So, participants were asked questions such as, "If you cannot express your disagreement directly to management, do you find other ways to communicate your concerns? What? How? Why?". Questions were also asked that probed employee silence behavior and silencing events in organizations (e.g., “Can you share an example of a time when you felt unable or unwilling to speak up to people who are above you?”). A full list of interview questions can be found in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

Glaser and Strauss' (1967) method of constant and comparison was used to analyze the data. I identified all incidents and codes that participants described in the interview then used open coding as suggested by Charmaz (2006). All of the identified
incidents were categorized based on the participants' narratives. Before transcribing, I listened to all of the interviews to get a general picture of overall dissent behavior. Each transcript was given a code as an identifier. Also, participants’ experiences were given a timestamp. The timestamp facilitated my ability to listen again to the interview for more clarity with respect to the participants’ intended meaning.

After transcribing, I read all transcripts line-by-line and generated labels to represent initial coding attempts. Open coding allowed me to go through all incidents of interest to discover patterns among them and gave labels to these incidents based on the pattern they represented. Based on these labels and in comparison with other labels, general categories of participants' stories were generated. The categories where compared to see where similar stories were grouped together. Two documents were generated, each intended to represent themes for each research question. In each document, a table was created with five columns comprised of incident, code, description, category name, and location of the file (participant's identifier and the line on the document where the incident could be found). Comparing and contrasting participant's themes, it was then possible to group similar categories together.

The transcripts were reread to identify other participant narratives that supported the developed categories and subcategories. This process was conducted in an effort to discover any possible narratives that provided additional, new categories. Finally, all of the general themes were reread and compared to the existing organizational dissent dimensions to see if and how they supported dissent theory. To make this connection, Patton's (2002) guideline was used by answering the following questions: Do the
emerging themes confirm existing organizational dissent theory? Do they offer new insights and interpretations of organizational dissent and silence theories?

Chapter Summary

This Chapter has analyzed the importance of mixed-method approaches (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) in general, and exploratory sequential design method (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), in particular. Most importantly, the Chapter offered justifications for using the exploratory sequential design method. Because the exploratory phase had already been conducted, this Chapter primarily focused on the research method for phase one. The chapter presented details about the structure of interviews, procedures, demographic details of participants, and methods of data analysis. The next Chapter provides the findings of the phase one project and discusses the data collected in phase one.
CHAPTER 4: PHASE ONE. QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

The purpose of this Chapter is to discuss the findings associated with the first phase of the research. That phase focuses on qualitative data that address two research questions: (1) What are the different attitudes about communicating dissent that are either perceived to be safe or risky by employees operating in a collectivistic/high power distance culture and what factors govern their choices? and (2) What are the antecedents and dimensions of organizational muted dissent?. I begin with the issue of the attitudes about communicating dissent that are perceived as either safe or risky.

Research Question One

Research question one focuses attention on investigating the different attitudes about communicating dissent that Omani employees perceive to be safe or risky when expressing dissent and factors that govern their assessment of these attitudes. Most of the employees interviewed for this research project indicated they were reluctant to speak up about workplace frustrations and disagreements with management. When participants were asked to share an example of a time when they spoke with management about issues with which they did not agree, 7 participants (39%) reported having raised issues with management. However, 11 (61%) reported never having raised issues to management even though they had found themselves disagreeing with the status quo of organizational policies and practices.

The findings were consistent with some of Kassing's (1997) dissent dimensions. For example, while 5 participants reported preferring to express dissent directly to management (upward dissent), 11 participants preferred expressing dissent to coworkers
(lateral dissent). All of the participants had experienced a situation of organizational dissent and all reported having remained silent at least once in the workplace regarding organizational practices with which they did not agree. The findings of this study suggest the need to extend Kassing's dissent model by proposing two new dimensions: downward dissent and muted dissent. The following sections will describe the downward dissent theme as well as how silence can be theorized as a function of muted dissent. In brief, the variation in comfort level of dissent expression revealed four dissent dimensions: (1) downward dissent, (2) upward dissent/invitational dissent, (3) bounded dissent, and (4) muted dissent.

(1) Downward Dissent

Participants reported the existence of managerial efforts to object, disagree, and challenge acts of their subordinates to change the status quo. All the studies of voice and dissent reviewed so far suffer from the fact that voice and dissent are primarily addressed upward and only sometimes to coworkers or externally. Previous studies failed to recognize the possibility that dissent can come from top management to their subordinates. Because this type of dissent (downward dissent) has not yet been addressed in the literature, I propose it as an extension of the existing dimensions of organizational dissent. While this form of dissent is an unanticipated finding, I explain it in detail based on participants' narratives. It is worth noting that the names of the participants have been changed for the purpose of confidentiality; only pseudonyms are used. Also, in all of the excerpts provided from the transcripts, the interviewer (the researcher) will be indicated.
by letter “I” and the participant by the letter “P”. The interaction provided below with an
electrical engineer, Majid (pseudonym), illustrates downward dissent:

I: Do you have an example of a time when you expressed your voice to your supervisor? By voice I mean your disagreement with management, your dissatisfaction or workplace frustration?

P: I had like a conflict, pure business conflict with one of the managers and at the end we . . . he raised complaints on me, and that had bad consequences even on my career I guess. I mean my . . . let's say my reputation in the organization. You know, he was like "this guy is a troublemaker and, you know, he just refuses the orders or he just tries to make things more difficult." This complainer [referring to the senior manager], he was one of the senior managers and raising a complaint from a senior manager will directly go to the General Manager so that . . . So this will be converted from a small conflict to an issue, a big issue you know. The General Manager will call you and a committee will be formed to just discuss about this, you will be like, you know, questions and answers, you will be in the corner just being criticized by all of them, those big dogs [laughs].

I: Do you mind telling me what happened and what caused the conflict?

P: He just gave me an order. I disagreed with him. I tried to convince him . . . he took it personally. He sent a complaint to management—to my boss and to the GM, and accordingly, they considered it as, like a big issue, and
they called for a meeting as per HR. You know this disagreement in opinion in the same call has led to loud voices.

Majid's manager disagreed, objected, and raised complaints about his subordinate. This communicative behavior came from top-down. The process of disagreement and the expression of contradictory opinions is regarded as dissent (Kassing, 1997). Interestingly, Majid regarded his manager as a “complainer.” Majid went on to say that his manager raised these complaints to his higher bosses. Raising complaints to higher ups is an instance of upward dissent (Kassing, 1997). However, from Majid's perspective, the complaints that came from his manager were no longer upward dissent because a different dynamic was in place. This claim was supported when Majid referred to his boss as a dissenter. He said, "this complainer, he was one of the senior managers."

Issa is a male assistant manager. He shared his experience with how his direct supervisor expressed dissent and criticized him behind his (Issa’s) back. He said, "I have just heard one instance where my immediate supervisor criticized my performance in front of others. A coworker transferred this information to me”.

Zaid, a crane operator, shared a similar story that implies that a manager expressed dissent to other subordinates. The following interaction with Zaid illustrates downward dissent:

I: Have you ever had a contradictory dialogue with your manager or you have seen something like that between your coworkers and your boss?

P: It did happen several times but not with me. It was between my boss and my other coworker.
I: What happened?

P: One of the employees has a bad relationship with our manager. They do not like each other. So, you always see them quarreling. For example, the manager would always try to spot or dig anything to criticize him [his subordinate] and the employee does that too. He tries to find anything to face the manager. He criticizes the manager, and the manager criticizes him back.

I: Were you there in that quarrel?

P: I was there.

I: What happened after the quarrel?

P: Actually, the manager, when such thing happens, you will see him go and tell the entire team [his subordinates] that this person is this and he is stupid . . . so and so, but I feel that the employee is right.

It is clear that the manager, in this case, is not satisfied with his subordinate, so he expressed dissent concerning that subordinate’s actions. Admittedly, some might argue that dissatisfaction of this sort is more appropriately labeled “discipline” rather than “dissent;” however, the dissatisfaction was not expressed exclusively to the subordinate. Instead, in Zaid’s situation, the dissatisfaction was expressed to other subordinates. I argue that, when disagreement/dissatisfaction is expressed outside the organization’s formal disciplinary process, “dissent” is the proper label to use.
Similarly, Ammar, an account manager, shared a story that elaborated on both types of dissent (upward and downward). When he was asked to whom he expresses dissent, he said,

My line manager, who is my direct supervisor, I can interact with him and vent all what I have, but whatever I say stops with him and never moves forward. I mean, there is a limit; he doesn't take any action. Whenever I go with him, he says this is our limitation and we cannot talk to them [those higher in authority]. He starts to criticize our system in the company. So, I feel that my voice reaches a limit and stops, and because of that, I cannot voice more than that.

From this example, it is clear that Ammar feels free to express dissent to his direct supervisor. However, because his supervisor has no power to make necessary changes, Ammar is, essentially, expressing his dissent to an ineffectual audience. Interestingly, Ammar (a subordinate in this relationship chain) is the recipient of his supervisor’s expression of dissent. As Ammar observed, "[my line manager], himself, he starts to criticize our system in the company".

The following is another example of downward dissent. Ghaleb, a Health Safety and Environmental Advisor, shared his daily struggle with downward dissent addressed directly to one of his subordinates who was not complying with organizational rules:

We have observed that you do not comply with safety rules and regulations okay, and next time, if you repeat the same mistake, this will be raised to higher management, okay. I mean, basically, this was a verbal . . . if anything happened; I will take this to HR department.
When his daily expression of downward dissent to his subordinate became ineffectual, he decided to complain to higher management. His dissent then shifted to an upward form:

Anyone who does not comply with the rules and regulations of the company, I have the right to warn him, to give verbal warning. So, I saw this guy, I told him once, for example, he was not complying with safety rules. . . . So, I decided to give a warning letter.

The above narratives regarding downward dissent raise critical questions concerning Kassing's (1997) dissent model. First, these examples problematize the criteria Kassing used to define his dissent typology (upward, lateral, and displaced). Are (or should be) the three types of dissent defined on the basis of organizational hierarchy or on the basis of the potential effectiveness of the audience? It is clear from the participants' stories, managers not only receive expressions of dissent from others but express dissent to their subordinates. If we define dissent type based on organizational hierarchy, then dissent that is expressed from a manager to his/her subordinate is not upward dissent because it came from someone at a higher level of organizational hierarchy to someone at a lower level. This type of dissent is also not lateral because the manager and the subordinate are not of the same levels of the organization’s hierarchy, and the manager here has a positional power while subordinate does not have that type of power. Finally, this is not displaced dissent because it is being expressed internally within the organization. In this case, the only option left is to consider this type of dissent as downward dissent.
Analogously, if types of dissent are based on whether they are expressed to an effective or ineffective audience, we also run into the problem of defining what counts as effective. Is an effective audience someone who can make appropriate changes, regardless of his/her positional power, or is an effective audience an employee who possesses formal positional power, regardless of whether or not any changes take place? If the presence or absence of an effective audience is the primary criterion for the dissent typology, then we are assuming that there is always an effective audience in an organization. While that is an “ought to be” statement, this would not be the case for every organization.

Another assumption hidden in this situation is that all issues on which an organizational member might express dissent have an internal (to the organization) effective audience, i.e., someone who is in a position to make the necessary change. In making this assumption, we are simplifying the complex nature of organizations as social systems. Knowing that organizations operate as open systems, this very fact makes their boundaries permeable. Hence, authority might find justification to put blame on the system and avoid ownership of dissent messages. For instance, even when dissent is expressed to someone who is presumed to be an effective audience (in the sense that he/she is in a position to make changes), that supposedly effective audience might respond by blaming the system, i.e., the structure of the organization. Essentially, in this situation, although the person expressing the dissent believes that the target audience has the power or authority to make an effective change, the receiver of the dissent does not believe that change is possible. In brief, whether classifying dissent based on
organizational hierarchy or based on who is deemed to be an effective audience, problems still arise in distinguishing among different forms of dissent actually present within an organization.

In the current study, most of the employees interviewed who had expressed upward dissent did not see any changes made as a result of their complaints. So, as far as these employees were concerned, management was not responsive, despite having been alerted to an unsatisfactory situation. This fact suggests that dissent is most usefully conceptualized on the basis of process and not on the basis of outcome.

If an employee expresses workplace frustration and disagreement with an organizational policy or practice, with that expression directed upward toward those who are considered, by the employee, to be an effective audience but the effective audience does not take any action, this is still considered an instance of upward dissent. The outcome is irrelevant. In this case, organizational hierarchy matters because it is taken for granted that managers are those who are in a position to take the actions that will result in a change. While this is generally true, it is not always the case.

A question that is unanswered is how do we categorize any dissent that is voiced by management to a subordinate? We cannot say it is displaced dissent because it happens within the organizational setting. Lateral dissent is, according to Kassing (1997), expressed to a less effective audience member, such as a coworker. Thus, downward dissent differs from lateral in two ways: the positional power of the dissenter and the effectiveness (with respect to making a constructive change) of the audience. Moreover, when a manager expresses organizational dissent to a subordinate, this could conceivably
influence how and when that subordinate will express dissent. None of the three types of dissent as suggested by Kassing (1997) fits this situation. Therefore, I suggest a new dimension of dissent that I call *downward dissent*. The following section addresses how downward dissent differs from upward dissent.

**How Does Downward Dissent Differ from Upward Dissent?**

Downward dissent differs from upward dissent in a number of respects. First, articulated or upward dissent (Kassing, 1997) is initiated by a subordinate to a supervisor and/or someone in authority. Dissent of this sort is more likely to occur when a dissenter perceives the potential for retaliation as being low and has a good relationship with his/her supervisor (Kassing, 1997). Compared with upward dissent, downward dissent is mainly initiated by supervisors to their subordinates. The pattern of dissent entails disagreement and objections concerning either acts by the employee (or one of his/her colleagues) or organizational practices. This is evident from Majid's story when he stated, “[The manager] sent a complaint to management—to my boss and to the GM, and accordingly, they considered it as, like a big issue, and they called for a meeting as per HR. You know, this disagreement in opinion in the same call has led to loud voices”.

Second, downward dissent is different from upward dissent in terms of communication dynamics. As shown in the previous example, management initiated dissent by phoning Majid, and in the process of doing so, this pattern changed the way Majid communicated. Majid disregarded power dynamics. He adopted a defensive position and implied he expressed his opinions and disagreements freely when he stated, "you know, this disagreement in opinion in the same call has led to loud voices".
Third, downward dissent differs from upward dissent in terms of function. If a dissenting issue is similar to Majid's, then an employee is more likely to express what might be called defensive dissent, where an individual defends his/her position about an act, as opposed to upward dissent that functions mainly to bring change to the status quo or to make suggestions or complaints about bad practices and policies. The following narrative from Sami, a Chief Manager, illustrates downward dissent that triggered defensive dissent:

One day there was… you know, an urgent call by the CEO and no one knew what was going on, okay. They had a project and there were some issues. The project was not running smoothly. And they called all of us. There was pointing on . . . you know. Why so so and so is not happening and there is some delay and bla bla bla. I talked freely because the CEO was upset, and he wanted to know what was going on, and I said that I have done my part, and I have the evidence to provide . . . yeahh . . . My line manager was not able to defend himself. I defended myself because I was doing my part.

It is clear that the Chief Manager exhibited defensive dissent in response to the downward dissent that was initiated by the CEO by saying “I defended myself because I was doing my part”. Speaking up in such scenarios might function as a defensive mechanism when the need for doing so entails a response to downward dissent that was triggered from higher levels of management. Downward dissent and upward dissent occur concurrently, as seen from the narratives above. So, when defining dissent, there is a need to understand whose perspective is defining the communication as dissent.
Like lateral dissent among coworkers, there is another level of lateral dissent that takes place among middle managers, and a lateral dissent that occurs among senior managers. When middle managers communicate dissent among themselves regarding their dissatisfactions and disagreements with their subordinates' unacceptable practices, from the middle managers' perspectives, this is purely lateral dissent (Kassing, 1997), but if the dissent becomes public, it becomes a downward dissent from the subordinate’s perspective.

In summary, I propose that downward dissent differs from upward dissent in three ways: 1) downward dissent is initiated from top management and is addressed to an ineffective audience given their lower power position; (2) downward dissent entails different communicative dynamics when initiated by authority; and (3) downward dissent has different functions, and usually can trigger defensive dissent.

In his definition of organizational dissent, Kassing (2011a) explained, "what remains absent from this definition is also key. It does not specify to whom one communicates dissent, thereby allowing for the possibility that it may be directed at multiple audiences, not just management" (p. 30). Accordingly, I suggest that downward dissent serves as a good example of an additional possible dissent audience among the multiple audiences. Despite the existence of multiple audiences for dissent, research has mainly focused on bottom-up dissent.

One major drawback of dissent and voice literature is that it focuses on upward strategies for dissent expression (Kassing, 2002), and upward dissent messages (Garner, 2009); however, as seen above, some participants in this study, reported to be middle and
senior managers, expressed the importance of understanding the strategies of downward dissent. Others might argue that downward dissent is similar to employee engagement, or disciplining an employee. However, both employee engagement and disciplining can include communicative forms that lack the expression of disagreement. For instance, employee engagement and/or disciplining can involve various communication forms that are far from expressions of disagreement, such as motivation, encouragement, supporting, involvement, empowerment, request, order, and even threatening.

So far, these findings raise questions about the previous definitions of dissent. For example, the very idea of downward dissent questions common ways of looking at the conceptualization of dissent. As explained above, upward dissent is expressed to people who have positional power. This interpretation contrasts with downward dissent that is expressed to individuals with no positional power. If we assume that a manager is dissenting (downward) to his/her subordinate, then who is exercising power? Does the conceptualization of dissent entail power dynamics? Who owns that power—the dissenter or the dissentee? If there is no power imbalance, can we consider dissent to have taken place? The section that follows discusses dissent and its relationship to power.

*Power Dynamics and Justification of Downward Dissent*

Some scholars claim that, by definition, to *speak up* involves communicating ideas, information, disagreements, and protests to someone who is perceived to have the power or resources to make a change or to bring organizational attention to the issue (e.g., Detert, & Burris, 2007). Building on this argument, Detert and Burris (2007) defined organizational voice behavior as:
The discretionary provision of information intended to improve organizational functioning to someone inside an organization with the perceived authority to act, even though such information may challenge and upset the status quo of the organization and its power holders, is critical to organizational well-being yet insufficiently provided by employees, who see the risks of speaking up as outweighing the benefits. (p. 869)

Almost all studies reviewed so far on dissent and voice emphasized upward dissent, including dissent messages (Garner, 2009), upward dissent strategies (Kassing, 2002), issue selling (Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998), and upward influence (Waldron, 1999). This fact is due to the belief that upward targets have the power to control rewards and sanctions. Difficulties arise, however, when regarding the power of making change or the power of bringing attention to issues as only possessed by those at the top of the managerial hierarchy.

While general employees might not have the power to control rewards, they can control other forms of resources that give them sense of power. In their study of employees’ muted voices in a culturally diverse workplace, Meares et al. (2004) suggested that "some workers enter organizations with more power (based, in part, on their cultural backgrounds) and thus these individuals have more privilege to talk (or not talk) about issues of mistreatment in the organization" (p. 5). Power is a complicated concept, and there are different forms of power in any organization.

For the purposes of this study and for the purposes of legitimizing downward dissent and its power complexity, I will refer to power in its general sense. While it is
true that top management has the power of rewards and punishments, power is not limited to position only, but also to gender, cultural and educational background, and socioeconomic status (Buzzanell, 2000; Cox, 1993; Meares et al., 2004). Meares et al. (2004) contended that, "relatively powerless groups also participate in constructing, and sometimes resisting, power through discourse" (p. 7). This fact indicates that, whenever there is power, there is resistance, which is manifested by overt and covert forms of dissent; hence, resistance can trigger downward dissent.

An interesting finding in this study is that power is also gained from interpersonal relationships. Naeem, an Inventory Analyst, shared his experience of dissent behavior with his supervisor. The outcome was that his supervisor took the dissent personally and used his power to unjustly evaluate Naeem's performance. The supervisor warned Naeem "do not put yourself head-to-head with your supervisor". Head-to-head, as used here, indicates a power gap between Naeem and his boss. The boss warned Naeem not to equate himself with the boss; the boss is unlike him as he (the boss) possesses power and deserves respect. However, Naeem went on to say that his boss was forced to move to another department. When I asked him how that was possible given that his boss had more positional power than him, he said, “When you have facts and interpersonal relationships everything is possible. Power is gained by facts and through relationships with others”.

The above narrative provides a basis for conceptualizing dissent as an expression of disagreement that is conditioned by imbalanced power. It is still valid to argue that both downward dissent and upward dissent occur with the imbalance of power in place as
the findings above suggest. Interestingly, similar to upward dissent, downward dissent can be inhibited. The following interaction with Ghaleb, a safety officer, indicates that managers can be intimidated by subordinates and that subordinates can have their own sources and forms of power. The narrative below also indicates that managers can experience fear with respect to encountering their subordinates (downward dissent):

I: I’d like to go back to the very interesting story you brought up earlier, about your friend who was labeled a troublemaker and a group-maker. When the HR of the new company called the HR of the current company, he told him that this guy is so and so, and somewhere in your statement, you said that they [managers] cannot tell him directly to his face?

P: Yes, that is true.

I: Why can’t they tell him directly? Why can’t they face him, knowing that they have power?

P: Because of the truth, he speaks up the truth. If somebody speaks the truth, they cannot face him . . . right. So, because when they do something wrong, they are not right, okay . . . they cannot go and face somebody who is right. So, they have to go . . . you know . . . other ways.

I: So, in general, people who have power, who have higher positions . . . why are they afraid? They can just tell subordinates . . . “hey you did this and that.” Even if they speak facts . . . I mean, if Omani labor law doesn't allow them to fire staff, they can just transfer them into other departments
or other fields and bring new people . . . at least they have that power. So, why they do not just go and tell them? Face them?

P: They cannot do that.

I: Why?

P: Because of the law.

I: No. I am not saying about the law regarding firing—the power of shifting employees.

P: The power to transfer, they cannot do that because, in our company, they have so many people who have been recently fired and the guys who were fired went to the court to sue the company, and all the guys who were fired, they won the case and they claimed compensation, and now I heard that, because of this poor management, the way they are dealing with employees, they fire or transfer according to what they want for personal or whatever reason. I heard that the shareholders are not happy about this management, because the troublemakers, what they call as troublemakers . . . forced the company to pay a lot of money for compensation . . . and this was the consequence.

I: So, managers cannot face subordinates because subordinates have facts, they have numbers, statistics, they are right, they have the truth. Then why, as you said, the majority of employees are afraid? They keep silent although the court will support them?
Because, whatever you have done . . . okay . . . as I told you, this is like a network. If you are with them, whatever you do, you will be fine with them. If you are not in their group, small mistake, they will count it, take it.

The evidence presented so far warrants the presence of downward dissent. If it is assumed that voice and dissent are addressed only in an upward direction, we assume that abuse, injustice, mistreatment, misconduct, and violations of work standards are not committed by subordinates to their supervisors. These behaviors are inevitably committed by lower level staff as well; as such, downward dissent is inevitable.

One of the few scholars who recognized that voice and dissent can be expressed to other audiences in addition to upward voice was Kassing (1997) who suggested that dissent can be expressed to coworkers and external non-organizational members as well. However, in his research, Kassing did not consider downward dissent as a possible dimension of dissent. Therefore, I propose to extend Kassing’s (1997) model to include downward dissent. This is because issues of power can occur at all levels. Power is gained or exercised through communicative acts and by controlling meanings, not just by controlling rewards and sanctions. According to Mumby (2001), power is “the production and reproduction of, resistance to, or transformation of relatively fixed (sedimented) structures of communication and meaning that support the interests (symbolic, political, and economic) of some organization members or groups over other” (p. 587).
So far, downward dissent has been addressed as a recurring theme and the above section explained why downward dissent takes place in organizations. The next section addresses the second recurring theme in relation to dimensions of dissent.

(2) *Upward Dissent/Invitational Dissent*

Upward dissent (Kassing, 1997) is the second recurring theme. While a majority of employees, as seen earlier, did not feel comfortable expressing dissent to management, some participants did report on their experiences of reporting concerns directly to their supervisors. For instance, Asim, head of an HR section, when he was asked about an example where he expressed dissent to management, said:

This happened when my direct supervisor had too many absenteeisms and did not care about the work, and of course, he procrastinated and would always call me at the last minute to catch up and get the job done. When I observed this, I went to the senior manager because I knew, had I gone to him [my direct supervisor], he would get mad and angry. So, I went to the senior manager, and I told him that the work gets procrastinated, and the person is always absent, and this really has impacted our work. What happened here, the senior manager and my direct supervisor, of course they have friendship relationship, and of course my complaint was not effective, and at the end of the day, all what I have said got back to me negatively. So when I saw that this is the kind of environment, I preferred to move from this department to another department.
Although the above example describes an instance of upward dissent with an unsatisfactory outcome, Deena, a female personnel representative, had the opposite experience when she engaged in upward dissent:

I: Can you share with me a story of a time when you observed a wrongdoing by a coworker and you chose to not keep silent? Can you explain what happened? What stopped you for keeping silent?

P: Not really. I found some fraud going on and went to a manager and reported what I had seen. Management was very supportive.

Mohammed, a project specialist, also reported having felt comfortable speaking up as illustrated in the following interaction with him:

I: Do you have an example of a time when you felt comfortable speaking up? What was the story?

P: I was very comfortable with my previous work experience, speaking even with finance director about even other employees, what problems they are facing in their workplace, and I was arguing and he was discussing some issues with me, and I was very honest with him that I really accept his opinions. I found his opinions firm, and I felt very comfortable telling him that, and he was very open-minded to accept that fact.

Ali, a contractor supervisor, reported having employed a circumvention strategy (Garner, 2009; Kassing, 2009) to express upward dissent:

So, yeah . . . such things happened and I went to his boss [his supervisor’s boss], and I did the same thing and he wasn't happy. So, I just confront people
nowadays. And this strategy, I brought it at home. Always, when I go shopping with my wife or something, she speaks to the salesman, and I say “No, no, no. He is not the decision maker. Let's go to the manager. He is the one to give us what we need.”

Ghaleb, a safety officer reported using an upward dissent strategy that involved a threat that could be deemed face-threatening (Garner, 2009, Kassing, 2002). He stated

I: So, your voice was heard?

P: Yes, [my voice] was heard after I had said that I would quit the company.

Najma is a female legal advisor. She stated that she used to express upward dissent, but when she realized that her coworkers were unsupportive and no one backed her up, she decided to avoid dissent. The following interaction occurred with her:

I: Have you ever raised issues to management or authority?

P: Actually I tried once to speak up.

I: About what?

P: We had an audit section, and the auditors came to the company. They just wanted to know what the problem was. Everybody was disturbed from the management and a lot of resignations had been happening throughout the year. It was crazy, and when they came, I told them, listen girls, I will talk but you have to back me up. And when I spoke up, no body supported me. I was alone; I mean they just did not support me. So, I was like, it is not my issue; it is your issue girls, but I am doing a favor by raising this issue. That really disturbed me, and since then, I decided I would not speak up.
Although some employees reported having expressed upward dissent, the majority reported having felt too unsafe to do so. For example, Assim asked to be transferred to another department due to his unsuccessful dissent attempt. Similarly, Ghaleb, as he indicated above, was almost willing to quit the company. In addition to that, for Najma, dissent behavior was a turning point in her career. Her experience resulted in a decision on her part to never speak up again. She said, “That, really disturbed me, and since then I decided I will not speak up.” These are some examples that show that to speak up implies risk taking.

Kassing (1997) reported that employees use upward dissent if they have a good relationship with their supervisors and perceive low probability for retaliation. While several motives for expressing upward dissent exist, the motives reported by my interviewees included: a subject matter expert [e.g., "he is also a very experienced guy and that's why he used to feel free to contradict the manager" (Sami, a chief manager)]; interaction proximity [e.g., "I feel more comfortable with the guy or the manger that I am in contact with on a daily basis" (Kamal, a production measurement specialist)]; relational proximity [e.g., "my direct manager was a colleague of mine; he used to work with me in the same office before he became a manager. So, I was comfortable with him from being a coworker" (Kamal, a production measurement specialist); "Now, since we appointed a GM, we have a close relationship. If I talk about a situation, the general manager used to be a manager before, like my level. He got promoted because he had a lot of experience and he is one of my closest friends in my industry. So, I am reporting to my closest friend. And we are very comfortable" (Saif, an HR manager)]; physical
proportion [e.g., "when I argue with people I really know, even if he is a manger, who is within the operation yard, or operation area... that I meet every day... I do not have any fears" (Ali, a contract supervisor)]; social support [e.g., “when I interacted with this guy, my partner, sometimes he really gives me... you know... the support that I need to confront other people, something like courage... he just gives me the courage" (Ali, a contract supervisor); and “maybe I would speak up if I got support from other coworkers like me in other locations" (Zaid, a crane operator)].

The aforementioned are the recurring themes that emerged from participants’ statements concerning their dissent motives and the situations in which they felt safe to speak up. These findings respond to research question one. In summary, being a subject matter expert, interaction proximity, relational proximity, physical proximity, and social support from others are dissent motives that participants reported as resulting in their feeling safe enough to express dissent.

In addition to these motives, it is interesting to note that a recurring theme that emerged was that participants felt safer when there was an invitation by management to speak up. In other words, upward dissent can be exercised in a more prosocial manner when invited. I regard this as an effective setting for dissent. Some participants reported avoidance of upward dissent; however, they also reported that, if management invited them to express dissent in an environment they perceived as being safe, then they would more likely express dissent. For example, Kamal, a production measurement specialist, when he was asked to describe situations in which he felt safe to express dissent, indicated that:
P: I think, I tend not to express unless there is a channel for expression, like there is a survey sent out or there is a . . . a manager asked you. I am that sort of person who would just . . . if someone provoked me to express concerns, I would. Otherwise, I would just live with it.

When I asked him about an example, he shared a story of how a manager three levels came to him and invited him to express his dissatisfaction and how he (the manager) could improve things. He explained out:

P: And he would also talk to you and ask for your opposite opinion. I mean, that is rare when a manager comes to an employee who is three levels below him and says “what do you think about something? How can we do something? Do you think we can improve certain things or certain training courses or certain contracts?”

Similarly, Sameh, an operations manager, reported having felt safe in expressing dissent because he did not initiate the dissent but, instead, received an invitation from management to speak up. The following interaction with him illustrates this:

I: When do you feel safe to speak up?

P: In our company, as I told you, it is a special case because we have European management, and they started operating in Oman recently. So, what happens is that, because management is not that familiar with how things work in the Omani business environment, the management invites us to express our workplace problems. This helps us to raise our issues.
I: What if you had local management, do you think they would have invited you to express your workplace frustrations?

P: I do not think so, but even if they invited us to speak up, it will be like the saying: 'like someone who inflates a pierced bota bag' [this saying corresponds to the American idiom 'fall on deaf ears']

Hisham is a civil engineer who rarely speaks up. He said that he speaks up only when he receives an invitation from management. He reported having observed an unfair evaluation of his performance, knowing that his records indicated he had never received a rating other than that of the highest level (“excellent”) in his entire work life. He said that he worked hard, and worked on a voluntary basis. It was shocking to him to see a poor evaluation at the end of the year. I asked him if he had spoken up. He said that he did not, but his direct supervisor had invited him to express his dissatisfaction. He explained:

P: Actually he [his direct supervisor] is the one that, he told me that “I know that you did more and you go fully satisfactory and this is, this is not fair because you should get outstanding, but it is not in my hand to give you…I knew that you deserve more.” First he told me that “you got this grade, what do you think about it?” I told him, “yeah it is okay,” and I said “I expected that.” I lied because I never expected that. Then he told me that “I know you worked more,” and so I told him “yeah, I was expecting outstanding but I did not get.” So, he is the one that initiated it. That's why this is what I like about him.
Because this dissent was initiated and invited by management, I consider it as a safe type of upward dissent and have labeled it invitational dissent. With invitational dissent, managers invite employees to speak up, making them feel that they (the employees) are freed to express themselves and will be heard. However, the findings of this study suggest that invitational dissent is not always effective due to the taken for granted fact that managers always have control over sanctions. For example, participants who worked as middle and senior managers reported that they had tried to invite their subordinates to speak up, but their subordinates were not responsive. Although, managers reported having tried to established a safe environment [e.g., "that's why I try not to act like a superior to them; I am not acting like a superior"; "I tell my subordinates, although I am your boss, it doesn't mean that I am always right; I am open to other ideas"], these attempts to employ invitational dissent failed to convince some subordinates to speak up. Ali, a contract supervisor who is also a middle manager, reported the need to understand better mechanisms of employing invitational dissent. He stated, "I am trying to discover ways that my subordinates can speak freely and never gossip about me, although the gossip stuff is always there, but you make it as minimal as possible".

While these are common conditions that facilitate upward dissent based on the participants in this study, the majority of participants preferred engaging in lateral dissent. For instance, participants were asked what was their preferred type of dissent (upward, lateral, or displaced). Seventeen participants were asked this question. Eleven (65%) reported preferring to express lateral dissent; 5 (30%) said they preferred expressing upward dissent, and only 1 (5%) reported having employed none of these
three types of dissent. Instead, that person reported preferring to remain silent. Having discussed how most participants preferred lateral dissent as opposed to other forms of dissent, the next section addresses lateral dissent as the third recurring themes of dissent.

(3) Bounded Dissent

As was mentioned in the previous section, participants reported that coworkers were the preferred audience when expressing workplace frustrations and disagreements about organizational policies and practices. Bounded dissent resembles what Kassing (1997) called “lateral dissent”. Lateral dissent is expressed to a less effective audience, usually a coworker (Kassing, 1997, 1998, 2011b). The findings of this study are consistent with Kassing’s lateral dissent. The difference between lateral and bounded dissent is that the latter might also be expressed to senior managers yet they do not have power to influence change; hence, bounded dissent is limited to ineffectual circles. Comparing words like “lateral” or “latent”, “bounded” indicates the existence of powerful norms in organizations that limit dissent to effective audience members. For example, Omar, a marketing specialist, reported that he vents to his coworkers regarding workplace frustrations, but he admitted that, although he expresses lateral dissent, he knows this approach is not effective. He said:

One thing that I noticed about myself is that, after a while, I realize that these are not effective ways of doing things. So, I do not think that I will do that anymore, but I do, I mean I do complain to coworkers, but after a while, I see like what we say 'ma fee faida' [no point]. Why do I do something that has no effect? I mean, you just waste your time when you are complaining.
Omar's story above is similar to that of Hisham, a civil engineer. Both acknowledged that expressing lateral dissent is not effective. Hisham expressed the belief that the reason for expressing lateral dissent is social support:

I: The reason you went to your coworkers to express your workplace frustration is emotional support?

P: Yes, but they cannot do anything. What else they can do?

I: Why do you think you needed emotional support?

P: Why do I need emotional support? I do not know.

Kamal, a production measurement specialist also reported that his coworkers express workplace frustrations and disagreement to him: "yeah, some of them speak with me. Just as you said, with a coworker. They cannot confront their supervisor or a line manager". Ali also said that his coworkers always express dissent among themselves and never speak up to management. He wished that they could break that fear and speak up. He shared this frustration by saying:

My coworkers, and even my support staff (who are below me), they have the same problems. They do not speak up. I speak with my coworkers about the disappointment, you know . . . They haven't got this; they haven't . . . They never go beyond, and this is a problem because it [the dissent message] doesn't go up.

This pattern of bounded dissent, i.e., dissent that never reaches an effective audience, is true even with senior managers. For example, Sami, a chief manager, reported that he and his coworker have experienced and are experiencing workplace disagreements, but they do not raise their complaints to the CEO or board of directors. Instead, they express
lateral dissent that just roams around the circle and is never spoken to an effective audience. Sami said that dissent is only voiced to an effective audience when there is collective action or a collective voice by all employees. He explained,

Like you know, I can only talk to… I mean the other employee who is at my level, a coworker . . . okay . . . it will just roam around in that circle only. It will not go to the top management. If it does . . . I mean there are just a few cases where it goes to the top—when all employees are upset.

Sami's story above is consistent with Senge et al.’s (1999) silo metaphor. When employees in organizations operate in silos, lack of interaction with other silos takes place. So, when participants reported having expressed dissent among coworkers and never raised issues upward, a culture of suppressed upward dissent was created. They did not speak up to management due to fear of negative consequences. Whereas bounded dissent is expressed to less effectual audiences, employees have also reported incidents where they chose not to speak about their frustrations even to their coworkers. Instead, they chose to remain silent about their dissatisfactions. The findings of this study suggest that silence can, sometimes, be as function of dissent. I labeled this theme as ‘muted dissent’ and elaborate this concept in the next section.

(4) Muted Dissent

As we have seen from the previous section, a majority of the participants in this research preferred to avoid upward dissent. Instead, they chose to either vent to their coworkers or to refrain from speaking about their workplace frustrations and
disagreements. The findings of this study suggested that silence can also function as a form of dissent behavior.

Employees who engage in displaced dissent outside organizational boundaries, and do not voice their concerns to authorities within the organization, might express their frustrations to an ineffective audience. Kassing (1997) reported that displaced dissent occurs when employees perceive the potential for retaliation to be high. Therefore, I argue that it would be more convincing to study muted dissent, investigate its antecedents, and its implications for voice and dissent behavior, instead of looking at displaced dissent.

Although Kassing (1997) labeled this type of dissent as a displaced dissent, I believe it can be conceptualized in terms of muted dissent because displaced dissent is not expressed within an organization; instead, employees choose to remain silent, and silence is pervasive in organizations (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005).

For Hirshman (1970), Farrell (1983), and Rusbult et al. (1982), neglect is a passive behavior. Analogously, Kassing (1997) considered displaced dissent as a form of neglect. Building on the work of Farrell (1983) who suggested that silence is a key element of neglect and inaction, I suggest that calling this dimension “muted dissent” gives it the importance it deserves. I also argue that Kassing's displaced dissent is a mere ramification of muted dissent. Other reasons for excluding displaced dissent have been
articulated in the section concerning 'problems with the existing dissent models' that is part of Chapter 1.

Additionally, some participants reported that they did not use displaced dissent. For example, Fareed, a corporate marketing executive, during his interview, when asked why he did not speak up, admitted, "to protect myself." He repeated that statement more than 15 times during the interview. The reason for his silence was fear of negative consequences (Morrison & Milliken, 200) and fear of retaliation (Kassing, 1997). I asked him the following:

I: When you have work related frustrations and disagreements, do you usually speak up to your manager directly, to coworkers, or to family and non-work friends?

P: none . . . I ignore

Although Fareed is a senior manager and has considerable power, it seems he does not speak up to top management, nor does he share his frustrations with his coworkers or with non-work friends. He simply said, "I ignore". Similarly, I asked Najma, a female legal advisor, whether she expressed her workplace frustrations and disagreements to her non-work friends and family members. She said:

I do not like sharing my work stuff at home. Even if I have problems, I rarely share them with my husband. I just like coming home and forgetting about work.

That's it. That's how stressful it is.

The aforementioned interactions with participants show that not every employee engages in displaced dissent; instead, they reported having expressed bounded dissent or as
having remained silent. These findings suggest that employees feel unsafe with respect to speaking up and, in such a situation, decide to remain silent regarding their workplace frustrations and dissatisfactions. For example, Sara, a marketing director, reported a situation when she felt unsafe to speak up,

I: Can you share an example of a time when you were unable or unwilling to speak up to people who are above you?

P: Being given too many tasks, all with the same level of priority.

Other participants, like Hisham, a civil engineer, reported that they usually avoided disagreeing with their managers. This is evident in the following interaction with Hisham:

I: Have you ever had a contradictory dialogue with your manager?

P: No.

I: What about normal contradictory dialogue? An example of a time when you had a disagreement with him.

P: Even if there is, I will not [express disagreement]. I will not express any disagreement with him, even if there is one.

These narratives of silence are not surprising in a collectivistic society. For example, I asked participants how other employees in their organizations express dissent at work. The findings were shocking. Sixteen participants were asked this particular question. The results revealed that 14 participants (88%) reported that other employees were mainly silent and avoided speaking up, and 2 participants (12%) reported that it depends on the
employees themselves as some speak up and others do not. The following selected narratives support these findings. Starting with Hisham, I asked:

I: Do people generally speak up about their concerns?
P: They keep silent
I: About workplace frustrations?
P: Yes, only a few talk.

This was also true for Issa, an assistant manager:

I: What about your coworkers, when they have workplace frustrations, disagreements, or dissatisfactions, do they express them directly to management or do they just talk to their coworkers?
P: I would say, on average, maybe 60% of them will not report to anyone. They will just look elsewhere and leave the organization. This is what happens. In a way, it can be healthy, but it is also a loss to the organization.

Mohammed, a project specialist, reported that coworkers express their frustrations to him. He reported that most of his coworkers share the same disagreements and dissatisfactions about organizational policies; however, when it come to a unanimous decision to raise issues, with a collective voice, to management, most of them have given up and, instead, decide to not take risks by remaining silent. This fact is evident in the following interaction with Mohammed:

I: What about your friends, your coworkers. So, far my conclusion from you, as a person, is you do not fear speaking up. You do not keep silent. You
express your views. You express your voice. Is that the case with other employees in your company?

P: I would say most of them decide to keep silent. If I can mention an example, if I go back to the HSE issue, before speaking with the manager, I was speaking with almost all of the team. It was about 20 members. Except for 3 people, all of them accepted the idea . . . it was a whole team discussion, but then they did not speak up.

Majid, another participant, shared his experience of dissent behavior in his organization and also confirmed the ubiquitous nature of silence in organizations. The following interaction with him indicates this pattern:

I: By “others” do you mean a majority of them?

P: Majority, yeah, the majority. They do not express their opinions.

I: But do they express those opinions to you?

P: Yeah, because we are coworkers. As coworkers, they . . . yeah, but when we come to meetings, [in front of] the big bosses, maybe 2 or 3 will speak but the majority will keep silent.

I: 2 or 3 out of how many?

P: Out of 20 let's say.

Ammar, an account manager, also reported that most employees refrain from speaking up:

I: What about other employees in your company? Do they usually voice their disagreements?
P: Most of them remain silent. They just vent the frustration among their coworkers.

Technical operator Fuad expressed the belief that, due to fears associated with speaking up, employees keep silent. He said that, even if employees agree as to something that is dissatisfactory in the workplace, they are still afraid to voice their view. The following interaction with Fuad supports this:

I: What about other employees? Do they speak up?

P: They are afraid. Maybe initially they will support you, but once you have decided with a group to go and speak up, they do not show up hahaha [laughs].

All these participants’ experiences indicate how silence in organizations is ubiquitous. Findings on dimensions of silence, as will be discussed in later sections, suggest that silence can also be considered a function of dissent. So far the findings have suggested four dimensions of employee dissent behavior: downward, upward, bounded, and muted dissent. The second part of RQ1 was directed at examining factors that influence individual choices with respect to these four dimensions of dissent. This is answered in the next section.

Factors Affecting Employees’ Dissent Choices

Participants reported that their choice for expressing dissent depended on several factors. In other words, the four types of dissent (downward, upward, bounded, and muted dissent) were found to occur concurrently. Depending on the situation, their levels of occurrence varied across issues and time. For example, some participants reported that
Timing governed their choice (e.g., "with many line mangers, you have to approach them in . . . you know . . . sometimes when they are in a good mood" (Sami, a chief manager); "sometime when you ask him [a manager] when he is not in a good mood, he gets mad and goes away" (Basheer, a sales and applications specialist); and "never complain to that person at a time when they are pressured or tense" (Sara, a marketing director).

These findings are consistent with those of Bisel and Arterburn (2012) who found that employees assessed appropriateness of timing for speaking up. They called this factor (when the timing was not appropriate) "constructing timing as inopportune" (p. 223). Other factors that influenced employee choice of a dissent channels, as reported by participants, included the following: "it depends on issues;" "it depends on a manager;" "it depends on my relationship with my supervisor."

Although the aforementioned situational factors were reported, all participants drew from two major recurring themes that influenced their choices (e.g., whether to wait for a dissent to be provoked by management, or to express their complaint directly to management, or to express their complaint to coworkers, or to remain silent). The two major recurring themes that govern employees' dissent choices are: power and fear.

*Perceived Imbalance of Power*

Participants who perceived power imbalance and the need to protect themselves decided to remain silent. Fareed, a corporate marketing executive, said:

I feel that managers do not care. They utilize their power . . . There is a power gap, so when something comes from top, employees will do it . . . For me, I always protect myself; no one can criticize me . . . I do not disagree.
Research on power indicates that people are hesitant to disagree with or to contradict those in authority because there is a possibility of retaliation (Cortinta & Magley, 2003; Kramer, 1998; Milgram, 1983). Although there is little empirical evidence concerning the relationship between power and silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001), there is a theoretical support that individuals' perceptions of a power imbalance affect employee silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). This view is also supported by Edmondson (2003) who found that team members spoke up easily when team leaders downplayed power differences. This approach increased feelings of psychological safety. The findings of this study related to *invitational dissent*, as pointed to earlier, are consistent with Edmondson’s psychological safety as a safe container by downplaying power. Similarly, these findings are consistent with Morrison and Milliken (2000) who found that perceptions of unequal power impact employee silence. Unequal power was also articulated by Kamal, a production measurement specialist, who said,

Yes, it matters because I knew that my direct manager had limited things when it comes to my progression, to my development. My manger's manager has a lot more authority than my direct manager. So, knowing that this guy has a lot of authority over what I get or what I do made me not confront him or not actually question him and tell him this is not ethical; we should not do that. I would normally say that I would confront someone who has no power to do anything that can affect me.

It is apparent from Kamal's narrative that power determines the level of safety when it comes to deciding whether to express dissent or not. One participant, Kamal, believed
that, if the audience of the dissent could not affect him, then he would feel safe to speak up. This finding is similar to punitive power (Cloven & Roloff, 1993; Lawler & Bacharach, 1987) as articulated in the literature. Kamal’s view is also consistent with Omar, a marketing specialist, as indicated in the following interaction:

I: In what situations do you feel safe to express your complaints, and what situations make you feel unsafe?

P: So, this goes back to my previous point. I feel safe to complain about a point if I know . . . my manager doesn't have to do anything [with] or is not related to that problem.

The above interaction with Omar indicates that, when managers are not part of the issue, or are not involved and do not have power to enforce costs and rewards, then an individual should feel safe to express dissent. The above participants' narratives imply that the presence of power can not only controls rewards and costs but also determines whether it is safe or risky to express dissent.

Like all other participants, Kamal, when he talked about power differences, referenced the power to control rewards and punishments, like promotions and evaluation. Power is an important factor in predicting dissent expression or silence. Pinder and Harlos (2001) alluded to the importance of power for explaining silence by drawing on Scott's (1990) notion of power dependence. Scott (1990) argued that the "relations of domination are, at the same time, relations of resistance" (p. 45). He went on to suggest that both dominant and subordinate groups exercise public transcripts and hidden transcripts. The former, in relation to this study, would be an example of voice
and dissent expression, and the latter would be the act of silence. These two transcripts are similar to Goffman's (1959) back stage and front stage.

Scott argued that these two types of transcripts are produced and reproduced whenever there is an exercise of power. Perceived dependency power creates a gap between public and hidden transcripts (Scott, 1990). For instance, hidden transcripts can be evident when an employee verbally agrees with a management directive despite the fact that he/she disagrees with that directive. This disagreement is an example of a hidden transcript when the employee hides his opinion and overtly behaves (public transcript) in a way that contradicts his/her true point of views (hidden transcript). This is evident in the interview data when Sami, a chief manager, explained why he did not speak up:

It is you know . . . he is my line manager first of all; he has the power of, you know. I should not use that word, but he has power, you know. He can degrade me in my appraisal, okay, and … I know the personality of my supervisor.

Similarly, Fareed, a corporate marketing executive, said that he did not speak up because it was a waste of time due to the imbalance of power. I asked him:

I: What reasons stopped you from expressing your disagreements?

P: It is a waste of time, I mean even if you go to top management, they still do not take your voice seriously. They will implicitly tell you . . . you are not at my level. You should raise it to someone near to my level who can contact me . . . it is all politics.

Fareed stated that, because he did not have the same positional power as his manager, he could not speak up. According to his experience, it can be implied that his manager
would more likely appreciate dissent that comes from a person with equal power as his. The way Fareed viewed the power imbalance is consistent with Fuad's, a technical operator, who said, if a person has power in an organization and has decided to speak up, then management will take his voice seriously. Fuad's experience is evident in the following interaction with him:

I: What other reasons that stopped you from speaking up to management?
P: Look, because I do not have a big position. If I go and speak up, who will appreciate that? Who will even look at me? I mean, if someone with good position speaks up, then they will listen to him.

Feeling of an imbalance of power is also experienced among middle managers, who reported a power gap with their senior managers. For example, I asked Asim, who is the head of an HR section, about factors that made him remain silent. He said:

If you speak up, sometimes they, the top managers, look at you with hatred in their eyes in the sense that they would say this guy is minding my own business, bigger than his position. Because of that, I prefer to be distant and give them their own space to make decisions.

These findings suggest that, when subordinates perceive a power gap with a supervisor, they tend to keep silent. This fact widens the gap between public and hidden transcripts. The power gap is minimized when supervisors are more open to employee's input (e.g., invitational dissent). As a result, muted dissent is at a minimum level if there is less power differential between supervisors and subordinates (Edmondson, 2003). In short, the aforementioned findings suggest how the perception of power dependence or
imbalance between supervisors and subordinates influences an employee's choice to voice dissent or silence. The findings have also suggested another factor that impacted employees’ choices to voice dissent or to refrain from speaking up. What follows is a description of this factor (fear).

Perceived Fear

Perceived fear was a major, reoccurring theme that accounted for participants' decisions to speak up or not. Fear and perceived power imbalance are interrelated, but remain distinct factors. While the emphasis of punitive power (e.g., perceived imbalance power) is on instrumental behaviors (e.g., control over rewards and punishments), the emphasis of fear goes beyond instrumental behaviors to include relational aspects (e.g., fear of damaging relationships), face-threatening aspects (e.g., fear of embarrassing self and others; fear of being viewed negatively). Relational fear is evident in the following narrative from Kamal:

A lot of people in the Omani culture are very indirect and are very cautious about relationships, to the extent that they do not like to spoil their relationship with someone. . . . because who works with you becomes your friend in Oman, yeah hehe [laughs]. You find yourself a friend with most people who work around you and . . . you started to not expressing yourself because you do not want to lose that friendship and especially at a coworker level. . . . We need to know more how to accept criticism as the Omani culture and not make it personal. In my work, I think that a lot of things become personal.
This narrative suggests that employees refrain from speaking up due to social fear, which is distinct from instrumental fear or perceived imbalance of power (control of rewards and costs) as mentioned in the previous section. It appears that friendship ties are very crucial at work. Sami, a chief manager, also supported this view, saying,

"I will give you an example. Within the environment itself, the work environment, there are some politics that are going on, okay . . . that is everywhere, you should avoid, you know, like you know, embarrassing your boss or your line manager by commenting on what he, whatever he has suggested in front of some particular managers, specific managers, because these guys will take it as a point against him at a later stage."

This participant reported that he avoided speaking up if the act of dissenting would put the audience at risk by embarrassing him/her. This type of fear suggests the need to protect others and avoid embarrassing them. There is another type of fear where an employee avoids speaking up to protect his/her own positive face. For instance, Ghaleb, as Health Safety Officer, did not speak up in order to avoid negative labels. He explained:

"So, there is fear to highlight these kind of issues, because the HR department or others would say . . . oh this is a problem-maker."

It is clear from the above example that Ghaleb's experience indicates that he did not want to damage his positive face. This is the face-threatening aspect of fear that is socially driven and is distinct from punitive power. Another example of fear that is social in nature is when an employee remains silent due to the fear that speaking up might damage
interpersonal relationship. The following story with Ammar, an account manager, illustrates social fear:

I think it is psychological factor. . . . And 100%, we are concerned about harming our relationships. Just take the example I told you before, when I sent that email to the VP; they now no longer speak with me. When they see me, they do not interact with me anymore. My relationship with them changed. For me, I do not want to damage any relationship with any person. This is my problem. I do not want to damage any relationship with any individual. I do not want anyone to have a bad impression of me.

As illustrated in the previous narratives, one of the reasons behind dissent avoidance is fear. This fear cannot always be identified. The following interaction with, Basheer, a sales and applications specialist, illustrates this fact:

I: Can you share with me a time when you observed a wrongdoing by management and you chose to remain silent?

P: My direct manager, no.

I: What about other managers?

P: It is not like a wrongdoing, but a behavior. For example, he is my manager's manager. Sometime when you ask him [something], when he is not in a good mood, he gets mad and goes away. He ignores you.

I: Have you told him that you are frustrated by his behavior?

P: No,

I: What stopped you?
P: I think it is fear
I: What do you mean by fear?
P: Because he can take negative actions, mmm, he cannot take actions but I do not know. It is just a fear.
I: I understand what you are saying, but what triggers this fear?
P: I do not know. It is just a fear.

Basheer's example shows that, sometimes, employees do not speak up not because of concerns about retaliation (controlling material rewards and costs), but because of a social fear or a relational fear. He said, "[the manager] cannot take actions [negative actions] but I do not know. It is just a fear". This narrative leads to a discussion of the difference between power imbalances and fear.

_Difference Between Power and Fear_

Although punitive power (power imbalance) and fear are interrelated, fear is different from power. Fear from speaking up can be a product of power imbalance. An employee might be fearless about speaking up, but the power imbalance could force him/her to remain silent. The following narrative from Kamal illustrates how power and fear are distinct:

Okay . . . it was one of the few times when I was taken to a meeting with my manager's manager's manager, like three levels up in the hierarchy. . . to give my opinion on technical issues. And before we went to the meeting with that director, my manager's manager told me not to mention the bad stories, or not to mention the bad things because he did not want the big guy to hear about them, even
though the meeting was to discuss how good we are doing in certain technologies at that time. We bought new technology, and we implemented it, and I was in charge of monitoring the implementation and the meeting was about . . . is this something good and how good it was. My manager's manager wanted me to say it was absolutely perfect, is delivering results. . . . If I said NO to the guy who told me do not talk about the problem and I started talking about the problem, I think he would just say, you know . . . we can . . . he would just counter what I've said, because he has the power, he . . . the hierarchy will . . . he will find a way to actually make what I said like it did not exist, so I thought, if he doesn't agree, if I cannot convince him, I cannot confront him,

It is clear from this narrative that Kamal wanted to speak up about his concerns, or what he referred to as “bad stories,” and about his disagreements with workplace practices. He implied not being initially afraid to speak up in that meeting, but his manager instructed him to remain silent. Here the manager used his power to command Kamal to avoid speaking about problems. Interestingly, Kamal decided to obey his manager's order, although he was not convinced. I followed up by asking him,

I: Interesting. So, now the reason . . . you did not speak up in that specific example is because you guys received instructions from the middle. . . .

P: The middle manager said, yeah that we do not speak in front of higher manager about this problem. And I did not violate that, because I was 100% sure that, if I did, he will not like me, the guy who told me do not do this. If I went against his instructions, and said something, I'd feel
comfortable, but then I was thinking about the consequences . . . and if I
do this, I would damage my reputation for the rest of my life. That is . . .
what made me accept something that was against what I believed.

Note the last line of Kamal's answer: “that is . . . what made me accept something that
was against what I believed”. We can see that he had his own *transcript* for how the
meeting should proceed (based on what he believed in). He wanted to be open and honest
in this conversation, but instead, he had to go against his personal transcript, and appear
to support his manager’s existing transcript due to the positional power held by his
manager.

Similarly, Basheer, a sales and applications specialist, shared an experience that
distinguishes between instrumental power (power of controlling rewards and costs) and
social fear. This distinction is evident in the following interaction with him:

I: Can he influence your appraisals and performance in end of the year given
   that he is a manager?

P: Not about appraisals and performance. I guess it is about my relationship
   with him.

I: Can you talk more about the nature of that relationship?

P: Because if I am in touch with him, he can take it in his head and comes up
   with negative impression about me.

I: If he develops a bad impression of you, so what?

P: His relationship with me can be affected...
I: When you talk about relationship, is it about workplace relationship or interpersonal relationship?

P: Regarding work relations, there is no work relation with him that much; we do not see each other very often; only during some meetings. And personal relationship, it is a good relationship with him.

Similar to Basheer's experience, Fuad, a technical operator, shared his experience during the interview of a time when he observed wrongdoing and unethical behaviors by management, but he remained silent. When I asked him if he was afraid to speak up, he said, “No”. Although he did not experience any fears about losing the relationship or having a face-threatening situation develop, he implied that the inequality of power meant he could not do anything about the issue. The following interaction with him illustrates this:

I: Can you share with me an instance when you observed wrongdoing by management and you chose to keep silent?

P: Yes, our managers.

I: Why you did not speak up?

P: Because there is nothing in the company that I know of which I can trust and will protect me.

I: Do you mind if you can tell me what was the wrongdoing you observed by managers?

P: The stories of favoritism and injustice in hiring—wasta [nepotism] in recruiting. These kinds of stories . . . managers talk about them without
shame. . . For example, I know that managers in this company are from x village and most of the employees who have been recruited so far are from x village. Why is that? It seems as if there were no other applicants from other cities who applied. They applied, but it is all corrupt.

I: Have you raised this issue?

P: Speak to whom? I told you, it is unsafe, or nobody will listen to you.

I: Do you have fear?

P: No, it is not fear. I am not scared, but nobody will listen to me. They take it as . . . I mean to whom will I speak up? The only place is in the head office. They will still tell me to talk to my local branch, so it is like that.

It is apparent from the above narrative that Basheer reported he was not afraid, but was silent because he did not have the power to bring about any changes. This is clearly conveyed in his statement, "no, it is not fear; I am not scared, but nobody will listen to me.” As seen, power and fear are two factors that influence decisions as to which of the four dimensions of dissent to choose (downward, upward, bounded, or silence). Drawing on these findings, as well as the chilling effect and its notion of punitive power, I suggest an extended conceptual model of organizational dissent as described in the following section.

Extended Conceptual Model of Organizational Dissent

Based on recent research in the field of communication studies, organizational dissent has been conceptualized in terms of the audience for the dissent (Kassing, 1997, 2002), and in terms of employee voice and organizational influence (Garner, 2009).
Building on Kassing's (1997) model of dissent, I propose an extended conceptual model of employee dissent that I frame in terms of perceived power and fear as the findings in the previous section suggest.

I propose that perceptions of power and fear govern an employee's choice of the form of dissent expression. First, I argue that enactment of dissent expression depends on the perceived power imbalance (from here on referred to simply as power) and perceived fear. If an employee perceives less of a power differential, he/she will feel safer to express dissent (Edmondson, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Sprague & Ruud, 1988). Moreover, when there is fear of being viewed negatively, or damaging an important relationship, or embarrassing others (i.e., creating a face-threatening situation), an employee might very well choose silence over dissent as suggested by the findings of this study. Tyler (1978) argued that what is not said is often more imperative than what is said. While organizational studies generally associate silence with loyalty (e.g., Farrell, 1983), this study treats silence as a central form of reaction to workplace frustrations and as a form of dissent.

Framing dissent exclusively in terms of the audience (Kassing, 1997) or in terms of dissent messages (Garner, 2009) does not resonate with the complex nature of various forms of responses to workplace disagreements and dissatisfactions. In phase one of this study, several employees indicated that they had chosen to remain silent about issues not because of their satisfaction at work (or lack of disagreement), but as a response to the dynamics of power and fear. In thinking about the role of silence, we need to keep in mind silence can convey both agreement and disagreement (i.e., dissent) (Jensen, 1973).
Moreover, previous conceptualizations of dissent and employee voice have exclusively framed dissent and voice as coming from the bottom-up. Within this view, dissent is directed to someone who is perceived to have the power or resources to bring about change (e.g., Detert & Burris, 2007). Kassing (1997) rejected this view and argued that dissent is not necessarily addressed to those who have power but can also be addressed to coworkers, to non-work friends, and to family members. However, almost all studies reviewed so far on voice and dissent (including Kassing's model) have failed to consider dissent that comes from top-down (downward dissent). An explanation for this fact might be that these studies and conceptualizations were conducted in low context cultures and positioned top-down complaints primarily as issues of “discipline” rather than “dissent.” However, the findings of this study, conducted in a high context culture (Hofstede, 1980), indicated the existence of downward dissent. It is worth noting that the complaints that come from top down are not always complaints about the behavior of the subordinate but can be complaints about the organization and organizational practices (similar to bottom-up complaints).

As pointed out in a previous section, while the existing theories generally frame voice and dissent in terms of a communicative behavior that is addressed to those who are perceived to have power, I propose the need to frame dissent in terms of fear and social relationships as well. This is because fear is also exercised from top-down. Fear of damaging a relationship can be present at all levels of an organization’s hierarchy; hence, downward dissent becomes a viable possibility. This fact affects how public and hidden transcripts influence people’s decision to express dissent or not.
When managers can no longer live with their own silence about organizational problems and dissatisfactions, yet are reluctant to voice those complaints to those who are higher in the organizational hierarchy, they might then decide to express their dissent downward to their subordinates. Hence, the extended model of employee dissent in this study marks a deviation from traditional approaches of voice and dissent by calling for the treatment of voice and dissent in a manner that focuses less on positional power and more on the dynamics of communication. This fact leads me to define employee dissent as a communicative act that is regulated by perceived power and fear and that is intended to question the organizational status quo. Figure 1 shows the impact of power and fear on employee choice for the expression of dissent.

The findings of the study conducted in phase one suggest that both managers and subordinates control the dynamics of dissent and the way it is exercised. According to Saunders, Sheppard, Knight, and Roth (1992), "because there is a difference in power between supervisors and employees, employees need to consider how their supervisors will manage employee voice before they speak up. Supervisors act as ‘voice managers’ whenever they receive input from employees" (p. 242). The most important finding of this study is that fear also regulates the way organizational members exercise expressive dissent and suppressive dissent.

The boundaries between public transcripts (dissent) and hidden transcripts (silence) are permeable. It is worth noting that original meaning of ‘hidden transcripts’ as defined by Scott (1990) is a state where hidden transcripts are shared at a group level with the purpose of subverting power and authority.
However, this study does not treat hidden transcripts in the same way. In this study, a hidden transcript does not necessarily have to function as subversive or to be shared at a group level. In other words, muted dissent does not have to be shared at a group level, and silence can occur without a subversive purpose. However, muted dissent is similar to a hidden transcript in that both of them are covert processes, and when a situation is no longer tolerated, dissent is overtly expressed and vice versa. In addition to that, employees’ perceptions of fear and power affect the selection of the form of dissent. The next section explains how an employee's choice of one of these dimensions is affected by perceptions of power and fear based on the model illustrated in Figure 1.
Upward Dissent: Low Fear, Low Power

Upward dissent entails perceptions of low levels of fear and low levels of potential for retaliation. This view is supported by Kassing (1997) who noted, "employees articulate their dissent when they believe they will be perceived as constructive and their dissent will not lead to retaliation" (p. 326). The perception of the absence of retaliation or low levels of negative consequences reduces any perceived power gap. Similarly, Saunders et al. (1992) found that employees report a greater likelihood of expressing voice when they perceive their managers to be responsive to and approachable with employee opinions. Moreover, Kassing (1997) argued that upward dissent entails open and direct expression to management, supervisors, and corporate officers. Edmondson (2003) also found that individuals speak up easily when leaders downplay power, hence low power in the y-axis of upward dissent as illustrated in Figure 1.

As indicated in the literature, employees engage in upward dissent when they believe they have a high-quality relationship with their supervisor (Kassing, 2011b). This high quality relationship reduces the fear that what they say to their supervisor might harm that relationship. When an employee believes that he/she can safely speak, then he/she breaks his/her silence. When silence is overcome, assuming that the risk taken is rewarded with a positive reaction on the part of the supervisor, fear is further reduced, hence low fear in the x-axis of upward dissent. In general, when employees perceive that their dissent will be perceived as constructive, there should be less hesitation with respect
to the expression of that dissent. Therefore, I suggest that upward dissent is more likely to occur when a dissenter perceives low levels of fear and low levels of retributive power.

Downward Dissent: Low/Medium Fear, Low Power

Downward dissent is expressed from a supervisor to his/her subordinate. When managers start suspecting, questioning, and expressing dissatisfaction and disagreement (downward dissent) toward employees' actions, they might express their dissatisfaction to their subordinates directly (e.g., directly express dissent to subordinate) or indirectly (e.g., by dissenting about their subordinates' acts to the subordinates’ peers as the findings of this study have suggested). Managers might feel comfortable expressing downward dissent because they possess positional power, so they believe that subordinates, due to their low levels of power, cannot act on any instrumental threats, like a negative job evaluation, hence low power on the y-axis as shown in Figure 1. However, when supervisors express dissent to their subordinates, they still can experience low to medium levels of fear toward their subordinates because, despite the manager’s positional power, he/she does not want to lose or damage relationships or create a negative impression of him/herself (social fear), hence medium fear on the x-axis (see Figure 1).

Bounded Dissent: Low Power, Low Fear

Low perception of power and high perception of fear is the case with lateral dissent. This form of dissent occurs "when employees believe they will be perceived as adversarial, but also feel they have some safeguard against retaliation" (Kassing, 1997, p. 326). Kassing suggested that employees have a safeguard against retaliation when they engage in lateral dissent because of the absence of power dynamics among coworkers. In
a different publication, Kassing (2011b) noted, "It follows that lateral dissent would associate with emotional venting. It is among coworkers that employees can vent their frustrations about troubling issues and about their lack of opportunities to address those issues with management" (p. 231). While emotional venting might be expressed to authority, it generally occurs among those who share the same levels of power. That is why employees experience low levels against retaliation due to the low levels of power among coworkers, hence, low power on the y-axis of bounded dissent (see Figure 1).

Expression of bounded dissent usually entails balanced positional power (e.g., coworkers). Therefore, employees feel safe to vent or express bounded dissent to coworkers. Similarly, low levels of fear can be experienced due to the fact that employees might feel that relationships will not be harmed. In other words, expressing bounded dissent requires taking fewer risks of instrumental threats (power), and social threats such as face-threatening and relational threat (fear). Fear from being viewed negatively, being viewed as a complainer, and/or damaging a relationship are minimal when dissent is expressed to coworkers. That is why bounded dissent can occur when there are low levels of fear, hence low fear on the x-axis (see Figure 1).

*Muted Dissent: High Power, High fear*

Finally, muted dissent occurs when there are perceptions of the existence of a significant power imbalance (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Morrison and Rothman (2009) argued that feelings of power can inflate how managers view their own competence, and viewing power this way can cause managers to show dominant behaviors that can, in turn, stifle and suppress employee voice. Findings from this study suggest that
participants refrained from speaking due to a power imbalance. Most participants kept silent to avoid negative evaluation at the end of the year, or missing out on a potential promotion. They perceived their supervisors as having control over rewards and punishments, hence high power in the silence quadrant (see Figure 1).

The findings of this study also suggest that employees remain silent due to social fear. This includes fear from damaging relationships, fear from embarrassing others, and fear from being viewed negatively (e.g., as a troublemaker). This fact leads me to suggest that high levels of perceived fear can inhibit employees from speaking up, hence high fear in the quadrant for silence.

Because the findings of this study suggested that silence is pervasive, it was necessary to suggest this form of reaction as one of the dimensions of dissent, which I labeled as muted dissent as illustrated earlier in Figure 1. Previous dissent models (e.g., Kassing, 1997) were tailored to individualistic settings, whereas evidence from this study suggests that Kassing's model cannot be fully transferred to collectivistic cultures where muted dissent is a very pervasive response to workplace dissatisfaction.

In short, drawing on silence and dissent literature and building on the findings of interviews conducted for this study, I have provided evidence in favor of including muted dissent as another form of response toward workplace frustration, disagreements, and objections of organizational practices. As findings suggest in this study, silence is pervasive and usually is neglected. This fact led me to limit the focus of this study to employee silence (muted dissent) and its dimensions. The next section attempts to
investigate these dimensions of muted dissent by answering RQ2 that asks, “What are the antecedents and dimensions of organizational muted dissent?”

Research Question Two

As the results of research question one indicated, dissent avoidance is pervasive among employees in private sector businesses in Oman. This research also attempted to explore the reasons for dissent avoidance, or what I designate as muted dissent. During analysis of the interview data, several forms of muted dissent or silence emerged. Through a process of constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), similar categories were grouped together, resulting in four general categories of employee muted dissent: (1) disengaged muted dissent, (2) protective muted dissent, (3) supportive muted dissent, and (4) defiant muted dissent. The following section illustrates each of these in detail.

(1) Disengaged Muted Dissent

Participants reported having remained silent on different occasions in their organization because speaking up, to them, added no value or was unproductive, and they reported it was a waste of time and futile. Disengaged muted dissent occurs when employees reach a stage of futility with but are disengaged from organizational reality. They believe that speaking up is not effective. One participant put it as follows: “so why bother speaking up?” Muted dissent was reported as having been experienced by 21 (91%) participants out of the 23. Disengaged muted dissent is not based on fear but on futility as in silence (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). This fact is evident in electrical engineer Majid's words:
It is not only the fear of not taking the action… Sometimes you are just, it is like giving up. It is a perception that these guys will not listen to you so why do you bother yourself and express your ideas. They do not deserve to… they do not appreciate employees who just try to think for them, they want just followers. The relation is like a master and a follower. So, they would appreciate the full agreement in the meeting, rather than a discussion.

Sara, a marketing director, shared her experience with sexual harassment, directed toward her from one male co-worker. She reported having observed this wrongdoing by this male employee, but she decided to remain silent. The reason behind her silence was that she heard that other staff members had complained but management did not take any action, so she decided to keep silent about it. This is evident in the following interaction with her:

I: Can you share with me a situation or story of a time when you observed a wrongdoing by a coworker and you chose to keep silent? Can you explain what happened? What prompted you to remain silent?

P: Overt flirting from a certain staff member which was so disrespectful to the females at the workplace. This once kept me quiet because I heard of previous complaints about him and no action taken.

The belief that speaking is a waste of time was also expressed from top-down, or what I called earlier “downward dissent.” For example, Ammar, an account manager, stated that he chose to remain silent regarding things he did not agree with because, even if he did say something, no one would have taken action. He said even his direct
supervisor had the same belief that there was no point expressing dissent due to the futility of such efforts. The following interview excerpt summarizes Ammar’s view about muted dissent or silent dissent:

The thing is that, regardless of whether you speak up or you do not speak up, nobody will hear your voice. Even if they do, they never change. Even my direct manager, himself, tells me at work, do your work, and go back to your home, do not speak up. And do not get involved regarding your voice about strategy or planning. As if he was telling me there is no point speaking up because the organization is already a rotten fruit.

Another example that supports disengaged muted dissent was articulated by Basheer, a sales and applications specialist, who said speaking up is futile:

I: But how do you look at your own voice and your own disagreements about how things are done at work?
P: Sometimes, if I want to talk about an issue, they have totally a different point of view, totally different. Because of that, I have no choice but to keep silent.

I: What are the factors that stop you from speaking up?
P: No reasons, but even if I speak up, there will be no actions taken.

Participants who reported that speaking up was futile and that it was a waste of time based their stories on their own experiences. However, there are narratives by participants that were based on the experiences of others. For instance, Zaid, a crane operator,
reported silent/muted dissent based on the experiences of others who had previously raised issues, but no actions were taken:

I: What stopped you from speaking up to the management about your disagreements (I mean before the strikes took place)?

P: Because there were workers in this company before me, and more experienced than me and they spoke up and raised this issue to the management, but nothing happened. There was no response.

Muted dissent is a common theme that occurred and reoccurred among 21 of the participants. Their silence behavior was shaped by organizational culture, hence a climate of silence, as Morrison and Milliken (2000) labeled it, was created. The following narrative from Ghaleb supports this fact:

I: Why were you not comfortable speaking up?

P: Because there was a barrier between me and him.

I: Would you like to tell me more about that barrier?

P: The barrier . . . he is not concerned, whatever we highlight on any issues, any concerns, he is not taking it seriously.

I: How did you know that he does not take your concerns seriously?

P: Because I have highlighted and raised issues several times, on several occasions, and there was no action. Even to confirm that he has received my . . . For example my emails, to say “okay I have received,” “I have followed up . . .” Nothing, even for a simple reply, I mean like feedback, even no feedback.
This narrative indicates that lack of feedback from managers, the lack of support and the lack of acknowledgement of subordinates’ voices, and, most importantly, lack of actions resulted in a situation of muted dissent among employees. Disengaged muted dissent is similar to acquiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003) and neglect behavior (Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992). This form of muted dissent is also indicative of exit (Hirschman, 1970) and disengaged behavior (Kahn, 1990). This finding supports previous research that points to speaking up making no difference, not being worth the effort, and being futile (Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000); additionally, when employees predict supervisor’s deafness (Bisel & Arterburn, 2012), they remain silent.

While disengaged muted dissent resembles acquiescent (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) and ineffectual silence (Brisnfield, 2009), I labeled the theme disengaged muted dissent for the following reasons. First, Pinder and Harlos (2001) characterized acquiescent silence as very passive, and the employees engaged in acquiescent silence can be less conscious of their silence and unwilling to change or as regarding their state of silence as normal. Some of these characteristics of acquiescent silence do not necessary speak to disengaged muted dissent as conceptualized in this study. For example, 21 of participants reported having engaged in disengaged muted dissent intentionally due to the suppressive forces and the norms of their organizations, but they did not indicate that they were unwilling to change.

Moreover, according to my observation of my participants' nonverbal behaviors, and their expressed feelings, it did not appear that they regarded their suppressed dissent
as normal, yet they did not have a choice but to submit to the existing reality. So, it seems
they experienced what Hirschman (1970) called “suffering in silence”. Therefore, I
labeled this as disengaged muted dissent because disengagement implies a feeling of
giving up and of suffering that is accompanied by some costs. Moreover, I did not label it
as ineffectual silence (Brinsfield, 2009) because calling this type of muted dissent
“ineffective” implies an evaluation. Words like “effective” and “ineffective” are
evaluative labels, and it is hard to evaluate unspoken behavior. Moreover, the word
“ineffective” does not imply a sense of giving up, and feelings of resignation, but the
word “disengaged” does.

Moreover, the word “disengaged” implies that employees have an agency when
choosing to suppress dissent. This agency is triggered by personal reasons, other reasons,
and organizational reasons as the participants' narratives indicate. Whilst disengaged
muted dissent is based on feelings of futility, protective muted dissent is based on
feelings of fear.

(2) Protective Muted Dissent

While previous research indicates that employees remain silent due to the fear of
negative consequences, the findings of this study introduce types and scope of perceived
negative consequences. Participants reported having engaged in protective muted dissent
to avoid negative consequences. In particular, protective muted dissent occurs when an
individual experiences fear from harming relationships, fear of a bad performance
evaluation at the end of the year, or fear of self-embarrassment (i.e., the development of a
face-threatening situation). When I asked participants the reasons they suppressed
dissent, eight said that they feared being blacklisted. For example, Ghaleb, a health safety officer, said:

If you speak up, even officially, in the professional way, the company will keep you on the blacklist, and they will treat you differently.

Similarly, Sami, a chief manager, said:

There are supervisors who will be not take it professionally, okay. That is his opinion. He is coming from so and so background, so it will end up after that session; that's all. So you will not feel any, you know… He will take revenge some other time because, you know? I was contradicting with or objecting to what he was saying. With my x-supervisor, I know his personality—that he will take revenge and he will keep me on a blacklist for maybe three or four years.

Sami went on to provide the story of an employee who was blacklisted due to his dissent behavior:

One of our employee disagreed with his supervisor and his manager as well, okay . . . because of some issues that . . . I mean his line manager, he wasn't transparent with him, so these things came into picture, and you know, there were some internal issues going on, and that's why he was put on a blacklist. He was blacklisted.

Past experiences with speaking up usually led employees to be cautious about future interactions. Sami, a chief manager, explained that employees who speak up get blacklisted while employees who agree and obey their managers’ orders get whitelisted.
The whitelisted employees are privileged. This fact is evident in the following interaction with Sami:

I: You said other employees were silent. Do you know why they did not speak up?

P: It was a department of four staff, one secretary and three managers. Of course, I am just, you know, ignoring the head of department. Two of us were blacklisted because we usually speak up, okay, and the other guy, who was on the whitelist, he used to keep quiet and obey the line manager no matter what he [the line manager] used to say. He [the whitelisted employee] was saying “okay, it is fine I will do it [complied]” …While myself and a senior staffer, . . . we did not, you know, agree with what he said all the time, so that disagreement was always there and that contradiction was always there. So we used to, you know, we used to say that, okay, we are both of us on the blacklist.

Faheem, an account manager, similarly said that, when employees speak up regarding their workplace frustrations and disagreements, they are listed under what he called a virtual blacklist. I asked him the following question:

I: Do you have any example of a time when you disagreed with those practices, but you also felt unsafe to speak up and instead remained silent?

P: Two years back, a decision was made by HR regarding some promotions. And, to be honest, the promotions were not that fair. I can say this because there were people with more experience, okay? And they were more
qualified to get those promotions. From our side . . . in our company, it is kind of—there are groups. Okay? And whenever you go and raise some concerns . . . I think we have like this virtual blacklist. I think if you keep talking, talking, talking and nagging, I think you will be on that list.

The notion of blacklisting was common among participants. So, I asked them what they meant by blacklisting. Their definitions of blacklisting referenced fears that revolved around three sub-themes: (A) relational fear, (B) face-threatening fear, and (C) instrumental fear. Participants reported that, sometimes, it was better to be on the whitelist (e.g., getting privileges like promotions, good evaluations, maintaining relationships, and positive face) than to be on the blacklist where these privileges were withheld. For this reason, I label this theme protective muted dissent.

It is worth mentioning that protective muted dissent is a self-oriented behavior and is manifested by protecting one's own relationships, protecting one's own job evaluation, and protecting one's own positive face. Drawing on participants' narratives, it was found that 18 (78%) participants reported at least one story pertinent to one of the sub-themes of protective muted dissent. These sub-themes of protective muted dissent are the three types of fear that constitute protective muted dissent. The following sections describe these sub-themes in detail.

(A) Relational Fear

Relational fear occurs when individuals are concerned about harming their relationships with others when engaging in dissent behavior. The concern that speaking up could affect relationships made participants choose to remain silent. Interestingly, this
fear was not limited to subordinates; managers feared harming their relationships with their subordinates. The fact that managers experienced this fear supports the earlier findings concerning the existence of downward dissent when conceptualizing dissent based on power and fear.

When employees predicted that their relationships with others would be damaged, they reported having suppressed dissent on issues where they internally experienced dissent. Fear from harming a relationship is consistent with the concept of the chilling effect (Roloff & Cloven, 1990). According to Roloff and Cloven (1990), fear of negative reactions from a partner is a primary reason for withholding complaints. They went on to suggest that partners withhold complaints due to the belief that even raising issues to a partner can threaten the relationship.

The key aspect of the chilling effect in organizational settings is that employees might also withhold complaints to protect harming their interpersonal relationships, as the findings of this study suggest. For example, Sami, a chief manager, when asked what stopped him from criticizing or raising issues to management, said:

Look, I usually use to avoid providing my comments freely because I do not want to spoil my relationship with my line manager. I always think, you know, that the first impression will be the last impression. So, keeping that good impression and . . . he will feel comfortable with me.

Zaid, a crane operator, said that he has observed his manager engaging in an unethical practice, but he kept silent and did not raise that to management. When I asked him what
stopped him from speaking up, his answer was that he needed to protect his relationship with his manager:

P: You know, currently, from time to time, he comes to me and he consults me. He takes my opinions on technical issues. I am the one there who does technical work, and he usually comes and asks for my opinions. Like, what do you think about moving this equipment? What do you think if we do so and so? However, if I complain about him, tomorrow he will no longer consult me. I feel comfortable when he asks me for my opinions, but if I raise complaints against him, I will lose that.

I: How do you feel when he comes and asks your opinions or when he consults you?

P: I feel recognized and I feel my status at work.

Faheem, an account manager, said that keeping good relationships with others is more important than expressing dissent. He claimed that keeping good relationships with others is a way of surviving at work. He also said that, if he has to speak up, he makes sure that their relationship is not affected:

So, you are just safe and just keep your good relations with everyone in the company and you play it right. For your benefit and for your career benefit, you keep good relationships with everyone, and whenever there is a chance where you can speak up without ruining your reputation in the company, you can express your feelings.
Similarly, Hisham, a civil engineer, reported that he did not speak up to managers despite the fact that those managers had no control over his rewards and costs. He implied that the relationship is what matters:

I: Is there something that stopped you from doing that [speaking up]?

P: Although that person did not mean anything to me, I mean he was in another department, so there was no direct interaction with him, but this is about me, I want to keep good relationships with others.

The following dialogue with Majid, an electrical engineer, indicates the imperative nature of relationships at work,

I: Since that event happened, I mean your conflict with the senior manager; could you please explain your daily interactions after the conflict? Did you notice any change?

P: Sure. You know the Omani culture, okay? It is the social relationships and good relationships that impact the business. So, if I have a good relationship with you, that can facilitate many things... I might...let's say bypass some rules just to help you, but if you just get problems from someone, then you will just be strict with the rules... deal with him [manager] as per the rules, you know, and that will impact his business and maybe the organizational business... I dealt with him in a more professional way, just following the rules and procedures, and that, honestly, will make things more complicated for him and vice versa. After this conflict, he was just trying to avoid me. I have another colleagues, my
boss, any orders, he tries to first send to my boss. Everything will be through my boss, or if he could approach another guy, another engineer.

As is described above, while employees experience fear associated with potentially harming relationships if they express dissent, they also reported having experienced fear from self-embarrassment. I have labeled this theme “face-threatening fear”.

(B) Face-Threatening Fear

This is the second sub-theme under protective muted dissent. Face-threatening fear occurs when individuals refrain from speaking up in order to protect themselves from negative impressions, from embarrassing the self to being labeled a “troublemaker,” an “eccentric” or a “complainer.” Zaid, a crane operator, observed that his rig manager was engaging in unethical behavior, but he [Zaid] did not complain about the situation. He reported that the reason behind his silence was to avoid self-embarrassment:

I: If you did complain about him, your rig manger, what would have happened?

P: I am concerned that he would have a negative impression of me. He will say “this [Zaid] is complaining about me. . . .”

I: If he has a bad impression of you, what would be the consequences?

P: Because I know that people in the management, they do not protect our privacies. For example, if I go and speak up to management, my name will leak, and they will know that I complained about him.

Similarly, Nasra, a female senior marketing specialist said:
It is an unsafe environment. How can I speak up? Managers are selective. They only accept the opinions of the selected few. If you speak up, you create enemies, and that's why employees say “yes” to get promoted. If you start expressing complaints and highlighting organizational issues, they shed a light on you and rumors get out and people start saying that [he/she] is a troublemaker. So, we are forced to remain silent to avoid being blacklisted.

Like Nasra, Kamal reported that there were times when he avoided expressing dissent because he did not want to be labeled as a troublemaker. He explained:

The fact that knowing that he is… If he has a wrong impression of me or he does not like me, I will not get, I mean I will not be good in my work… and I did not want to be the troublemaker, let us put it that way.

Ghaleb, a Health Safety and Environmental Advisor, reported having remained silent to avoid negative labels that might threaten his positive face:

P: There is fear to highlight these kinds of issues because the HR department or others would say . . . “oh, this is a problem-maker.” This is, I mean this is gathering with people, is brainwashing other guys, you know . . . this is like a group-maker. So, for some issues, everybody fears to highlight them first. For example, according to the Oman labor law, we have the right to get annual leave, but everybody is afraid to say we have that right…

I: Do you have an example of an issue where you or others have been labeled as a problem-maker?
P: Well, I know one of my colleagues, he was telling his story in this company. Basically, he applied to another company, and he was offered a better contract than the current one. And the company which he has got an offer from, its HR manager called the HR manager of this current company (the company that I am working in now) and he asked about this employee, I mean my colleague. And our HR manager told him, “this guy is a trouble-maker and a group-maker.”

As seen from this narrative that participants in this study reported having avoided speaking up to protect themselves from being labeled as troublemakers. Interestingly, Ghaleb, in his narrative, indicated that his management would refer to an individual who expressed dissent as a “group-maker” in the sense that he/she creates an oppositional group against organizational policies and practices. A group-maker, as defined by Ghaleb, is an employee who does good things with his/her peers. However, for management, according to Ghaleb, a group-maker: “basically creates a group and tries to brain-wash guys, like to talk negatively about the company, you know?”

So far, it is apparent that labels like “trouble-maker” or “group-maker” threaten the positive faces of individuals as a consequence of expressing dissent. The reason I refer to this as a face-threatening fear is because the participants did not want to be perceived as troublemakers, and they wanted to have positive face in front of others. Other participants remained silent to protect themselves from being excluded and did not want to be viewed as eccentrics. Ali, a contractor supervisor, admitted:
So, somehow, I do not want myself to be in the picture always, so the management will have the idea of, ahhh he is the only person who is always confronting us, or somehow he is always against us.

On several occasions Ali muted his dissent to protect his positive face and did not want to appear as if he was a bad guy who always disagreed. Similarly, Sameh said he kept silent in some situations to avoid any bad impressions of him. I asked him what would have been lost had he raised his voice. He responded “I did not want to look like the only one who disagrees. I do not want to create that impression.”

While relational fear and face-threatening fear are social forms of fear, there is another type of fear that has repeatedly emerged in the data. I label this fear instrumental fear. This category of fear is also the basis of the suggested dissent model as discussed in earlier sections. Instrumental fear is a perceived fear that management will retaliate if employees express dissent. The next section talks more about instrumental fear as a third sub-theme that defines protective muted dissent.

(C) Instrumental Fear

Instrumental fear occurs when employees remain silent in order to protect themselves from retaliation by authority, such as poor appraisals and evaluations. This fear harkens to punitive power (Lawler & Bacharach, 1987; Roloff & Cloven, 1990). As indicated in the literature, when individuals perceive their partners to have the power to control the rewards and costs in an interpersonal relationship, they tend to withhold their complaints so as to protect that relationship (chilling effect). Similarly, participants in this study reported that they refrained from expressing dissent due to the fact that their
managers controlled the costs and rewards available in the organization, like promotions, opportunities for training, and end of the year performance appraisals. They did not want to lose these opportunities, so they did not express dissent, at least not to their managers. Instrumental fear was obvious in my conversation with Ali:

I: I need to ask you, in general, how comfortable are you in speaking up to your managers or anyone who is above you, about work related issues that really concern you?

P: In the beginning of my career, when I started working, I was really afraid of such things. So, I tried as much as I could to not talk to my superior in a way that was really going to hit me back when it came to the end of the year performance. So, I tried to avoid a few things where I can clearly say there was a clash between my thoughts and his thoughts. So, somehow, I just, you know . . . I said, okay, go on; go on. I just go with his thoughts.

Ali went on to explain that his subordinates did not speak up either because they feared bad evaluations at the end of the year:

They [his subordinates] are afraid. They are not afraid of being fired. They know 100% no one can fire them, but they are afraid—of what? They are afraid of performance [ratings], so if they get low performance [ratings], that means increment [in salary] is not big and bonus is not huge. So, then, what really matters . . . is money . . . how much you give me . . .

Similarly, Ghaleb avoided speaking up about issues related to human resources because of the fear from being given a bad performance evaluation at the end of the year. He gave
a story of his friend who ended up with bad evaluations and who was not nominated for training due to his expression of dissent. Ghaleb explained:

If you are going to apply somewhere . . . This is an example; this is a true fact and happened to my colleague, and they treated him differently, and they did not face him. They will treat or will not face you in front of you; they will do anything the way they want. They will not give you maybe promotion; I mean, even during a performance appraisal, they will bring any excuses. When you apply for training, because according to our agreement [contract] we are entitled to go abroad to attend two courses yearly, and so basically, if you apply to some of these facilities, they will try to block you, to get nothing. That is if you are on their blacklist.

Sometimes employees use muted dissent to protect themselves from **sideline effect** (one of recurring themes), a state where management treats one employee differently from others due to his or her dissent actions or other reasons. Sideline effect is an example of something that can create instrumental fear because a victim is put “on the side” as an alternative or an option B when it comes to instrumental rewards. This is evident in Ghaleb's story:

Basically there were new comers coming and [management] they promoted them and I talked to my boss and I felt that, they were not really ready to promote me yet. Basically I was not feeling comfortable because the way they treated me was different from others.
Similarly, Sami, a chief manager, as pointed out earlier said that whitelisted employees get privileges while blacklisted employees are put on the side or are blocked from receiving instrumental rewards. Fuad is a technical operator. He implied that managers have the power of retaliation and control rewards and costs. He reported having avoided speaking up in some situations because of fear from being blacklisted. The following interaction with him defines instrumental fear and what he meant by being blacklisted:

I: If someone is blacklisted, what would happen to him?

P: For example, if you ask something or request something from the company, they become aggressive toward you. Do you understand?

I: What do you mean they can become aggressive?

P: I mean, they do not process your requests. For example, if I wanted to go on emergency leave or request asked for a temporary replacement for a day, or I have urgent circumstances, they will never take this into consideration.

Mohammed, a project specialist, said that employees in his organization usually keep silent because managers control performance appraisals and training opportunities. I asked him if he could tell me why his colleagues did not speak up:

Sometimes it is their mentality. Here, the boss is right. Even if my opinion is right, I will accept whatever the manager will say. After all, he has the appraisal, and I need to get promoted; I need to keep my job; I need to have good relationship with him. So he can give me training; he can do this and this. So they
[my colleagues and I] wanted to avoid any conflict with that manager, even if he was wrong.

Synthesis

The aforementioned narratives indicate that participants in this study refrained from speaking in order to protect their relationships with others, to protect their self-image, and to protect themselves from poor performance evaluations. These three types of fear (relational, face-threatening, and instrumental) produce (or contribute to) protective muted dissent. This form of silence is different from disengaged muted dissent in that it [protective muted dissent] is governed by feelings of fear. Protective muted dissent is similar to quiescent silence (Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Pinder & Harlos, 2001), and defensive silence (Brinsfield, 2009; Van Dyne et al., 2003) as fear is a common characteristic of those forms of silence. The reason I labeled this form of muted dissent as protective is due to the fact that participants employed the phrase "to protect myself" multiple times. For example, Fareed mentioned the phrase “to protect myself” more than 15 times during his interview. This fact is evident in the following interaction with him:

I: So, why did you not speak up and express your disagreement, given that you knew it was a failed project?

P: Why should I bring problems to myself?

I: What kind of problems?

P: If I disagree with him . . . I will feel . . . I mean I want to achieve something . . . so personally I want to protect myself. . . .
Moreover, the word *defensive*, as in “defensive silence” (Van Dyne et al., 2003), implies that there is a force coming from an external environment and an individual is expected to position him/herself against this external force or attack. In other words, to defend one's own position implies taking overt action; however, this is not the case in muted dissent because muted dissent involves hiding one’s position and, thus, is a covert act. The word “protective” implies the nature and complexity of a hidden transcript (Scott, 1990) because the response to the fear is not that of directly confronting (i.e., interacting with) the source of that fear but, instead, giving the public appearance of agreement. If an employee remains silent about issues where private dissent exists, then that employee need not defend him/herself. The suppressed or muted dissent provides protection from what he/she perceives as being the reality of organizational practices. Furthermore, the word “protect” implies an action that is initiated by an individual. Individuals intentionally remain silent, and this action is a discretionary act taken by an individual; hence, it is more suitable to call this theme or form of muted dissent “protective”.

Protective muted dissent is similar to the MUM effect (Rosen & Tesser, 1970). While the MUM effect is limited to sharing bad news, protective muted dissent is broader in the sense that individuals remain silent about organizational complaints, disagreements, work frustrations, and general work practices due to relational fear, face-threatening fear, and/or instrumental fear. Protective muted dissent is similar to psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) in terms of fear. Psychological safety is defined as "a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk taking" (Edmondson, 1999,
p. 354). It follows that the lack of psychological safety predicts protective muted dissent. Similarly the lack of opportunity for voice (Avery & Quiñones, 2002) can predict protective muted dissent. Figure 2 illustrates a visual picture of the relationships among protective muted dissent and types of fear that influence individuals toward dissent avoidance.

Engaging in protective muted dissent does not indicate an individual's preferred state of response toward organizational complaints, bad practices, and disagreements. In other words, employees who engage in protective muted dissent can be referred to “as suffering in silence”, similar to Hirschman’s (1970) description of those who engage in “loyalty” as a response to organizational dissatisfaction. However, there are moments when individuals remain silent without “suffering,” per se. This is an example of the third theme of muted dissent that emerged from data and will be discussed in the next section.
Figure 2. Protective muted dissent and its sub-themes.

(3) Supportive Muted Dissent

While protective muted dissent is a self-oriented behavior (i.e., intended to protect one's own image, one's own relationship, and one's own good performance evaluation), supportive muted dissent is other-oriented behavior where the focus is on others and on the organization. In other words, supportive muted dissent is a state where an employee...
fails to speak up in order to support and/or benefit other members or to support organizational practices. This other-protection can take different forms.

Suppressing one’s dissent in order to support others can be manifested in behaviors that avoid embarrassment for others. This is evident in participants' narratives when they were asked the reasons for suppressing dissent toward practices with which they did not agree. For example, Ali, pointed out, "I did not really want to hit him—attack my supervisor with my words and this stuff—because, you know, it might hurt him". Similarly, Sami, another participant, said, "you should avoid, you know, like, embarrassing your boss or your line manager by commenting on what he, whatever he has suggested in front of some particular managers". Sami went on to explain that he did not want to let his boss down: "I know if I am contradicting with him [in front of his boss] at that particular point, it is like, you know, I am bringing him down, or I am letting him down". This view was echoed by Hisham, a civil engineer, who said, "So, I do not want to create problems and also, as I told you, I like my lead [manager]. I do not want to damage his reputation. So, I do not want to go over his head". Similarly, Issa, an assistant manager said, "he might be intimidated by company officials, and he will not be in a position to act freely, so it can affect his career path within the organization".

Some participants reported that they did not speak up about their workplace dissatisfaction in order to protect their bosses from being replaced. For instance, Zaid, a crane operator, reported having suppressed dissent in order to protect his boss. The following interaction with him supports this view:
I: If I recall, you said that your rig manager is bribing the inspector to pass the equipment; do you agree that this is unethical behavior?

P: Yes.

I: What stopped you from raising that unethical behavior to top management? At the end of the day, you are the one who operates the cranes. If you operate equipment that did not pass the inspection, you can get yourself injured? It is unsafe.

P: Because I have fear that the rig manager will be replaced.

Zaid's experience above uncovers an important aspect of supportive muted dissent. Specifically, supportive muted dissent does not necessarily mean supporting a common good. In Zaid's story, we can see that he kept silent to support his direct manager from being questioned or from being replaced, so he supported his manager's actions, even though those actions arguably put him at a personal risk. Similarly, Issa, an assistant manager, reported that he had kept silent in some situations in order to avoid harming others:

I: So, are you also concerned about his [your manager’s] career or your career?

P: Mine, and even his…So, for example some decisions might be made although they might not be perfect, just to . . . I'll not say to please others but at least to not harm others, let me put it like that.

At the organizational level, individuals might decide to remain silent and suppress their own views and opinions that are related to dissatisfactions for the sake of supporting
organizational tasks. Kamal, a production measurement specialist, shared his story of a time when he remained silent to support the need to complete an organizational task on time even though he disagreed with the entire process,

What I understood was my manager's manager wanted to close the job and get the job done, someone to review and then it is done. The quality of work was not, to me, it was not good; it did not really fit the standard. I mean, it should not be accepted. So, this means that my manager's manager made a wrong decision in actually contracting out this job. . . . Then he came back [the authority] saying, but now… it is end of the year and this job should be closed now. We have contracted it out and we need to close and process the payment and close…the chapter. I [Kamal] wanted to do it my way, but I . . . we can close that chapter. Again, I did not want to say “I accept this; I reviewed it and I accept it,” because, inside me, I did not accept it, but he wanted to close it.

Kamal's story above indicates that sometimes he has had to remain silent, i.e., suppress his own views, in order for a project to be completed on deadline. I regard this example as engaging in muted dissent in order to support the organization. It is worth mentioning that there are always unintended consequences and because of that, supportive muted dissent is not necessarily enacted in support of outcomes as much as in support of the process. That is why it is difficult to claim this form of muted dissent is a proactive behavior with respect to outcomes, but it can be proactive with respect to process. This is because, if Kamal had expressed his opinion, the project he was part of might have not been delivered on time because he was also a key player in the project. Kamal went on to
say that “sometimes, we do not need to say all what we believe to be true,” and he implied that we should remain silent because remaining silent can be a supportive act.

Speaking up can be a double-edged sword. He argued,

You get to a stage where I should not say all what I believe in; I mean I should be selective. You learn diplomacy, let's put it in this way. When you start working and you have goals you want to achieve, you have beliefs that you should stick to; going 100% with your goals against your beliefs is not good… I believe, also, the other way around: saying all you believe in is also not good.

Similar to Kamal's example, Mohammed, reported that he kept silent regarding his disagreements in order to facilitate his team's task:

I: So you do not speak because you want to have good representation of the team?

P: Yeah.

I: Why does it matter to you if the team shows its reality, its real identity?

P: Maybe it is a positive attitude to not break up… to continue supporting each other and hoping that, in time, the working environment or the dynamics between the team will improve and things will improve. So, I do not want, if I speak up and show them as a weak point or something like this, that will affect the future teamwork.

Asim, head of an HR section, reported that employees suppress their dissent in order avoid making management feel bad. The following dialogue with him explains:
I: What about your other employees? Can you tell me how they express dissent?

P: Most of them prefer to keep silent.

I: What do you think the reasons are?

P: I think they prefer silence because they want to live in peace. The boat is moving, and everybody else is clapping.

I: Can you talk more about “to live in peace”?

P: I mean, they would see wrongdoing or they would see problems in front of them or even sometimes their own rights are violated, but they prefer to live the situation and they try their best not to make the management or their direct supervisors mad . . . So, they prefer to ride the wave, and leave everything untouched.

Asim indicated that employees experience workplace frustrations and dissatisfactions, but they do that to support where the boat is going (where the organization is going). This is evident when he said, "They want to live in peace. The boat is moving and everybody else is clapping" and “To ride the wave, and leave everything untouched."

We can infer from the narratives that individuals engage in supportive muted dissent to support other people's images and to support organizational tasks. The dividing line between protective and supportive muted dissent is that the former focuses on the self, and the latter on others. Supportive muted dissent is similar to prosocial silence (Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Van Dyne et al., 2003), and relational silence (Brinsfield, 2009). To avoid the multiple meanings of prosocial silence (e.g., withholding information
due to its confidentiality; and to reveal confidential information to outsiders), I adopted the label supportive muted dissent. Yet, supportive muted dissent still shares several characteristics with prosocial silence. For example, an individual might engage in supportive muted dissent based on cooperative motivation, altruism, benefiting others, and/or to support the organization (Van Dyne et al., 2003). While supportive muted dissent can be a proactive form of suppressive communication, there are times when employees engage in muted dissent but their motive is not grounded in the desire to be supportive. I call this form of muted dissent defiant.

(4) Defiant Muted Dissent

Previous forms of muted dissent (disengaged, protective, and supportive) were drawn from the themes that emerged in this study and were supported by previous research on employee silence (e.g., Brinsfield, 2009; Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). In this section, I introduce defiant muted dissent as an extension of existing conceptualizations of employee silence and muted dissent behaviors. To my knowledge, based on a review of the literature, defiant muted dissent has not yet been introduced or discussed in organizational dissent and silence literature. Defiant muted dissent is a state where an individual superficially supports public transcripts while implicitly and genuinely activating a hidden transcript. Therefore, I define defiant muted dissent as a state where an individual withholds genuine views while superficially supporting public positions. The individual implicitly activates hidden dissent through prolonging or disagreeing with the public position in question when acting, but does not verbally express disagreement.
when discussing the situation. Interview data suggested two main narratives that manifested defiant muted dissent: defiant muted dissent through behaviors that prolong situations and defiant muted dissent through disagreement expressed through actions but not words.

Defiant Muted Dissent Through Prolonging

The following interaction with Saif, an HR manager, illustrates muted dissent as a form of resistance by prolonging or buying time with the hope that those in authority or the manager will change his/her mind:

I: Could you please tell me where you observed a wrong doing by your supervisor and what was your reaction?

P: I can say that…if you just stand head to head against him [manager] and say, “You cannot do that”—see you have to be diplomatic. I delay it a little bit—that process. So I can go to the next day and convince him that what we are doing is completely wrong. I kept delaying it for long time. I did not do it [what he was ordered to do by the authority], actually, because I knew it was wrong, but I cannot tell him to his face. No way I can do it.

I: So, you kept silent at that moment? Why you did not just tell him?

P: I told him it is okay. I know what you are saying [addressing his manager]. I know the situation of that person [a person he was asked to recruit on the basis of favoritism], and he is in hardship, and we want to recruit him. "We have a lot of people like that. Come on" [saying to himself]. And
then, at the end of the day, I just draw back a little bit, and I went back to my office, thinking about another way to approach him [his manager], so this is sort of a diplomatic thing. And by keeping delaying, he might know the consequences of his [the manager’s] action. At the end of the day, I managed to not go as per his decision.

I: So, you did not express your internal voice.

P: In certain way, I played in a diplomatic way. I told him [the manager], we are going to do whatever you want, but we need a little bit more time. We need to do so and so. I did this just, you know, to save time.

I: So, if I understand you, another way to express your voice, I mean, one strategy you follow, is to delay taking action so as to buy time?

P: Yes, because I know the personality that I am dealing with. It depends. Some of them, they accept, and some of them are arrogant. They want to do it in their way, and it depends on the personality, but in my situation, this is what I have done. . . . The situation that we have right now, if I go and argue those things at that moment, then everything will be spoiled and cannot be fixed. I play with the time.

I should emphasize that muting dissent or suppressing dissent does not mean that one is not necessarily vocalizing any words. Defiant muted dissent is a failure to openly verbalize one's own views and disagreements. Saif's narrative above indicates he spoke and agreed with his boss’s idea to recruit someone based on favoritism, but his ethics did not allow him to do that. Instead, he chose to agree verbally with his boss, stating that
actions will be taken while, at the same time, he withheld his own genuine view that this action was wrong and unethical. In order to defy his boss's request without voicing his genuine view on the issue, he withheld his view and decided to delay taking action for a long time, hoping that his boss would forget or would change his mind. This is an example of prolonging as a function of defiant muted dissent, i.e., as a strategy to engage in silent dissent.

*Defiant Muted Dissent Through Disagreement in the Action*

Another strategy in defiant muted dissent is to disagree with the action when acting, but not verbally express disagreement when discussing the situation. I regard this as defiant muted dissent because an individual fails to express his/her true opinion. Majid said that the majority of employees in his company remained silent, with some of them engaging in defiant muted dissent by verbally agreeing when discussing a situation but then not acting. He described this pattern by saying, “They disagree in the action when they act, not verbally when they discuss”. The following dialogue with him illustrates defiant muted dissent:

P: You see, maybe it is the atmosphere that the bosses underestimate the capabilities and the way of thinking of their subordinates, you know? So, subordinates, over time, will be familiar with this. Just listening to them, shaking their [the subordinates’] heads and just saying “right,” agree from time to time, okay, and after the meeting they will do whatever they want. They [subordinates] will not follow these orders, and it will continue the same.
I: So, they do not disagree?

P: They disagree in the action—when they act—not verbally when they discuss. Yeah.

I: So, when the management realizes that employees disagreed orders, what do managers do?

P: They start blaming managers and line managers that “we have said you have to do this, times and times, and nobody is implementing it.” It just continues with other issues and other problems . . . They [subordinates] disagree [intrapersonally], but they believe that there is no need to argue or engage in long discussions or anything, just bypass their orders [manager’s order] and do whatever they [the subordinates] believe is right. Similarly, Ammar, an account manager, reported that he usually does not express his true disagreements verbally; however, he does what he sees as being right. The following interaction with him elaborates this:

I: Did you comply with their [managers] orders?

P: No, I do it on their backs hahaa [laughs]. . . . For me, I believe that keeping the customer informed helps him, and he [the customer] feels more comfortable because he feels that we did not neglect him, but we are working on his request. This is my opinion, but the organization has a different opinion.

I: So, do you still keep silent regarding this issue?
P: They gave me two warning letters, but I disregarded the letters because I know, internally, that what I am doing is not wrong. I know what I am doing, and I am responsible for what I am doing. I do not express my opinion or justify it, but I put it in action.

Similarly, Zaid, a crane operator, reported that management tried to impose a practice with which he did not agree. He could not express his disagreement; instead, he just did what he felt was right:

I: Did you try to convince him [the manager] that you have a better way?
P: He wanted it that way, so I just complied.

I: My question is: have you expressed your disagreement to him?
P: It depends. Only when he is in a good mood. But most of the time, when he tells me to do the job based on his way, I tell him 'inshallah' [sure, with the willing of God] I will do it, but then I do it according to my way.

I: You do it without his permission?
P: Without his permission. Sometimes if I have disagreements with him, I do not express or impose my views in front of him. . . . After I have taken action, then I just go and tell him what I did based on what I know is right.

In summary, so far I have discussed the findings of the qualitative data. Four general dimensions of muted dissent emerged from the participants’ interviews: disengaged, protective, supportive, and defiant (see Figure 3). The next section reports conceptualization of the muted dissent model.
Conceptualizing Muted Dissent

This part of the dissertation discusses the conceptualization process of the concept of muted dissent. For this discussion, I used the guidelines for conceptualizing and operationalizing processes as suggested by Jaccard and Jacoby (2010), and Viswanathan (2005). This section starts by suggesting a definition of muted dissent. The discussion covers how the suggested definition is differentiated from its related expressive and suppressive forms of communication. This process will be achieved by delineating the domain of muted dissent from other existing constructs.

Figure 3. Dimensions of organizational muted dissent.
Previous Usage and Motivation

I begin by returning briefly to the motivation for conceptualizing and operationalizing muted dissent as argued in Chapter One. We have seen from the literature review and from the findings of phase one of this study that dissent expression is not always a viable option. We also learned that organizations have powerful norms that often suppress employee expression of personal views (Argyris, 1977; Morrison & Milliken, 2000). We saw that participants in the interview study reported avoiding speaking up about practices with which they did not agree. This fact suggests the pervasiveness of dissent suppression behavior.

These findings offer a legitimate rationale for paying rigorous attention to the motives for dissent suppression and to theorizing about the suppression process. For example, other constructs related to this phenomenon (e.g., employee voice, organizational dissent, and employee silence) have either focused on general overt communicative behaviors (as is true with employee voice) or a more suppressive communicative behavior (as is true with employee silence). Employee silence has been conceptualized on a more abstract level to include all forms of suppressive communication forms. I argue that employee silence should be studied in a more systematic and specific way. One possibility, as suggested in this study, is to consider the different types of silence that are specifically related to issues of disagreement and objection (messages related to dissent). These types of messages I consider to be defined by the targets about which individuals remain silent, with “target” as used here indicating not the person being addressed but the purpose of the conversation.
Most of the reviewed definitions treat employee silence as a general construct by focusing on silent behavior toward forms of communication in general, such as ideas, views, suggestions, advice, and concerns (Brinsfield, 2012; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003). Although focusing on employee silence regarding general issues is imperative in understanding silence behavior at a more abstract level, in doing so we lose the specificity of issues about which someone is keeping silent. For instance, an individual who remains silent regarding issues pertinent to improving a specific practice or to providing a suggestion experiences different anticipated outcomes compared to an individual who remains silent regarding issues with which he/she does not agree. In other words, a manager might not retaliate toward an employee who offers suggestions, ideas, or opinions. However, an individual who points out problems, questions management, or expresses objections and disagreement to an authority might anticipate negative repercussions.

In her study of organizational voice, Morrison (2011) argued that an employee who keeps silent in order to protect him/herself, “may be less prominent for suggestion-focused voice than for problem-focused or opinion focused voice, as the former may be seen as less personally risky” (p. 398). This fact suggests that type of message can dictate a person’s choice as to speak up or remain silent. When defining employee silence as a general construct that is comprised of all forms of communication or types of messages, we might draw conclusions that are not necessarily true for silence that is defined at a more specific level (e.g., suppressing suggestions; and suppressing dissent). Due to these reasons, I suggest muted dissent as a new construct that refers to a person’s response of
silence despite possessing a dissenting viewpoint. In order to advance our understanding of the scope and nature of employee silence and dissenting behavior, I suggest a definition of muted dissent as elaborated in the next section.

**Muted Dissent Defined**

After an extensive conceptualization process based on a review of the literature and the findings of phase one of this study, muted dissent is defined as “a state in which an individual (or individuals) experiences what he/she (they) believes to be a genuine objection and/or disagreement about one or more organizational practices and/or policies, and has access to an individual(s) deemed to be in positions to have an influence or to make needed changes, but intentionally suppresses his/her (their) views due to perceived or experienced threats, due to feelings of resignation, or due to prosocial motives”.

**Domain Delineation**

The above definition treats muted voice or employee silence in terms of dissenting behavior. This process of moving from an abstract level to a more specific level helps to differentiate constructs. Jaccard and Jacoby (2010) stated, “one way in which theories differ is in terms of the abstractness of the concepts used in the framework” (p. 75). To make a conceptual definition clear and concise for the purpose of measurement, a process of instantiation is used. Jaccard and Jacoby (2010) defined instantiation as “a deliberate process that involves specifying concrete instances of abstract concepts in order to help clarify their meaning” (p. 76). Hence, I describe the instances or properties of the aforementioned definition of muted dissent in the next section.
The definition of muted dissent treats the individual as the unit of analysis. Jaccard and Jacoby (2010) pointed out that many behaviors in the social sciences have four main elements: (1) an action, (2) an object or target, (3) a setting, and (4) time. First, the action in the above definition is that of intentional suppression of one’s own point of view. Second, the object or target here is “objections and disagreements about organizational practices and/or policies”. Third, the setting is limited to conversations that symbolically invoke the organization. The fourth element is time. According to the definition above, the time element of muted dissent is identified as involving those moments when an individual has the opportunity to express dissent but chooses to remain silent. The keyword of the time element lies in the word “experiences”: “experiences what he/she (they) believes to be genuine objections”. Whenever an individual experiences the urge to disagree but suppresses his/her dissent, he/she is considered to have engaged in muted dissent.

Having specified the target of muted dissent, it is worth mentioning the audience for the muted dissent. According to the definition, the audience of muted dissent is that of “individual(s) deemed to be in positions to have an influence or to make needed changes”. These individuals could be direct supervisors, managers, or anyone (even a peer or a subordinate) who is assumed to be in a position to make a change. Sometimes there are people who do not have the power to make a final decision but are believed to have the influence or capacity of a kind that can potentially help to make a change. That is why the definition acknowledges audiences who have influence or are thought to be capable of making change.
The definition is limited to instances where an individual intentionally chooses to remain silent. This fact differentiates muted dissent from other conceptualizations of employee silence that treat silence as “a more automatic response that neither requires, nor often involves, conscious recognition of alternatives or weighing of costs and benefits” (Kish-Gephart et al., 2009, p. 167).

Another property of the definition is that muted dissent takes place, in some instances, within the context of “perceived or experienced threats.” As suggested in the findings of phase one of this study, it is also possible that an individual will engage in muted dissent due to his/her past experiences or the stories of others. While previous definitions of employee silence failed to recognize the perceived and actual threats, this definition takes into account both types of threats.

The final properties of muted dissent are: threats, feelings of resignation, or prosocial motives. These properties speak to the typologies of muted dissent as conceptualized in this study. For example, threats here comprise instrumental threats (e.g., retaliation by authority), face threats (e.g., negative impression or identity management, negative labels), and relational threats (e.g., harming relationships). Feelings of resignation are defined by feelings of futility and that speaking up would not be worth the effort. Individuals might also suppress their dissent to avoid harming others or harming organizational tasks, a unit, or the entire organization. This is driven by prosocial motives. Instantiation of the definition alone is not enough to delineate the domain of muted dissent. Viswanathan (2005) suggested other processes for domain
delineation, such as differentiating the construct from other constructs (e.g., what it is, and what it is not), and level of analysis.

Superordinate Constructs

It is worth mentioning that muted dissent is part of a larger class of concepts that are related to overt and suppressive communicative behaviors (Hewlin, 2003). For example, muted dissent can be considered as part of suppressive behavior, such as employee silence. Pinder and Harlos (2001) defined employee silence as an act of “withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual's behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his or her organizational circumstances to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress” (p. 334). Most employee silence definitions treat silence at a broad and abstract level, as exemplified by Pinder and Harlos (2001). However, muted dissent, as suggested in this study, has a more narrow focus limited to dissenting forms of communication.

Both silence and dissent fall on the spectrum of suppressive communication behavior. The difference between muted dissent and employee silence is parallel to the difference between employee voice and organizational dissent. Premeaux and Bedeian (2003) defined employee voice as, "openly stating one’s views or opinions about workplace matters, including the actions or ideas of others, suggested or needed changes, and alternative approaches or different lines of reasoning for addressing job-related issues" (p. 1538). While employee voice references general forms of communication (e.g., ideas, views, suggestions, and feedback), dissent is limited specifically to contradictory views and opinions (Kassing, 1997). Analogously, while employee silence
references general forms of suppressive communication, muted dissent is limited to the suppression of contradictory views and opinions. In short, while dissent is a specific form of employee voice, muted dissent is a specific form of employee silence.

Another construct that might be considered as superordinate to muted dissent is *employee resistance*. O'Connell Davidson (1994) defined resistance as individual or collective actions that workers perform and which managers oppose. He went on to say that resistance can be manifested by strikes and work-to-rules. Employee resistance is, in effect, a direct challenge to authority that is overtly manifested. Kassing (2011a) argued that organizational dissent is a form of resistance. The difference, then, between organizational dissent and muted dissent is analogous to the difference between employee voice and employee silence in terms of level of specificity and in type of communication (expressive, and suppressive). While, in a situation of dissent, some employees might choose to engage with authority, specifically expressing contradictory opinions (i.e., engaging in organizational dissent), other employees might choose a course of muted dissent, remaining silent with respect to their concerns.

*Differentiation from Competitor Constructs*

As we have seen, “voice” refers to a large set of communicative behaviors, including agreement, argument, offering suggestions, and providing support (Gorden, 1988). Organizational dissent is "a unique subset of employee voice that entails the expression of disagreement or contradictory opinions in the workplace" (Kassing, 1998, p. 184). Analogously, muted dissent is a unique subclass of employee silence that has a focus on objections and disagreements. Therefore, muted dissent is seen to separate itself
from parallel expressive communicative concepts (e.g., organizational dissent, organizational conflict, and upward influence).

Organizational conflict is defined as, "the interaction of interdependent people who perceive opposition of goals, aims, and values, and who see the other party as potentially interfering with the realization of these goals" (Putnam & Poole, 1987, p. 552). Muted dissent is different from conflict in that muted dissent does not necessarily involve incompatible goals, values, and aims. When an individual engages in mutated dissent, that dissent might be driven by conflict avoidance.

Upward influence is a "deliberate attempt by a subordinate to select tactics that will bring change" (Waldron, 1999, p. 253). Upward influence is similar to issue selling constructs (Ashford et al., 1998). Both upward influence and issue selling constructs are different from muted dissent in that they do not necessarily involve contradictory opinions. The reason I classified upward influence, organizational dissent, and organizational conflict as horizontally differentiated from muted dissent is because dissent, upward influence, and conflict can coincide. For example, a person who expresses upward dissent is also expressing upward influence. This indicates that dissent, upward influence, and conflict are competitor variables that fall under the expressive communicative spectrum. If an individual suppresses these behaviors, he/she engages in the suppressive communicative spectrum (muted dissent).

Another construct that could be considered as horizontally different from muted dissent is the mum effect. Both muted dissent and the mum effect are a subset of the broad construct of employee silence. “MUM” is an acronym for "keeping Mum about
Undesirable Messages to the recipient" (Rosen & Tesser, 1970, p. 254). While the MUM effect is limited to conveying bad news, muted dissent is limited to conveying disagreement and objection. The MUM effect occurs when people remain silent or refuse to deliver bad news in order to avoid negative consequences and personal discomfort.

**Subordinate Constructs**

The difference between organizational dissent and whistle-blowing rests in its level of specificity. Historically, Redding (1985) suggested that whistle-blowing is an example of the expression of dissent. Whistle-blowing is a dissent behavior that is expressed externally to a public audience (Redding, 1985; Stewart, 1980). Parallel to the difference between organizational dissent and whistle-blowing, muted dissent has a subordinate construct that is differentiated in terms of specificity—exit. Hirschman’s exit can be considered a subset of muted dissent because exit occurs when a person refrains from speaking up, choosing a more extreme behavior of quitting. Hence, we can consider exit to be a subordinate construct to muted dissent. Figure 4 illustrates a visual map of how muted dissent is differentiated from other related constructs in terms of expressive and suppressive communication and in terms of abstractness level.
Figure 4. Differentiating muted dissent.

Muted Dissent: What It Is, What It is Not

In this section, I discuss boundary conditions of the suggested conceptualization of muted dissent. The first boundary condition is the target of the muted dissent. “Target” here is defined as the object of muted dissent or message type as described earlier. For
example, a person who refrains from speaking up suppresses his/her objections (e.g., suggestions, opinions, disagreements, input, and advice) toward a target. Muted dissent, as conceptualized in this study, has a boundary of objections and disagreements. For example, when a person observes wrongdoing in an organization, he/she experiences an objection and might choose to either express or suppress that objection. If he/she suppresses the objection, then he/she is considered to have engaged in muted dissent.

Essentially, anytime an individual is dissatisfied and/or disagrees with decisions and policies but suppresses his/her dissatisfaction and disagreement, then he/she is considered to have engaged in muted dissent. If a person does not experience any disagreements, dissatisfactions, or objections but chooses to remain silent, this is not the act of muted dissent. Also, if an individual has nothing to say, i.e., has no opinion on an issue, then this is not an act of muted dissent. This is because muted dissent takes place when a person consciously and intentionally inhibits genuine dissent.

The second boundary is intentionality. If a person intentionally suppresses his/her dissent, then we can regard this as muted dissent. On the contrary, if an individual does not have enough information about a situation and cannot take a position, yet he/she remains silent because he/she does not have anything to offer, this act of silence is not muted dissent because he/she does not possess, at least yet, a contradictory position. As a third boundary, muted dissent as conceptualized here is limited to the context of organizations. Table 2 shows how muted dissent is differentiated from previous definitions of employee silence.
### Previous Definitions of Employee Silence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Morrison &amp; Milliken, 2000, p. 707)</td>
<td>&quot;Withhold … opinions and concerns about organizational problems.&quot;</td>
<td>Broad, as it includes all types of opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pinder &amp; Harlos, 2001, p. 334)</td>
<td>&quot;Withholding of any form of genuine expression about the individual's behavioral, cognitive and/or affective evaluations of his or her organizational circumstances to persons who are perceived to be capable of effecting change or redress.&quot;</td>
<td>Withholding of any form of genuine expression. A broad construct that is similar to employee voice in terms of focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Van Dyne et al., 2003, p. 1360)</td>
<td>“Intentionally withholding ideas, information, and opinions with relevance to improvements in work and work organizations.”</td>
<td>Message type is broad (e.g., ideas, information, opinions), but the function is limited to the goal of improvements at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Morrison, 2011, p. 380)</td>
<td>&quot;I therefore use the term silence to reflect 'failure to voice' (i.e., withholding input that could be shared rather than expressing such input).&quot;</td>
<td>This construct is broad (e.g., input). Input comprises any type of message (e.g., feedback, suggestion, dissent, concern, ideas). Also the underlying assumption or implication is that silence is not a desirable behavior (e.g., the word “failure” implies that silence is a passive behavior or not desirable).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Brinsfield, 2012, p. 671)</td>
<td>“Scope of situations where employees have something meaningful to say, but also feel compelled to remain silent.”</td>
<td>A multidimensional and a broad construct that includes a scope of situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Definition of Muted Dissent</td>
<td>“A state in which an individual (or individuals) experiences what he/she (they) believes to be a genuine objection and/or disagreement about one or more organizational practices and/or policies, and has access to an individual(s) deemed to be in positions to have an influence or to make needed changes, but intentionally suppresses his/her (their) views due to perceived or experienced threats, due to feelings of resignation, or due to prosocial motives.”</td>
<td>A multidimensional construct but limited to dissent (objections, disagreement, and contradictory opinions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dimensions of Muted Dissent

Turning now to dimensions of muted dissent as per the findings of phase one, I describe four different dimensions of muted dissent (disengaged, protective, supportive, and defiant muted dissent).

1- **Disengaged Muted Dissent**

Disengaged muted dissent is a state where an individual refrains from raising concerns, criticisms, disagreements, and/or workplace frustrations with individual(s) who are assumed to have power or influence to make change due to feelings of futility and/or the belief that raising concerns would be pointless and a waste of time. Basically, disengaged muted dissent occurs when employees believe that speaking up will not change a situation. Some examples of disengaged muted dissent include: "I don't speak
up at work, because I know even if I raise concerns I will just waste my time”; "Even if I speak up, it will fall on deaf ears”.

2- Protective Muted Dissent

While disengaged muted dissent is based on feelings of futility, protective muted dissent is based on threats. Protective muted dissent occurs when an individual experiences a threat to relationships, a threat to performance evaluation, or threat to self (i.e., a face-threatening situation). For example, in the case where an employee has experienced these three threats (instrumental, relational, and/or face) in the past or has perceived them as happening when someone speaks up, he/she might suppress his/her dissent.

A. Instrumental Threat

Instrumental threat occurs when employees remain silent in order to protect themselves from retaliation by authority (e.g., poor appraisals and evaluations; and prohibited from training nominations and promotion opportunities). Examples of instrumental threat include: "If I question my boss, he/she will give me a poor job evaluation”; “If I point out a problem, I will be blacklisted and never nominated for training”.

B. Relational Threat

Relational muted dissent occurs when individuals are concerned about harming their relationships with others when engaging in dissent behavior. The concern that speaking up could affect relationships could encourage employees to remain silent. An example of relational muted dissent is: “I
avoid raising concerns at work because I do not want to harm my relationship with authority”.

C. **Face Threat**

Protective muted dissent due to face-threatening motives occurs when individuals refrain from speaking up in order to protect themselves from negative impressions, and from embarrassing self (being labeled a “troubemaker”, an “eccentric”, or a “complainer”). An example of face threat motive includes: “I avoid criticizing managers at work because I do not want to embarrass myself”.

3- **Supportive Muted Dissent**

While protective muted dissent is a self-oriented behavior (i.e., intended to protect one's own image, one's own relationship, and/or one's own good performance evaluation), supportive muted dissent is other-oriented behavior where the focus is on others and/or the organization. Supportive muted dissent is a state where an employee avoids speaking up in order to support and/or benefit other members or to support organizational practices. For example, employees might suppress their dissent, criticism, or disagreement because they do not want to be the reason for delaying an ongoing project due to raising concerns. As an additional rationale, they might remain silent in order to avoid hurting others' feelings or putting others in trouble. If this happens, then it can be said that muted supportive dissent has occurred. Examples of muted supportive dissent include: "I avoid raising complaints because I don't want to hurt others' feelings”; “I
know that if I raise concerns, this might delay us or we might not meet the deadline, so I avoid speaking up”.

4- Defiant Muted Dissent

Defiant muted dissent is a state where an individual superficially supports public transcripts while implicitly and genuinely activating a hidden transcript. This fact leads me to define defiant muted dissent as a state where an individual withholds genuine objections and disagreements while superficially supporting public positions. For example, defiant muted dissent occurs when an individual implicitly activates hidden dissent through prolonging or disagreeing with the public position, but does not verbally express disagreement when discussing the situation. I should emphasize that remaining silent does not mean that one is not necessarily vocalizing any words. Defiant muted dissent is a suppression of one's own objections and disagreements. Employees are considered to have engaged in defiant muted dissent in two ways.

First, defiant muted dissent is expressed through prolonging. For example, Ali, an HR manager, was asked by his CEO to hire the relative of one of the CEOs (nepotism). Ali could not express his dissent directly to his CEO due to a variety of reasons (evaluation, fear, relationship, etc.). Instead, Ali went along with the CEO and showed compliance while, at the same time, he suppressed his true internal opinion. Ali tried to express his disagreement in a diplomatic way by delaying taking action, hoping the CEO would forget or reassess his position. Another strategy in defiant muted dissent is to disagree with the action when acting, but not verbally express disagreement when discussing the situation. For example, Sara reported nodding her head to her manager
indicating her agreement or verbally expressing her agreement (superficially), but her true opinion was totally different. While Sara failed to express her opinion or only superficially agreed, she took a different action (she went against the wish of her boss). Figure 5 illustrates typologies of muted dissent.

Figure 5. Expressive and suppressive forms of communication (dimensions of muted dissent).
Other Findings

Culture and Muted Dissent

As we have seen, protective muted dissent entails concerns about harming relationships. Participants in this study reported that personal relationships are very important. They wanted to protect their relationships by avoiding speaking up because management and employees, in general, did not distinguish personal from professional life. This pattern was a recurring theme among participants when they were asked about the role of national culture on dissent behavior.

Participants were asked: What is it in the Omani national culture that affects muted dissent behavior? According to the findings, interpersonal relationships appeared to be very important in Oman. This finding was not surprising for a collectivistic country. Participants reported having remained silent in order to protect their relationships because, to them, the boundaries between personal and professional aspects are blurred. This is evident in participants' narratives. For example, Ali, a contract supervisor, said:

P: Just recently, whatever I have said, I mean, the last example, when I confronted him [Ali's supervisor], before that, I told him “please do not...” I am telling him, I am warning him, “please do not mix personal and business.” He said, “What do you mean?” I said, “In personal life, we are fantastic guys, but in business, is business.”

I: Do you think he separated between the two?

P: Do you know what he replied?

I: What?
“I will try to do,” though he never did. . . . The second day, when we met in the mesa eating . . . we are supposed to be, you know, to have personal life . . . back to personal life. I noticed from his way of talking to me, the way he shakes my hands, is totally different. And, to be honest, my partner was telling me the same thing. So, it is not just my thoughts. Even my partner noticed that.

Ali went on to say that sometimes supervisors, themselves, will warn employees to avoid confusing personal and professional boundaries; however, in reality, they cannot do that. Ali gave an example of a time when he went to a one-on-one meeting with his manager. Ali said: "to be honest, in the same meeting, he said ‘listen, I am not mixing personal and professional.’ He was telling me that, but I did not feel it. It was just a phrase that he said”.

Fareed shared a similar story regarding the permeable boundaries between personal and professional behaviors that caused him to refrain from speaking up. This is evident in the following dialogue with him:

I: So when you provide your opinion to your manager and he disagrees, do you utilize other channels to voice your opinions?

P: I did not try other channels. Sometimes I write on my blog. Because I know he disagrees, I do not write on the blog about such disagreements, or if I indicate them, I avoid using any names when I write. The problem is that they do not share information. Information comes from managers; however, we feel it. It will not be successful, but manager would say “just
do it, just do it”. No room for opinions, no communication. So, I have concerns reporting to managers.

I: What would happen if you disagree?

P: Relationships. . . . I mean, they mix between job and relationships. Similar stories regarding blurred boundaries between personal and professional acts were repeated by several participants. For example, 17 (74%) participants reported that boundaries between personal and professional life were, to a great deal, permeable. They reported that, because these boundaries are blurred, interpersonal relationships are affected when dissent is expressed. In order to avoid influencing an interpersonal relationship, participants reported having suppressed their dissent.

The blurred boundaries between personal and professional life, reported as the interviews were unfolding, stimulated me to investigate the role of the local culture with respect to this pattern. I asked participants about the role of local culture and dissent expression, in general, and in dissent suppression, in particular. For instance, Ammar, an account manager, said that he kept silent about his organizational dissatisfactions and frustrations because silence, to him, functions as respect, and the local culture limits voice behavior. Ammar reported that, although practices of his manager were not professional, he could not disagree with him [his manager] because of the respect he [Ammar] has for his manager. The following interaction with him highlights this:

I: What about our culture? Does it have any role as to why employees keep silent?
P: Our culture limits our voice to a great degree. For example, we keep silent because it functions as respect. For example, our GM is Omani, and he is not productive, but I cannot go and express my disagreements with his behavior at work because he is Omani. I know him; he knows me, and we share same heritage and values. So, I respect him and I do not want to speak up to avoid harming him. I do not want to disgrace or expose him because I respect him. I respect him as a person, his age, but his work is never professional.

Ammar went on to say that Omanis do not demarcate between what is personal and what is professional. I asked him about factors that inhibit Omanis from expressing dissent. He said:

In Oman, they [people] always mix professional and personal life. . . . Even if I do not mention any names, for example, if I criticize a process or work, somebody will interpret it that I meant him. If I suggest to meet with the GM to speed up issues, the senior manager or manger would take it personally. They will understand that I meant they are not capable enough to speed things up. They take everything personally. We have totality of mixing between personal and professional stuff. For example, Westerners, they tell you weekend is weekend. They do not talk about work during weekends. However, Omanis will talk about personal stuff and work at any place, in mosques, when they meet at funerals, when they meet at weddings.
Similarly, Hishaam, a civil engineer, reported having avoided dissenting because dissent, to people in Oman, was like an act of embarrassment. He explained, "We think that everything of disagreement is an embarrassment". The following dialogue with him supports this sentiment:

I: Do you feel that, sometimes, our culture, the Omani culture, the national culture, has anything to do with employees being silent about some issues?
P: Yes, I think so. Yeah.
I: Can you tell me more? What is it in our culture, or what norms and values in our culture, make employees not to speak up?
P: I think we have this idea that we cannot embarrass anybody publicly. I mean, we do not have the right to do that. So, we think that everything of disagreement is an embarrassment. . . . I hear a lot from other colleagues in our department that “I knew that what he [a speaker] said in the meeting is wrong, but I did not want to embarrass him.” I hear that a lot. It did not happen to me, but I hear it a lot. They think that disagreement is embarrassing the person in front of you.

Najma, a female legal advisor, said that people avoid dissent in the local culture because the culture is based on “mujamalaat”. Mujamalaat is a local word that can be interpreted as meaning “to exhibit superficial affection so as to please others” or “to fawn over someone.” The word is similar to American idiom “kiss someone's [posterior]”. For Najma, mujamalaat is a local cultural norm that inhibits dissent expression. The following dialogue with her explains this view:
I: What in this culture stops staff from speaking up at the workplace?

P: No democracy.

I: No democracy in the culture itself?

P: Yes, yes, yes.

I: What democracy are we talking about? In social setting or in what?

P: I think “mujamalaat.”

Several other participants reported the inappropriateness of criticism in the local culture. The following direct quotes from participants support this norm: "our society is based on criticism avoidance, we do not want someone to criticize us" (Sameh, an operations manager); "If you criticize something, it is like you are criticizing someone. We do not really understand that criticizing something is not criticizing someone. We are a lot of . . . we are emotional people I would say, and we can get angry very easily” (Kamal, a production measurement specialist); "Because there are . . . the problem we have in our culture . . . they mix between the job and personal things" (Ghaleb, a health safety and environmental Advisor).

Figure 6 shows that personal and professional boundaries are permeable. This is one reason suppressed dissent occurs in general, so as to avoid harming both types of relationships (personal and professional). Because personal and professional boundaries are permeable, as reported by the participants, employees are cautious about raising issues and complaints. Therefore, employees protect themselves from harming personal relationships, from harming their self-image, and from harming their potential organizational rewards.
Figure 6. Blurred boundaries between personal and professional acts.

**Power Distance**

Criticism and dissent function as respect, as was reported by the participants. This is also due to the way participants looked at *power distance*. When I asked Ammar why some managers did not appreciate dissent, he said:

P: It is about Omani culture. You know, the local manager is after prestige. When you go to him, you have to make an appointment. We do not have an open door policy.
I: Why do they like prestige?

P: He [the manager] wants to prove to others that he is a prominent person and that he has power and authority and responsibility and is important. But if he keeps his door open, everybody goes in and out. He will lose that power.

Similarly, Sameh, an operations manager, reported how power distance functions as an obstacle toward dissent expression:

I: If he [a Western manager] was an Omani and you criticized him the same way you criticized a European, what would his reaction be?

P: According to my experience with our culture, you cannot criticize someone because criticism is difficult. I can tell that, to a great extent, an Omani manager would hardly accept criticism from his subordinate. If you do, he would tell you like our saying here, “are you coming to teach me my job?”

This notion of power distance can inhibit dissent expression as the narratives above suggest. When I asked Hisham the reason why he did not express his dissatisfaction and disagreements concerning workplace practices, he said "I told you we respect our line manager, so we are 18 in the department and nobody dared to approach the line manager to question him. . . ."

**Gender and Dissent**

I asked 15 participants whether there was a difference between male and female employees toward dissent expression. The findings suggest no noticeable difference. For
example, 6 (40%) participants said that male employees spoke up and expressed dissent more than female employees. On the other hand, 7 (46%) participants reported that female employees express more dissent. The remaining 2 (14%) participants believed that biological sex had nothing to do with the expression of dissent; instead, personality was the factor that determined dissent expression or avoidance.

Chapter Summary

This Chapter began by emphasizing the two aims of phase one of the study: 1) to conduct an exploratory examination to discover how organizational members describe and respond to organizational dissent in the workplace, and 2) to explore various antecedents and dimensions of organizational silence based on participants' narratives and experiences. With these aims in mind, the Chapter presented the findings of phase one. Constant comparative analysis revealed four dimensions of dissent: (1) downward dissent, (2) upward dissent, (3) bounded dissent, and (4) muted dissent. While Kassing's (1997) dissent model is comprised of three dimensions (upward, lateral, and displaced), the findings of this Chapter suggest two additional dimensions: downward dissent and muted dissent.

The Chapter further discussed how silence might function as dissent by analyzing four themes that emerged from the study as described in this Chapter. These themes speak to the reasons collectivists refrain from speaking up according to this research. The four dimensions of silent dissent that the findings suggest are: (1) disengaged muted silence, (2) protective muted dissent, (3) supportive muted dissent, and (4) defiant muted dissent. It is now necessary to statistically test whether these dimensions of muted dissent
are distinct and whether they provide confirmatory evidence of a factor structure. In order to achieve this aim, dimensions of muted dissent were operationalized and an instrument assessing employee muted dissent was developed and validated. This process is explained in the next Chapter.
CHAPTER 5: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

The aim of this Chapter is to develop measures of organizational muted dissent. This Chapter discusses three main parts that were undertaken to develop these measures. Part 1 is dedicated to generating items and establishing content validity. Part 2 of this Chapter describes a pilot study (study 1) that was conducted to test proposed measures of muted dissent. Part 3 explores the dimensions of muted dissent and efforts to reduce the number of items (study 2) by applying Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Evidence of construct validity was developed in a separate study (study 3) that will be described in Chapter 6. This Chapter presents how items were generated and how content validity was established. This Chapter discusses study 1 (pilot study) and study 2 (EFA).

Item Generation and Content Validity

Researchers have argued that problems with reliability and validity of survey measures continue to affect the interpretation of field results. One reason for flawed measures of abstract constructs is a lack of well-established guidelines for researchers to follow as a roadmap when developing a scale (Hinkin, 1998; Price & Mueller, 1986). Barrett (1972) argued that the difficulty of conducting empirical research in organizations lies in assuring the accuracy of the measurement. To avoid common problems of scale development and to make sure the scale follows psychometric principles, scale development guidelines suggested by Hinkin (1998) were followed.

Item Generation

Hinkin (1998) pointed out that there are two ways of generating items: deductive and inductive. Because an exploratory sequential design method was used in this
dissertation to explore dimensions of employee muted dissent in a collectivistic setting, an inductive method to generate items was employed. Hinkin (1998) argued that the inductive approach is appropriate when the construct under investigation has no clear identifiable dimensions. This inductive approach was discussed in the preceding chapters, and in Chapter 4, conceptual definitions, domain delineation, and boundary conditions of organizational muted dissent were explained. (see Table 2 from Chapter 4 for the conceptualization of muted dissent and its difference from existing constructs.) Drawing on the dimensions of muted dissent from the qualitative findings, items were generated. The qualitative study helped to establish the content validity of an organizational muted dissent instrument by identifying and exploring dimensions of muted dissent. This process laid the foundation of a content domain for the new proposed measures.

**Item Development**

In this step, the guidelines of writing good items as suggested in the literature (e.g., Berdie, Anderson, & Niebuhr, 1986; DeVellis, 2012; Hinkin, 1998) were followed. Some of these guidelines include restrictions concerning: a) length of items; b) reading difficulty level; c) multiple negatives; d) double-barreled items; e) social desirability; f) general adjectives and adverbs (e.g., several, most, usually, significant number of); g) words with multiple meaning (e.g., value); h) if yes, then questions; i) hypothetical questions; and j) leading questions. I used these guidelines as a checklist for each generated item to ensure I did not violate recommended methods of item development.

In order to generate items, a combination of two methods was employed: exploratory qualitative study using interviews (e.g., items were generated from excerpts
and quotes of interview participants), and past research and theory concerning employee voice and silence. Drawing on these two methods, I generated initial items for six dimensions of muted dissent. Protective muted dissent is a second-order construct defined by three sub-dimensions (relational threat, instrumental threat, and face threat) as per the findings of phase one. As a result of treating protective muted dissent as a second-order construct, items were generated for 6 factors of muted dissent in total (disengaged, protective, supportive, defiant, relational, face threat, and instrumental). In order to create measures of these 6 dimensions, an initial item pool of 60 questions was created. Refinement of these items was inspired by existing instruments concerning employee silence and voice literature, such as Brinsfield (2009), Van Dyne et al. (2003), Knoll and Van Dick (2013), Detert and Edmondson (2011), Vakola and Bouradas (2005), and Kassing (1998). (Please see Appendix E for initial proposed item pool of employee muted dissent measures.)

*Content Validity*

While different methods have been developed to examine content validity (e.g., Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Schiesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lankau, 1993), it was suggested that there is no statistic that examines content validity (Gliner, Morgan, & Leech, 2009). Content validity is established by first defining the concept and, second, reviewing the literature to see how the concept is represented (Gliner et al., 2009). Accordingly, the literature was reviewed and an exhaustive list of reasons for employee muted dissent was created based on the findings of the interviews. The exploratory study yielded four recurring general themes of
employee muted dissent. This approach helped to establish content validity. Content validity was also tested by sending the items to six expert reviewers. Expert reviewers were given conceptual definitions of the 6 dimensions and a list of items under each dimension. This entire process is explained in the following section.

**Expert Reviewers**

Once items were generated from the interview transcripts, I revised each item and refined the wording according to consistency, clarity, ambiguity, and conciseness with the conceptual definitions of each construct. After that, the items were sent to 2 graduate students who had taken graduate classes on scale development, 2 senior managers with graduate degrees who also participated in the qualitative study, and 2 academics. In order to have diverse perspectives with respect to the language of the items from both the general public and from a researcher’s perspective, reviewers were included from both the world of academics and working professionals. Reviewers were asked to select the top items for each dimension and put those items in rank order. This process helped to prioritize good items and to drop potential bad items. The items were then revised on the basis of the reviewers’ recommendations.

*Recommendation by Expert Reviewers*

Based on the feedback from expert reviewers, several items were reworded and two items were added to capture content validity of muted dissent. For example, 4 reviewers who understood the local Omani culture commented as follows:

“maybe adding an alternative word for ‘futile’ (for Omanis to understand)”
“I think you might want to replace the word futile to a simpler well known word such as ‘useless’ or ‘pointless.’”

Therefore, I changed item 1 under disengaged muted dissent (“Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is futile”) to “Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless”. Under defiant muted dissent, one reviewer commented on the item, “I challenge management by taking different actions”:

“This seems like an explicit challenge to the management unlike the rest where the subordinate doesn't explicitly present his/her disagreement.”

As a result, this item was dropped because the word ‘challenge’ might mean an explicit way of expressing dissent.

One reviewer who is also an expert researcher in organizational theory suggested that people might remain silent due to organizational history and due to the influence of others. He suggested adding items to capture these factors. Therefore, the following two items were added under disengaged muted dissent (“Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened”, and “Other employees have tried to change things in the past, but have failed”). Other refinements of the initial item pool (as suggested by expert reviewers) included, but were not limited to, changing the item “I fear negative consequences” to “I fear receiving unfair job assignments”. This change was due to the recommendation of one reviewer who argued that “negative consequences” is too general and suggested being more specific so as to capture specific dimensions of muted dissent. (see Appendix F for all changes and refinements on items that reflect recommendations of expert reviewers.)
Study 1: Pilot Study

The pilot study was not intended to reduce the number of items nor to find a factor solution for the construct dimensions. (These were the aim of Part 3 of this Chapter: the EFA phase). The main aim of the pilot study was to decide whether items should be included, their performance, estimation of internal consistency, and estimation of response behavior to particular options (Johanson & Brooks, 2010). This pilot study served to investigate whether items measured the designated constructs and whether items of a single construct had reasonable correlation among themselves to establish a preliminary judgment of internal consistency.

Procedures

After approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), initial participants were contacted and asked to complete an online survey through Qualtrics. (see Appendix G for the complete survey for the pilot study.) Participants were informed of their rights as volunteer participants and were asked to indicate their consent by clicking on the designated link on the survey link. Because the goal of the pilot study was to test the preliminary instrument and not to test hypotheses, only a small number of working professionals were recruited via email. The preliminary initial items included 62 indicators intended to measure 6 dimensions of muted dissent. All items used responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). After each block of items for a specific dimension, participants were asked to respond to an open-ended question: “Do you have any suggestions for improving the above
question?” It is worth noting that the pilot study was available in English and in Arabic. Participants were sent two separate links to choose their language of preference.

According to DeVellis (2012), the order of items can influence the way respondents answer the statements. To overcome the bias of the order of items, items were set within measures to be randomized. This option is available in Qualtrics. Each participant who opened the link to the survey received a different order of the items within each block of measures.

**Measures**

**Disengaged Muted Dissent.**

Participants were asked about their level of agreement with a list of reasons why they might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding their disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) where 1 indicated low level of disengaged muted dissent, and 5 indicated high level of disengagement with respect to dissent expression. Disengaged muted dissent was measured using an initial pool of 12 items. Examples of these items included: "Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless"; "Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened"; and "Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time". (see Table 3 for a complete list of items.)
Supportive Muted Dissent

Like disengaged muted dissent, participants were asked about their level of agreement with a list of reasons addressing why they might want to remain silent regarding issues they do not agree with at work. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). One indicated a low level of supportive muted dissent, and 5 indicated a high level of muted dissent due to supportive concerns. Ten initial items were dedicated to measure supportive muted dissent. Examples of these items included: "I do not want to get others in trouble"; "I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development"; and "I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity". (see Table 3 for a complete list of items.)

Defiant Muted Dissent

Participants were asked to think about a situation in which they failed to express true disagreement to their supervisor or higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work, or decisions with which they did not agree. Participants were presented with 10 initial statements (items) potentially employed to express implicit disagreement. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). One indicated a low level of defiant muted dissent, and 5 indicated a high level of defiant muted dissent. Examples of defiant items included: "I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind"; "I comply in front of management, but I do what I see as right"; and "I avoid raising disagreements
with my supervisor when discussing a situation, but I implement what I truly see as right". (see Table 3 for complete list of items.)

Relational Threat

Relational Threat was conceptualized in the preceding Chapter as present when individuals refrained from speaking up to protect themselves from losing or harming a relationship. In order to measure relational threat as one of the first order constructs for the protective muted dissent, 10 initial items were used. Participants were asked about their level of agreement with a list of reasons why they might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding their disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). One indicated low relational threat, and 5 indicated high levels of relational threat. Some of the relational threat included: "I fear losing relationships with management"; "Higher-ups might take my views personally"; and "I do not want to damage my relationship with management". (see Table 3 for a complete list of items.)

Face Threat

Similar to relational threat, face threat was another construct that was part of protective muted dissent. Participants were asked about their level of agreement with the reasons why they might want to suppress their dissenting views. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). One indicated that a participant was not concerned over losing positive
face; 5 indicated that a participant remained silent because he/she had high levels of concern about his/her face-work due to potential threats to his/her image. Ten initial items were presented to measure face threat. These items included: "I do not want to be viewed as a complainer"; "I do not want people to have a negative impression of me"; and "I might embarrass myself by complaining". (see Table 3 for complete list of items.)

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>I do not want to get others in trouble</td>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_2</td>
<td>I do not want to hurt others' feelings</td>
<td>INS_2</td>
<td>I fear losing job benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_3</td>
<td>I do not want to affect my supervisor’s prestige</td>
<td>INS_3R</td>
<td>It is likely that I will be promoted if I disagree with organizational practices (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>I do not want to damage management’s reputation</td>
<td>INS_4R</td>
<td>It is likely that I will be nominated for training if I criticize management (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>I do not want to embarrass others</td>
<td>INS_5</td>
<td>Speaking up might impact my job evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_6R</td>
<td>I do not mind if my opinions upset others (R)</td>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td>Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development</td>
<td>INS_7</td>
<td>I do not want to miss job promotion opportunities due to speaking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_8</td>
<td>I do not want to delay tasks</td>
<td>INS_8</td>
<td>Pointing out problems will affect my appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity</td>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td>Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>I do not want to hinder tasks</td>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td>I fear receiving unfair job assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Any variable name ending with letter R means it is a reverse coded item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_1</td>
<td>Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless</td>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>My manager might take my comments personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td>It is difficult to make changes in this organization</td>
<td>REL_2</td>
<td>I do not want to harm my relationship with my manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
<td>REL_3</td>
<td>I do not want to damage my relationship with management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints</td>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
<td>REL_5</td>
<td>I think people here take work-related disagreements personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened</td>
<td>REL_6R</td>
<td>People here do not mix personal and professional issues (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>I believe that speaking up will not change things around here</td>
<td>REL_7R</td>
<td>Criticizing management in this organization will not harm my relationship with managers (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears</td>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>Higher-ups might take my views personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_9</td>
<td>I know that complaining is just a waste of time</td>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>I know that speaking up means damaging relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_10R</td>
<td>Managers take my concerns seriously (R)</td>
<td>REL_10</td>
<td>I fear losing relationships with management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_11</td>
<td>Other employees have tried to change things in the past, but have failed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_12R</td>
<td>I believe my concerns will be addressed (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Any variable name ending with letter R means it is a reverse coded item.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind</td>
<td>FTH_1</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a complainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation</td>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind</td>
<td>FTH_3</td>
<td>I do not want to damage my positive image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_4</td>
<td>I avoid raising disagreements with my supervisor when discussing a situation, but I implement what I truly see as right</td>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>I do not want people to have a negative impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_5</td>
<td>I comply in front of management, but I do what I see as right</td>
<td>FTH_5</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a negative person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_6</td>
<td>I tend to buy more time to implement decisions with which I do not agree</td>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>I do not want management to have a bad impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_7</td>
<td>I delay taking action, hoping management will re-evaluate their decisions</td>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree</td>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_9</td>
<td>I hesitate to take action, hoping management will forget</td>
<td>FTH_9</td>
<td>I might embarrass myself by complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_10</td>
<td>I do what is good for the business even if that will contradict management</td>
<td>FTH_10R</td>
<td>I do not care when people label me as a complainer (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Any variable name ending with letter R means it is a reverse coded item.
**Instrumental Threat**

The third first order construct for protective muted dissent is instrumental threat. Participants were asked about their level of agreement with a list of reasons identifying why they might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding their disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices. They indicated their responses based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). One indicated that the reasons behind their silence were not due to the fear of retaliation or instrumental threat (e.g., job evaluation, promotion, etc.), and 5 indicated high levels of instrumental threat.

Instrumental threat was measured by an initial pool of 10 items. Examples of these items included: "Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job"; "I fear receiving unfair job assignments"; and "Criticizing management could affect my potential training". (see Table 3 above for complete list of items.)

**Participants**

Participants for the pilot study consisted of a convenience sample of working professionals in Oman \( (N = 42) \). For the purpose of preliminary instrument development, this sample size met the recommended minimum sample of \( N = 30 \) as suggested by Johanson and Brooks (2010). Out of 42 participants, 7 participants did not indicate some of their demographic details. Of those responding to specific questions, 24 were male (68.6%), and 11 were female (31.4%). Five (14.3%) participants reported having a doctoral degree, 14 (40%) had a master’s degree, 6 (17.1%) had a 4-year college degree, and the remaining 28.6% had 2-year college or high school diploma. Participants were
from different industries (e.g., oil and gas, telecommunications, banking and finance, health care, real estate, media, and government).

Results

Results from the pilot study indicated that the items on the survey were clear and readable. Descriptive statistics indicated that there was no item with a mean less than 2.62 or greater than 3.86. The Standard Deviation range for the items was $SD = 0.86$ to $SD = 1.15$. Most items that belonged to the same muted dissent dimension had significantly moderate inter-item correlations ranging from $r = .40$ to as high as $r = .80$. These inter-item correlations and the resultant histograms were inspected visually and statistically using R statistical Package (R Core Team, 2013). As can be seen from Figure 7, items that measured one muted dissent dimension tended to have significant inter-item correlations among items indicating that they measure a similar construct. Based on these correlations, this relation was a preliminary indication that these items have convergent validity and internal consistency. To inspect discriminant validity, one item was randomly selected from each muted dissent dimension. That item was correlated across dimensions of muted dissent. A visual depiction of the correlation chart is provided in Figure 8. As can be seen from Figure 8, items from different muted dissent dimensions tend to have lower correlations or to not be correlated. This relation is an indication that items for the 6 muted dissent dimensions tend to measure different constructs.
Figure 7. Correlation charts and histograms of muted dissent items.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
The preliminary findings of the pilot study indicated that items were generally indicative of muted dissent measures. Moreover, because there was no indication that the items had unexpected patterns, no changes were made to the items. However, based on feedback from participants, some changes were made to the survey. For example, one participant commented on the open-ended question:

In general, it depends on the employee how he/she is viewed from management perspectives based on his personality, experiences, relationship with the management.
Although the statement above taps into several issues, it served as a reminder to include a question about the level of experience of the employee (which was missing in the pilot study), as tenure could then be included as a control variable.

Another participant commented that she felt safe expressing dissent to her direct supervisor but not higher-ups. As a result, prevalence questions were generated to assess overall attitudes toward dissent expression. The prevalence questions included: “When you experience disagreements and dissatisfaction at work how willing are you to express your frustrations to your immediate supervisor?”; and “When you experience disagreements and dissatisfaction at work how willing are you to express your frustrations to your supervisor’s manager?”.

In addition to the above change, the pilot study served to estimate the time that participants took to complete the entire survey. For example, 10 research participants who participated in the pilot study were asked to time themselves from the moment they started the survey to the moment they finished. Eight of these participants provided that information. The average time it took them to complete the survey was 15.75 minutes. Therefore, in the final survey, the instructions specified that it would take about 10-15 minutes to complete the survey. After the results of the pilot study were examined and the survey was refined, the final questionnaire was administered to the target sample. The following section of this Chapter discusses the determination of the number of factors on the muted dissent measure.
Study 2: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The purpose of this study was to conduct a series of exploratory factor analyses (EFA) to reduce poor items and to refine the number of good items that share common psychometric properties to establish the reliability of a muted dissent measure. Data that was used in this phase was different from that used in pilot study. This approach is because the sample size of the pilot study was not sufficient to conduct EFA. Due to this fact, power analysis was conducted to determine the minimum sample size for an EFA and the minimum sample size needed to conduct Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) for this study and for the subsequent study as will be presented in the next Chapter. Although this section is pertinent to EFA only, the section also discusses power analysis and sample size estimation for the subsequent studies because a large sample was collected at one time point and then randomly split into two independent samples: one sample for EFA and the other half for CFA and the structural model.

Statistical Power and Sample Size

Researchers have often used the subject to indicator ratio guideline to support sample size in the scale development process. For example, Rummel (1970) suggested a 1:4 item-to-response ratio, and Schwab (1980) suggested a ratio of at least 1:10. In other words, for a ratio of 1:10, a researcher needs a sample size of at least 240 when the instrument has 24 items. However, this rule of thumb (e.g., a subject: indicator ratio) is "very crude and usually [does] not generalize to the researcher's data set and model" (Brown, 2006, p. 412). Moreover, no evidence exists to validate this rule of thumb.
(MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang, & Hong, 1999). Similarly, Little (2013) argued that this rule of parameter estimates to observation (e.g., 1:10) "should not be perpetuated any further" (p. 120). He found, in his simulation study, that the standard errors are reduced when the sample size increases from $N = 40$ to $N = 100$. In addition, he noticed that this increment rate is quite slow after $N = 150$. He went on to suggest that $N = 120$ is sufficient for a Structural Equation Modeling study because a sample size that is larger than 120 will slowly improve precision. Little (2013) suggested that a minimum sample of $N = 100$ is sufficient for a single-group model, and a minimum sample of $N = 150$ is sufficient for multiple-group models with a minimum of $N = 75$ per group.

**Sample Size for EFA Study**

As seen from the previous section, several studies have shown the flaws in the rules of thumb for determining sample size. Therefore, I relied on the minimum sample of $N = 120$ as suggested by Little (2013). This approach means that, for both studies (EFA and CFA), at least $N = 240$, a one-half sample of $N = 120$ for the EFA and the other half of $N = 120$ for the CFA, was needed.

**Sample Size for CFA Study**

Relying on Little's (2013) suggestion, a minimum required sample alone might not result in a good model fit using root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) for the CFA model. Therefore, an analytical method was used to calculate statistical power and sample size (MacCallum, Browne, & Cai, 2006; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). Estimating sample size in SEM depends on estimating a minimum $N$ to have a model converge to accurately estimate parameters and to detect model
misspecification (Brown, 2006). To test these assumptions, power was tested for RMSEA. Unlike chi-square, RMSEA estimates population value. Therefore, the confidence interval with RMSEA can be estimated. This confidence interval helps to detect whether RMSEA is significantly different from a specific value (MacCallum et al., 2006; MacCallum et al., 1996). Because, in this study, I did not know what the response rate would be in Oman, a test was run to estimate the minimum needed sample to be able to reject the null hypotheses of not close fit (e.g., $H_0$: RMSEA > .05). Rejecting a test of not close fit means that the model fits well with a given sample size. In other words, if $H_0$: RMSEA > .05 is rejected, that means the value of the upper bound of the confidence interval for RMSEA is less than .05; hence, a conclusion of a well fit model can be made. The following section shows the findings of statistical power and sample size that was estimated using an online webpage that generates R code to calculate power and sample sized as developed by Preacher and Coffman (2006).

Due to the fact that sample size and power estimation was conducted before data collection, factor solutions and the number of items were not known beforehand. Therefore, the number of items was estimated for a CFA model for each dimension. For the second-order items, CFA testing of a full measurement model of the employee muted dissent measure (given that EFA will suggest 3-6 items per each silence measure) along with other existing measures, involved testing 11 latent variables with a total of 45 observed variables. For this test, .05 alpha level, 913 degrees of freedom, .8 desired power, .05 null RMSEA and .04 alternative RMSEA were used. The calculation of 45 observed variables using formula $p(p+1)/2$ yielded 1035 total known parameters. In
addition, there were 122 parameters to be estimated (e.g., variances, covariances, and weights). Degrees of freedom \((df)\) were attained by taking the difference between known and unknown parameters \((df = 1035-122 = 913)\).

Although MacCallum et al. (1996) suggested setting alternative RMSEA at 0.01 to be able to determine a minimum robust sample size for an extremely good model, I set alternative RMSEA at .04 and null RMSEA at .05 because this was a study that aimed at examining an exploratory model. With alpha = .05 and a desired power of .80 and \(df\) of 913, the statistical power analysis of RMSEA indicated that a minimum sample size of \(N = 170\) was required for the CFA model. A power of .8 was used based on what research has suggested (Cohen, 1988; 1992). Also, power analysis for RMSEA was used because the proposed model has a large \(df\). Kenny, Kaniskan, and McCoach (2011) suggested that RMSEA could be a misleading test of fit for structural models with small \(df\). Due to this fact, it was not surprising to have this test recommend a minimum needed sample size of \(N = 170\) for this proposed study.

**Statistical Power for the CFA Study**

While other analytical methods exist for testing power analysis in SEM models (e.g., Satorra-Saris method [Satorra & Saris, 1985]), the Monte Carlo simulation method (Muthén & Muthén, 2002) has been suggested as a more robust method to decide sample size and power. Hence, to further validate that \(N = 170\) was the minimum required sample for the CFA model, this sample was replicated 1000 times by using the Monte Carlo simulation approach. A Monte Carlo study helps not only to identify sample size and power, but is also more robust than the Satorra-Saris method in detecting model
parameter estimates (Brown, 2006). Hence, R code was developed for the two models for CFA: a population model and an analysis model (see Appendix H). For the population model parameters (e.g., loadings, covariances, and regression weights), I relied on previous research findings (e.g., Brinsfield, 2013; Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Whiteside & Barclay, 2012). The *simsem* package that runs in R developed by Pornprasertmanit, Miller, and Schoemann (2013) for simulation purposes, power analyses, and handling missing data was then used to run simulation and estimate parameters. The Monte Carlo approach of 1000 replications of $N = 170$ suggested a good model fit of RMSEA = .035. Figure 9 shows the fit indices from simulated data.

*Figure 9. Simulated fit indices.*
**Power to Detect Significant Parameters in CFA**

Using the same computer code shown in Appendix H, power was tested to detect for significant parameters by determining if a path exists and, if so, whether it was statistically different from zero. The output of the Monte Carlo study suggested that most parameters had power of at least .8 at alpha .05 to be statistically significant (e.g., loadings and covariances) (see Figure 10).

```r
> newPow2 <- subset(FilteredPower2, subset=(Power>0.0))
> print(newPow2)

                   Power
Instrumental~x15  0.9604743
Instrumental~x13  0.9604743
Instrumental~x14  0.9591568
Relational~x15    0.9525692
Relational~x16    0.9525692
Relational~x17    0.9512516
FaceThreatening~x21 0.9617916
FaceThreatening~x19 0.9604743
FaceThreatening~x20 0.9617918
Submissive~x01     1.0000000
Submissive~x02     1.0000000
Submissive~x03     1.0000000
Submissive~x04     1.0000000
Supportive~x05     1.0000000
Supportive~x06     1.0000000
Supportive~x07     1.0000000
Supportive~x08     1.0000000
Defiant~x09        1.0000000
Defiant~x10        1.0000000
Defiant~x11        1.0000000
Defiant~x12        0.9986825
Overall_Justice~x22 1.0000000
Overall_Justice~x23 1.0000000
Overall_Justice~x24 1.0000000
Overall_Justice~x25 1.0000000
Overall_Justice~x26 1.0000000
Overall_Justice~x27 1.0000000
```

*Figure 10. Power for CFA parameter estimates (acceptable).*
However, parameters related to the second-order factor (*protective muted dissent*) produced very low power for parameter estimates at alpha = .05 and N = 170 (see Figure 11). One explanation for this low power to detect significant parameter estimates for the *protective muted* dimension might have been due to the nature of the factor. For example, previous research did not suggest a second-order factor for employee silence constructs nor in dissent literature. Because of this fact, a series of quantitative studies (EFA, CFA, SEM) were employed in this dissertation to validate the findings of the qualitative study. Because sub-dimensions of protective muted dissent have not been suggested in previous studies, it was not possible to find exact estimates in the population model to compare with the analysis model. As a result, it was necessary to guess these estimates. In doing so, this process might have lowered power estimates for protective muted dissent parameters.

```r
> power <- getPower(Output,nVal=170,alpha = 0.05)
> protectivePow <- power[protectiveParam]
> print(cleanProtectivePow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protective =~ Instrumental</td>
<td>0.28063241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective =~ Relational</td>
<td>0.28326746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective =~ FaceThreatening</td>
<td>0.28722003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.26350461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.31752306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.09617918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall_J ustice =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.06060606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org_Commitment =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.06060606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Satisfaction =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.12121212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward_Dissent =~ Protective</td>
<td>0.17523057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

*Figure 11.* Power for CFA parameter estimates (poor).
Power for SEM Model

By using the same parameters of power analysis as in the CFA model, with the exception of degrees of freedom that was set to 928 due to the inclusion of additional parameters in the model, power analyses for the structural model as hypothesized in Figure 12 indicated that a sample size of $N = 168$ was required to test the structural model for the purpose of validating new measures (the highlighted latent variables as shown in Figure 12).
Figure 12. Hypothesized structural model

Note. The path diagram was created using Onyx software developed by von Oertzen, Brandmaier, and Tsang (2012).
Figure 13. Plotting power and sample size for RMSEA.

The generated R code from the website of Preacher and Coffman (2006) is attached in Appendix I. Statistical power to determine a model fit with alpha = .05, \(df = 928\), null RMSEA = .05 and alternative RMSEA = .04 is illustrated in Figure 13 as calculated by an online function developed by Schoemann, Preacher, and Coffman (2010).

**Power for SEM Parameters**

Overall, the power of the SEM model was similar to the CFA model in that most parameters had good power except for the regression weights for the *protective muted dissent* construct. This result showed the same issue as in the CFA model because *protective muted dissent* was a second-order factor. Figure 14 shows low powers of the regression weights for this dimension with \(N = 170\) despite having alpha level set at .08 instead of .05. This simulation was repeated with 1000 replications but with a bigger
sample \((N = 450)\). Although with \(N = 450\) the power did improve when compared with \(N = 170\), power was still low for these parameters (see Figure 15).

An explanation for the low power of the second-order factor was similar to the CFA model as explained previously. However, this was not a major issue because the aim of the study was to investigate whether the factors were distinct and whether a second-order factor model was a better model than a 6 first-order factor model.

```r
> power <- getPower(Output,nVal=170,alpha = 0.08)
> #print parameters of portective silence
> print(Power_Regressions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org_Commitment~Protective</td>
<td>0.22033898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Satisfaction~Protective</td>
<td>0.08474576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward_Dissent~Protective</td>
<td>0.15254237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective~Overall_Justice</td>
<td>0.37288136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14. Power for SEM parameter estimates \((N = 170)\).*

```r
> power <- getPower(Output,nVal=450,alpha = 0.08)
> #print parameters of portective silence
> print(Power_Regressions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org_Commitment~Protective</td>
<td>0.3253012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job_Satisfaction~Protective</td>
<td>0.1325301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward_Dissent~Protective</td>
<td>0.3373494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective~Overall_Justice</td>
<td>0.4096386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 15. Power for SEM parameter estimates \((N = 450)\).*
Method: Exploratory Factor Analysis

For the purposes of scale development, it was necessary to use several independent samples (Hinkin, 1998). In other words, EFA was conducted with one sample and CFA with another sample. In this research, an initial large sample size ($N = 544$) was collected and then split randomly into two independent samples: one for the EFA ($N = 244$) and the other for the CFA and subsequent analyses ($N = 300$) as per the suggestion of Krzystofik, Cardy, and Newman (1988). The following sections describe data collection, characteristics of targeted sample, procedures, and measures of muted dissent for EFA study.

Research Question

As a reminder, findings from the exploratory interview study in phase one suggested that employees suppressed their dissent expression due to several reasons. The reasons for remaining silent at work were categorized with 4 main themes emerging. These themes were conceptualized as main elements of an Organizational Muted Dissent Model. These 4 dimensions (themes) were: disengaged muted dissent, supportive muted dissent, defiant muted dissent, and protective muted dissent. Protective muted dissent was defined by three subthemes, including relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat. It follows that the qualitative study suggested 6 unique dimensions of Organizational Muted Dissent.

The aim of the quantitative study was to develop a scale to measure these 6 dimensions of Organizational Muted Dissent. A series of EFA procedures were employed to reduce the number of items, to test the factor solution of the items, and to determine if
the dimensions of muted dissent were internally consistent. Hence, the following
Research Question was investigated:

RQ3. What is the factor structure of the employee muted dissent items?

Procedures

Before data was collected, the study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Ohio University (see Appendix J). Participants were assured that their privacy would be protected and the collected data would be used only for the purposes of the study. The questionnaire was then administered online through Qualtrics. To increase the number of participants from various industries in Oman, the questionnaire was made available in two languages (Arabic and English). The questionnaire was originally constructed in English and then translated it into Arabic. This translation process was done in three steps. Step 1, the English version was sent to two different professional translators for conversion into Arabic. Step 2, I translated the questionnaire into Arabic myself. Step 3, I compared the three translations for discrepancies. For example, the statement “to speak up” was literally translated to “yatahaddath” or “yatakallam” which correspond to the English words “to say” or “to speak”. This difference is because there is no direct corresponding statement in Arabic for “speaking up,” but words like “to disagree”, “to question”, and “to raise issue” have corresponding Arabic words, and hence they were used instead. These discrepancies were addressed, and the final wording from the 3 translations that best appropriately described the research model was selected.
After that, another individual who is a fluent speaker of both Arabic and English performed a back-translation. The back-translated statements were compared to the original English questionnaire. For the most part, there were insignificant discrepancies with respect to conceptual meaning. A few discrepancies were resolved by rewording the Arabic word corresponding to “embarrassing”. (see Appendix K for Final English Questionnaire along with the consent form on the first page, and Appendix L for the final Arabic Questionnaire with the consent form on the first page.)

Sampling Procedure

Participants were identified through a snowball sampling approach, asking them to complete an online survey through Qualtrics. Recruitment tools included the use of social media platforms (e.g., LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, and Whatsapp). A few Human Resources managers in Oman were contacted personally and asked to circulate the questionnaire to their staff. LinkedIn groups related to Human Resources and Labor in Oman were contacted, and the recruiting script was posted (see Appendix M for the recruiting script) to their members. Recruitment was based on the inclusion criteria (must be at least 18 years old, full/part time employee who works in Oman). To comply with the inclusion criteria, I filtered all my LinkedIn contacts to those who work in Oman only and sent them a recruiting message.

Some managers and employees were asked to re-Tweet a link to the survey to their Twitter networks. The recruiting message was posted on Omani FaceBook pages and groups. MBA professors in the business school of a large public university in Oman were contacted and asked to share information concerning the study with their MBA
students. Finally, because WhatsApp (an instant messaging application for smart phone devices) is popular in Oman, a recruiting message to my WhatsApp contacts and to my WhatsApp groups. Those individuals were asked to forward the message to their WhatsApp groups. Because WhatsApp is a smartphone application, and because the questionnaire was best viewed on a computer browser, WhatsApp contacts were asked to open the link using computers. This entire process yielded a total sample size of $N = 544$. I randomly selected $N = 244$ and $N = 300$. The former was used for the EFA; the latter was used to conduct the CFA. Because the CFA followed subsequent analyses of hypotheses with structural models, I dedicated a larger sample size for the CFA.

**Participants for EFA**

Although the initial sample for the EFA was $N = 244$, 16 cases were deleted. These cases were deleted because of missing data. In large part, these participants had provided demographic data but not responded to questions relevant to this study. The final sample size after deleting missing data cases was $N = 228$.

Respondents consisted of male employees ($n = 136, 69\%$) and female employees ($n = 61, 31\%$) with a mode (most frequently occurring age category) age ranging from 35 to 44 years old. There were 31 participants who did not provide demographic. From here on, all percentages are reported as valid percent after accounting for missing values. Ninety-seven (49.2\%) participants reported having a supervisory role, while 100 (50.8\%) were not supervisors. Being a supervisor or not was measured using the question “In this organization I have at least ONE employee who reports to me directly” where ‘0’ means not a supervisor and ‘1’ is a supervisor.
Participants spanned different industries and different hierarchical levels. For example, participants were from oil and gas (22.8%), educational services (18.8%), government (21.3%), health care (8.1%), real estate (2%), media (3%), academia (5.1%), banking and finance (2%), telecommunication, manufacturing, construction, and retailers accounted for (4.5%) and “other” (12.2%). Respondents also spanned different hierarchical levels: senior managers ($n = 21, 10.7\%$), middle managers ($n = 85, 43.1\%$), general staff ($n = 91, 46.2\%$). There was a bimodal distribution of tenure in their current position. The two most frequently occurring categories of work experience were 5-10 years and more than 10 years. These two categories of tenure accounted for about 52%. Nearly half of the participants (93 or 47.2\%) reported having a 4-year college degree; 43 (21.8\%) reported having a master’s degree; 21 (10.7\%) reported having doctoral degree or MD, and 20.3\% reported having 2-year college or high school diploma.

**Survey Instrument**

The 6 measures of muted dissent were assessed using the refined items after integrating expert reviewers’ comments and after testing via the pilot study. The measures of this final study (EFA and CFA) are the same as the pilot survey. These initial items and their variable names are illustrated in Table 3. The variable names in Table 3 will be referred to in subsequent analyses instead of using a full statement of the item. As seen from Table 3, each dimension of muted dissent was initially measured using 10 items. The single exception was disengaged muted dissent, which consisted of 12 items. All items were measured based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). (For more details of measures pertinent to muted
dissent, see a section with a subheading ‘Measures’ in the pilot study section as these were the same measures that were used for this study as well.) This study also included existing measures (organizational justice, organization commitment, upward dissent, and job satisfaction) for the purpose of scale validation. These existing measures and their relations with muted dissent measures will be examined in Chapter 6 (study 3).

The final survey was administered through online-based survey via Qualtrics with the following instructions being presented to the respondents:

In organizations, we observe practices, policies, and decisions that we do not agree with. We experience situations in which we feel frustrated and dissatisfied with managerial imperatives. However, we might not speak up regarding wrongdoing, unfair treatment, and frustrations. We nod our heads; we say that we agree, and we might even superficially support decisions in front of management although we do not really agree. Instead, we might observe what we define as a wrongdoing by management or by authority, but decide to remain silent. We might observe a mistake or error in judgment and never speak up.

Participants were also instructed to provide reasons why they might or might not speak up, by providing them with the following instructions:

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your level of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations
at work, or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

A question stem was provided for each of the six measures of muted dissent. For disengaged muted dissent, supportive muted dissent, relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat, the following question stem was provided:

In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because:

For items of defiant muted dissent, the following question stem was used:

Think about a situation in which you failed to express true disagreement to your supervisor or higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you do not agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies do you usually employ as a way to express your disagreement?

Consistent with pilot study, items within measures were set to be randomized. Each participant who opened the link to the survey received a different order of the items within each block of measures. This approach was used to overcome the bias of responses that is caused by the order of the items (DeVellis, 2012).

Data Screening

Prior to analysis, all 62 items for all 6 dimensions of muted dissent were tested using IBM SPSS program for inconsistent data (e.g., out of range data points), missing values, normality, and extreme values at both univariate and multivariate levels.
Missing Data Analysis

The data were screened for missing values using the ‘Analyze Patterns’ function in SPSS. All variables (100%) had at least 1 missing value; 25% of the cases had at least 1 missing value, and total missing values were 3.2%. Visual representation of missing value patterns did not suggest a nonrandom pattern. Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) argued that if there was 5% or less of missing values and the values are missing in a random pattern, then any procedure for handling missing data yields similar results. Because the EFA dataset had only 3.2% of missing values, which is less than the cutoff point recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell, and because they are missing at random, the SPSS default setting which is Listwise deletion was used. In doing so, power estimate was not affected because there was only 3.2% of missing values from a total sample size of $N = 228$.

Normality

All items were analyzed for normality. First, frequencies were run with histograms to check for bimodality. There was no issue of bimodality. Then the standard deviations were analyzed to see if any items had a variance of less than one-fifth of the range. The standard deviations of all items did not deviate much from one-fifth of the range ($SD = 0.80$). After that, skewness and kurtosis were examined. The skew statistics were divided by their standard errors of skewness to get a calculated $t$-test. Following Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), $p < .001$ or critical $t$ value of 3.30 was used to identify items that were statistically significantly different from zero. The same thing was done for kurtosis. Kurtosis statistics were divided by their standard errors of kurtosis to obtain
a calculated t-test, and the same cutoff points were used as in the skewness test. The results of dividing skewness and kurtosis by their standard errors indicated that 24% of the items were skewed, and 13% of variables were kurtotic. Items were also investigated for extreme means, with Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, the criteria was to flag items for potential removal of means larger than 4 or less than 2. However, there were no items with a mean greater than 4 or less than 2. All items that had issues with skewness, kurtosis, mean, SD, and bimodality were flagged using the * symbol. In doing so, it was possible to track items that violated assumptions for making the decision as to whether to remove the item or keep it. (see Appendix N for items that were flagged.) Descriptive statistics of all items are displayed in Table 4.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Muted Dissent Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>-.612</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_9</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_10R</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_11</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_12R</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>-.377</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>-.285</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_3</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>-.531</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_5</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>-.756</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_6R</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_7R</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>-.407</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>-.513</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_10</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_4</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_5</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_6</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_7</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_9</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_10</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_1</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_3</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_9</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_10R</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_3</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_6R</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_8</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_2</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_3R</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_4R</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_5</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_8</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outliers

Prior to running the outliers test, the histograms were examined for any data points sitting on their own on the extremes, and the boxplots were checked for possible outliers. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), univariate outliers are cases that have z scores in excess of 3.29 or less than -3.29. I saved z-scores for continuous variables, and I looked for any z-scores that met this guideline. According to this test, no outliers were found for all continuous variables at the univariate level.

However, at the multivariate level, 8 cases were found to be multivariate outliers. Mahalanobis distances test was used through linear regression analysis in SPSS. The ID case numbers were entered into the regression line as the dependent variable, and 62 items as the independent variables. With 62 degrees of freedom and a critical chi-square of $\chi^2 = 99.601$ at $p = .001$, 8 cases were found to have Mahalanobis distance greater than the critical $\chi^2 = 99.601$. The alpha level was set to $p = .001$ as per the suggestion of Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). I ran the factor analysis two times: once with multivariate outlier cases and once without. The results appeared to be consistent. Hence, the multivariate outliers were not deleted in the final analysis.

Results: Exploratory Factor Analysis

Criteria for Exploratory Factor Analysis

To assess the dimensionality and item reduction of 62 muted dissent indicators, a series of EFAs were performed through IBM SPSS using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) with oblique rotation using direct oblimin. PAF was used rather than the principal component method as recommended in the literature (e.g., Ford, MacCallum, & Tait,
1986; Rummel, 1970) because principal component analysis mixes common and specific variances (Hinkin, 1998). Oblique rotation was used because of the potential that the factors involved with muted dissent would be correlated.

Prior to testing PAF, the Kaiser, Meyer, Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was run to test factorability of the correlation matrices with a resulting value of .86. Values of KMO greater than .80 (meritorious) indicate that a factor analysis (FA) is appropriate. Psychometric adequacy was also tested using Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 7751.6, 1891, p < .001$). The factor solution was determined by applying several criteria for selecting items that belonged to the same component. For example, items that correlated less than .40 were eliminated as suggested by Kim and Mueller (1978). According to Churchill (1979), items that are not correlated might not belong to the same domain and hence affect reliability.

In addition, items were dropped that did not meet the 60/40 convention for item inclusion. In other words, only items that had a loading of at least .60 and no cross-loadings of .40 or higher were included. However, in a rare case where a factor loading was slightly less than .60 and deleting such an item affected the content validity of the measure, then the item was retained. Determination of the number of factors was based on the eigenvalue scores and based on the scree plot. Factors were retained that had an eigenvalue score greater than 1.

A sequence of steps was employed during EFA. Any item that did not meet the inclusion criteria as explained above was eliminated. Prior to elimination of any item, I checked whether the elimination of that item would affect the content validity of the
scale. This method was done in an iterative process. Items with poor loading were dropped one at a time, then a new EFA was run. This iterative process was employed until the final factor structure was reached.

Initial Item Reduction

During the series of steps for conducting an EFA, a total of 3 items of the disengaged measure were eliminated because they did not meet the 60/40 criteria. For the same reason, 6 items from the relational threat measure, 4 items from the defiant measure, 2 items from the face threat measure, 1 item from the supportive measure, and 2 items from the instrumental measure were deleted. The EFA was rerun and the item DIS_1 “Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless” was eliminated because it did not load above .50.

There were some items that met the inclusion criteria but were eliminated. This was due to fact that the literature suggests that the more items in the questionnaire, the more difficult it can be to choose the one that will more correctly test the construct (DeVellis, 2012). It is also recommended to retain only one-half of the generated items for use in the final instrument (DeVellis, 2012; Hinkin, 1998). Moreover, the process of minimizing the number of times helped to produce a questionnaire with a simple structure and parsimony as suggested by Thurstone (1947).

Two examples of items that were removed despite the fact that they met inclusion criteria are: the item FTH_3 “I do not want to damage my positive image”, and FTH_5 “I do not want to be viewed as a negative person”. These two items were redundant as they measured the same aspect. Hence, they were eliminated. If indicators are
interchangeable or have the same or similar content, this fact means they share a common theme, and “dropping an indicator should not alter the conceptual domain of the construct” (Jarvis, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2003, p. 203). After unwanted items were eliminated, the result was an EFA of 29 muted dissent items, which revealed 6 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 explaining 62.84% of total variance. (see Table 5 for the final factor structure.)

As shown in Table 5, all factor loadings met the inclusion criteria except for the item REL_9 “I fear losing relationships with management” which had a factor loading of .53. However, I decided to include this item because, without it, the content validity of the “relational threat” construct would not have been fully established. By including the item REL_9, the conceptual domain of relational threat was captured.
Table 5

*Pattern Matrix of Exploratory Factor Analysis Scales (N = 228)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td><strong>0.805</strong></td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td><strong>0.798</strong></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td><strong>0.690</strong></td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td><strong>0.618</strong></td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td><strong>0.763</strong></td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td><strong>0.868</strong></td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td><strong>0.668</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td><strong>0.676</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td><strong>0.791</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td><strong>0.536</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td><strong>0.691</strong></td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td><strong>0.852</strong></td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td><strong>0.739</strong></td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td><strong>0.704</strong></td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td><strong>-0.833</strong></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td><strong>-0.782</strong></td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td><strong>-0.802</strong></td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td><strong>-0.834</strong></td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td><strong>-0.758</strong></td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td><strong>-0.723</strong></td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-1.167</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td><strong>-0.670</strong></td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td><strong>-0.722</strong></td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-1.158</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td><strong>-0.798</strong></td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td><strong>-0.742</strong></td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td><strong>-0.796</strong></td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td><strong>0.874</strong></td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td><strong>0.739</strong></td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td><strong>0.818</strong></td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td><strong>0.689</strong></td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Principal Axis Factoring with direct oblimin rotation method; Total variance explained for 6 factors = 62.84%. 
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As seen in the previous section, the results suggested a 6 factor structure, with eigenvalues exceeding 1. To further test whether these eigenvalues were statistically significant for the six-factor structure, I ran a parallel analysis (using the Monte Carlo Approach to determine the number of factors) using principal-axis factoring (O’Connor, 2000). Because this approach was not directly available in IBM SPSS, a parallel analysis macro that was developed by O’Connor (2000) was used.

This macro for testing parallel analysis comes with two options: 1) for normally distributed data and 2) for permutations of raw data. The latter is used when the data is not normally distributed at the univariate and/or the multivariate level. During the data screening phase as indicated in the previous section, it was found that that 24% of items were skewed and 13% were kurtotic, resulting in about one-third of the data not being normally distributed at the univariate level. As noted earlier, the 8 cases that had multivariate outliers as indicated by Mahalanobis distances test were retained. Therefore, in the parallel analysis, I used an option for nonnormal data (the permutations option) to find a factor solution with 1000 randomly generated data sets. The results of the parallel analysis were consistent with the previous section. At the 95% percentile in all 1000 data sets, a six-component solution was significant. Root (component) 7 is the point where eigenvalues for the original data fell below the random data; the actual eigenvalue from the original raw data (.36) was below the 95% percentile (.54) of random data. The 7th factor and beyond 7 in raw data explained less variance than the factors that were generated by random data, suggesting it was appropriate to not retain a 7-factor or larger.
solution. In other words, the six-factor solution was determined to be the best factor structure based on the parallel analysis test. Results of the parallel analysis are displayed in Figure 16, and the scree plot is displayed in Figure 17.

Figure 16. Six-factor solution with parallel analysis (Root 7 and beyond not significant). Note: Principal axis/common factor analysis method was used.
Figure 17. Scree plot of parallel analysis showing point of intersection between raw data and generate data sets.

Based on the EFA using the regular procedure in SPSS and Monte Carlo approach through parallel analysis, the final result suggested the number of factors for the muted dissent measure was 6 factors. Inter-item correlations among indicators of all muted dissent elements are illustrated in Appendix O. The correlation among these 6 factors is displayed in Table 6.
Table 6

*Factor Correlation Matrix (N = 228)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental (F1)</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive (F2)</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant (F3)</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged (F4)</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat (F5)</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Threat (F6)</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring; Rotation Method: Oblimin.

In sum, the 6 final factors of the organizational muted dissent scales were disengaged muted dissent (DIS_3, DIS_4, DIS_5, DIS_6, DIS_7, and DIS_8), relational threat (REL_1, REL_4, REL_8, and REL_9), defiant muted dissent (DEF_1, DEF_2, DEF_3, and DEF_8), face threat (FTH_2, FTH_4, FTH_6, FTH_7, and FTH_8), supportive muted dissent (SUP_1, SUP_4, SUP_5, SUP_7, SUP_9, and SUP_10), and instrumental muted dissent (INS_1, INS_6, INS_9, INS_10). The final loadings of these indicators are displayed in Table 7 and final list of indicators are reported in Table 8.
Table 7

*Final Pattern Matrix of Muted Dissent Measures (N = 228)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disengages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defiant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Principal Axis Factoring with direct oblimin rotation method.  
F4 = Disengaged muted dissent; F6 = Relational threat; F3 = Defiant muted dissent.
Table 7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td><strong>-.833</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td><strong>-.782</strong></td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td><strong>-.802</strong></td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td><strong>-.834</strong></td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td><strong>-.758</strong></td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td><strong>-.723</strong></td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td><strong>-.670</strong></td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td><strong>-.722</strong></td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td><strong>-.798</strong></td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td><strong>-.742</strong></td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td><strong>-.796</strong></td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td><strong>.874</strong></td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td><strong>.739</strong></td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td><strong>.818</strong></td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td><strong>.689</strong></td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Principal Axis Factoring with direct oblimin rotation method.  
F1 = Instrumental muted dissent; F2 = Supportive muted dissent; F5 = Face threat.
Table 8

*Final List of Items for the Six Measures of Muted Dissent*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VariableName</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>VariableName</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>My manager might take my comments personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints</td>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>Higher-ups might take my views personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened</td>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>I know that speaking up means damaging relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>I believe that speaking up will not change things around here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VariableName</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>VariableName</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind</td>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation</td>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>I do not want people to have a negative impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind</td>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>I do not want management to have a bad impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree</td>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VariableName</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>VariableName</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>I do not want to get others in trouble</td>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>I do not want to damage management’s reputation</td>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td>Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>I do not want to embarrass others</td>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td>Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development</td>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td>I fear receiving unfair job assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>I do not want to hinder tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Reliability

In the previous section, the results of the EFA suggested a 6 factor solution. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). Prior to performing the reliability analysis in SPSS, each of the 6 factors was examined for unidimensionality using Factor Analysis with eigenvalue scores greater than 1 for each scale of muted
dissent. All 6 scales showed unidimensionality of structure when each scale was factor analyzed independently. Table 9 provides the factor analysis for each scale, indicating Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure and total variance explained by the unidimensional factor.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Unidimensionality of Muted Dissent Scales</th>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged Muted Dissent</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>59.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Threat</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>50.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant Muted Dissent</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>52.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Muted Dissent</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>56.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Threat</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>67.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. All factor loadings for each scale were .6 and above*

After testing for unidimensionality for each of the 6 scales of muted dissent, Cronbach's alpha was computed for each unidimensional factor. Items were then averaged to produce one composite score, and the means and standard deviations were computed for each composite score. Table 10 provides the descriptive statistics ($M$, $SD$, skewness, and kurtosis), and Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha$) of the 6 factors of muted dissent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha (α)</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged Muted Dissent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.07 (.92)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Threat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.40 (.91)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant Muted Dissent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.08 (.89)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.51 (.95)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Muted Dissent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.58 (.88)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Threat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.11 (1.06)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Summary

This Chapter began by outlining the steps that were taken to develop scales for the muted dissent measure. The Chapter described how items were generated, developed, and how content validity was established. In addition, a pilot study (study 1) was described and its purpose was elaborated. The pilot study revealed that items were performing as expected, and inter-item correlations were significant and fell within the expected range.

Finally, the method, participants, measurements, and results of study 2 (EFA) were reported. The findings of the EFA suggested a six-factor solution of muted dissent measures (disengaged, supportive, protective, and defiant). A Monte Carlo approach with parallel analysis confirmed the six-factor solution. The Chapter presented final items that showed strong loadings with strong Cronbach's alpha reliability. Attention turns now to Confirmatory Factor Analysis in order to determine whether the six factors are distinct.
The next Chapter will report that analysis as well as address construct validity and the tests of the hypotheses.
CHAPTER 6: HYPOTHESES TESTING AND SCALE VALIDATION

The aim of this Chapter is to report on the assessment of whether the 6 dimensions of muted dissent that were found during EFA procedures were empirically distinct constructs. In order to accomplish this aim, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted. This process helped to overcome the drawback of EFA in that EFA cannot test the goodness of fit of the factor solution in SPSS. CFA serves to determine the measurement model and its overall significance.

A second aim of this Chapter is to test the 6 muted dissent dimensions for convergent, discriminant, and nomological validities. Finally, the Chapter covers the tests employed to assess the research and to assess the relationship between the proposed measures of muted dissent and existing measures. The Chapter begins with the hypotheses and research questions that were used to examine the nomological validity of the muted dissent scales.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This section describes existing measures for the purpose of establishing criterion-related validity through a nomological network (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955) for muted dissent scales. Because the common method for construct validation among researchers is the nomological network approach, as suggested by Cronbach and Meehl (1955), this method was employed with an intention to uncover the network of relationships of the muted dissent scales with other existing validation measures.

It is worth noting that the nomological network approach has been criticized (e.g., Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2004; Whitely, 1983), resulting in researchers
developing different validation approaches. For example, previous research attempted to
draw on construct representation methods by testing antecedents, correlates, and
consequences of constructs under investigation to establish construct validity as
suggested by Borsboom et al. (2004). The problem with this newly suggested approach is
that it has primarily been tested through experimental studies (Borsboom et al., 2004).
This fact was indicated by the authors who claimed that a test is valid if "(a) the attribute
exists and (b) variation in the attribute causally produces variations in the outcomes of the
measurement procedure" (p. 1061). This claim certainly assumes testing for causality to
test for validity.

Although Borsboom et al. (2004) emphasized causality to establish validity,
studies in the behavioral sciences are dominated by a correlational approach and not the
causal approach (De Houwer, Teige-Mocigemba, Spruyt, & Moors, 2009). Because
causal relationships were not studied in this study, it was unrealistic to use the
representation method to test for validity. Therefore, the nomological network method
(Cronbach & Meeh, 1955), used to examine construct validity through a correlational
approach, was employed.

The criteria set to test criterion-related validity was that measures of muted
dissent will be predicted by organizational justice (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009), and
measures of muted dissent, in turn, would predict specified outcome variables including
upward dissent (Kassing, 1998), job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), and
organizational commitment (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, (1974). These measures
are described next.
Overall Organizational Justice

Pinder and Harlos (2001) claimed that employee silence is a response to a perceived injustice. Analogously, Goodboy et al. (2009) found negative relationships between lateral dissent and employee perceptions of interpersonal and distributive justice. Perceptions of procedural justice were also found to be negatively related to employee silence (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Thibault and Walker (1975) claimed that individuals who believe they have been treated fairly are more likely to believe that they can be effective in influencing their environment.

Organizational justice has been defined in terms of employee perceptions of fairness with organizational setting (Greenberg, 1987). While there are different dimensions of organizational justice, such as distributive, interpersonal, procedural, and informational (Colquitt, 2001), this study used the overall justice measure as developed by Ambrose and Schminke (2009). Whiteside and Barclay (2012) provided three reasons for using overall justice over event-based justice in employee silence research. They argued that the concept of overall justice provides a general behavior of how employees generally perceive justice across time and situations. Second, they argued that overall justice is more suitable when studied with global outcomes. Finally, they argued that the overall perception of justice drives employee judgment of justice. According to their findings, there is a negative relationship between overall justice and acquiescent silence and between overall justice and quiescent silence. Accordingly, a negative relationship is anticipated between overall justice and disengaged muted dissent as well as protective muted dissent. Hence, the following hypotheses and research questions are proposed:
H1a: Overall justice will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H1b: Overall justice will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
RQ1a. Is defiant muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?
RQ1b. Is supportive muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?

_Upward Dissent_

As was suggested in the literature review, employee silence does not imply an absence of voice (Van Dyne et al., 2003). A relationship between overt dissent and muted dissent was anticipated. Kassing (1997) argued that dissent expression is influenced by perceptions of retaliation. He went on to suggest that individuals are more likely to express upward dissent when they perceive low retaliation by authority. Also, Kassing (1998) found a positive relationship between freedom of speech and upward dissent. Because silence takes place when employees do not feel safe to speak up due to the lack of freedom of speech or due to the organizational culture (Morrison & Milliken, 2000), a negative relationship between overt upward dissent and the proposed dimensions of muted dissent is expected.

Moreover, due to the fact that disengaged muted dissent and protective muted dissent happen due to a fear of negative consequences, it was expected that people who reported high levels of protective and disengaged muted dissent would report low levels of upward dissent. Brinsfield (2009), in his study of silence motives, also found a negative relationship between employee voice and dimensions of silence motives. Hence, the following hypotheses are suggested:

H2a. Upward dissent will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H2b. Upward dissent will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
H2c. Upward dissent will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent.
H2d. Upward dissent will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent.

Job Satisfaction

Because dissent expression entails taking risks, dissent expression has been associated with job satisfaction (Avtgis et al., 2007; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). For example, speaking up can lead to low levels of job satisfaction and job commitment (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Morrison and Milliken (2000) argued that organizational silence makes employees feel unvalued. This is due to the fact that organizational silence can influence feedback mechanisms and lack of information, and can lead to less effective organizational processes (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Similarly, Vakola and Bouradas (2005) found a negative correlation between silence behavior and job satisfaction. Kassing (1998) also found an association between employee satisfaction and upward dissent.

Moreover, it has been found that, when employees experience opportunities to express their views, they also experience satisfaction in bargains (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Avery and Quinones (2002) suggested that, if employees experience lack of opportunity to express their views, they experience dissatisfaction. Knoll and Van Dick (2012) found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and two types of silence (acquiescent and quiescent). Building on these previous findings, a negative relationship is predicted between job satisfaction and two dimensions of muted dissent that are similar
to acquiescent and quiescent: protective and disengaged muted dissent. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H3a: Job satisfaction will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.

H3b: Job satisfaction will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.

Because supportive and defiant muted dissent are newly proposed dimensions, not much has been written about how they are (or are not) related to job satisfaction. As a result, the following questions are posed:

RQ2a. Is defiant muted associated with job satisfaction?

RQ2b. Is supportive muted dissent associated with job satisfaction?

Organizational Commitment

Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment in terms of "the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). They went on to suggest that commitment is characterized by at least three factors, "(a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; (c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership" (p. 604). Employee commitment has been studied in voice and dissent research. A positive relationship was found between employee commitment and upward dissent (Kassing, 1998). Organizational silence research suggests that silence leads to perceived lack of control, and low commitment and motivation (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Because organizational silence can make employees feel under valued (Morrison & Milliken, 200), organizational commitment is expected to be negatively related to dimensions of muted dissent. This claim is supported
by Vakola and Bouradas (2005) who found a negative correlation between silence behavior and organizational commitment. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are posed:

H4a: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.

H4b: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.

H4c: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent.

H4d: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent.

*Individual Differences and Other Contextual Variables*

Factors that influence silence have also been suggested in the literature, such as individual characteristics (e.g., lack of experience) (Milliken et al., 2003). Whiteside and Barclay (2012) found that participants with higher positions were less likely to engage in acquiescent, quiescent, and prosocial silence. Participants in phase one of this study (see Other Findings: Gender and Dissent in Chapter 4) reported that there were no differences between males and females regarding dissent expression or silence. In addition, Knoll and Van Dick (2012) did not find any statistically significant differences between the forms of employee silence and gender, age, and company size.

However, other studies have shown that gender (biological sex) could be related to silence (e.g., Harlos, 2010; Molseed, 1989; Pinder & Harlos, 2001). Similarly, LePine
and Van Dyne (1998) argued that gender could potentially influence silence. In short, Morrison (2011) stated that findings pertinent to sex differences in voice literature suggest mixed results. Due to the mixed findings in the literature, the following research questions are suggested:

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference between biological sex, supervisory role, organizational hierarchy, and job tenure toward the dimensions of muted dissent?

Summary of RQs and Hypotheses

H1a: Overall justice will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H1b: Overall justice will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
RQ1a. Is defiant muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?
RQ1b. Is supportive muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?
H2a. Upward dissent will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H2b. Upward dissent will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
H2c. Upward dissent will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent.
H2d. Upward dissent will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent.
H3a: Job satisfaction will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H3b: Job satisfaction will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
RQ2a. Is defiant muted associated with job satisfaction?
RQ2b. Is supportive muted dissent associated with job satisfaction?
H4a: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.
H4b: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to protective muted dissent.
H4c: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent.  
H4d: Organizational commitment will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent. 

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference between biological sex, managerial status, organizational hierarchy, and job tenure and the dimensions of muted dissent? 

**Study 3: Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)** 

To fulfill the goals of this Chapter, the following procedures were performed: (a) confirming the factor structure suggested in study 2 by testing the measurement model of the 6 muted dissent measures, (b) testing convergent and discriminant validity of these 6 measures, and (c) testing second-order CFA. 

**Method** 

Previous research suggests avoiding using the same sample that was employed when some items were deleted and some modified when replicating the study so as to examine construct validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991; Schwab, 1980). Therefore, in this study an independent sample was employed but with the same scales developed in study 2 (see Table 7 and Table 8 from the previous Chapter for the final items that were employed in this study). 

**Participants**

Although the initial sample was $N = 300$, 14 cases were deleted. These cases were deleted because they were completely missing. The final sample size after deleting completely missing cases was $N = 286$. Respondents consisted of male employees ($n = 178, 71.8\%$) and female employees ($n = 70, 28.2\%$) with a modal age (most frequently occurring age category) ranging from 35 to 44 years old.
Thirty-eight participants did not respond to the demographic questions. From this point on, all percentages are reported as valid percent after accounting for missing values. There were 141 (56.9%) participants who reported having a supervisory role, and 107 (43.1%) who indicated they were not supervisors. Being a supervisor or not was measured using the question “In this organization I have at least ONE employee who reports to me directly,” where ‘0’ means not a supervisor and ‘1’ supervisor. Participants spanned across hierarchical levels: 24 (9.7%) senior managers, 118 (47.6%) middle managers, and 106 (42.7%) general staff.

Participants spanned across different industries: oil and gas 68 (27.4%), educational services 30 (12.1%), government 58 (23.4%), health care 11 (4.4%), and 32 (13%) respondents from various industries including telecommunications, manufacturing, banking and finance, real estate, transportation and warehousing, rental and leasing, and media. The remaining 38 (15%) respondents were from “other industries”.

The mode of job tenure of respondents was between 2 to 5 years (27.8%), 1 to 2 years (27%), 5 to 10 years (24.6%), and those with more than 10-year experience (20.6%). Most of the participants (227, 91.5%) were Omani nationals, and only 21 (8.5%) were expatriate workers. Nearly half of the participants 120 (48.4%) reported having a 4-year college degree, 59 (23.8%) a master’s degree; 6 (2.4%) reported having a PhD or MD, and 53 (21%) reported having a 2-year college or high school diploma.

Design and Procedures

The procedure for this study was consistent with study 2 during the EFA phase. In this study, I used the second independent sample to run CFA. It is worth noting that
existing measures for testing validity were included when the data was collected for the main large sample. Validation measures and muted dissent measures are discussed next.

**Measures**

Unless otherwise specified, all scale measures used 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Hinkin (1998) contended that a 5-point Likert-type scale for the development of new items is warranted. Suggesting a 5-point Likert-type scale for new items is due to the fact that coefficient alpha reliability increases with a 5-point scale and then levels off after 5-points (Lissitz & Green, 1975). In their simulation studies, Lissitz and Green (1975) rejected the idea that a 7-point scale is optimal for reliability.

**Disengaged Muted Dissent.**

The final items based on the final factor solution reported in study 2 were used to measure disengaged muted dissent. Six items were used to measure disengaged muted dissent. Examples of these items include "I know managers will not take my concerns seriously"; "It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints"; and "Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time". The original alpha of this scale based on study 2 was $\alpha = .89$.

**Supportive Muted Dissent**

Based on study 2, six items were used to measure supportive muted dissent. Examples of these items include "I do not want to get others in trouble"; "I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development"; and "I do not want my criticisms to
reduce organizational productivity”. The reported reliability as per the findings of study 2 was $\alpha = .88$.

**Defiant Muted Dissent**

Defiant muted dissent was measured based on 4 final items extracted from the EFA in study 2. Examples of defiant items include: "I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind"; "I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation"; and "I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind". Study 2 revealed a reliability of $\alpha = .81$ for this measure.

**Relational Threat**

Relational threat was measured using 4-items identified in study 2, specifically: "My manager might take my comments personally"; "In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone"; "I know that speaking up means damaging relationships"; and "Higher-ups might take my views personally". Reliability of the relational threat scale was found to be $\alpha = .77$ as reported in study 2.

**Face Threat**

Face threat was measured using 5-item identified as relevant in study 2, specifically: "I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker"; "I do not want people to have a negative impression of me"; "I do not want management to have a bad impression of me"; "I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker"; and "I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes". The reliability of the face threat scales was found, in study 2, to be quite strong at $\alpha = .89$. 
**Instrumental Threat**

Instrumental threat was measured using 4-items identified as relevant in study 2. The items that were used are: "Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job"; "Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities"; "Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion"; and "I fear receiving unfair job assignments". EFA findings in study 2 suggested $\alpha = .83$ for instrumental scale.

**Overall Organizational Justice**

Ambrose and Schminke’s (2009) overall justice scale was used. Their scale contains 6 items with a reported .93 reliability. Sample items include: "Overall, I’m treated fairly by my organization"; "In general, I can count on this organization to be fair"; and "In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair". (see Appendix P for the complete list of items.)

**Upward Dissent**

Kassing's (2000b) 9-item upward dissent scale, which was a revised version of the Organizational Dissent Scale (Kassing, 1998), was used to measure upward dissent. Previous administration of this measure produced a reliability range from .78 to .86 (Kassing et al., 2012). Some of the items included in this scale are: "I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management"; "I speak with my supervisor or someone in management when I question workplace decisions"; "I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization". (see Appendix P for a complete list of items.)
Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using a 4 item scale developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980). Those items include: "Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job opportunities for promotion"; "Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job training"; and "Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job rewards in relation with performance". (see Appendix P for complete list of items.)

Organizational Commitment

A 5-item measure was adapted from Porter et al.'s (1974) organizational commitment questionnaire. Respondents were asked items such as: "I believe that company's values and my values are similar"; "I am proud to say that I am working for this organization"; and "This organization encourages me to put the maximum effort in order to be more productive". (see Appendix P for complete list of items.)

Individual and Contextual Characteristics

Biological sex was assessed using one dichotomous item (0 = "male", 1 = "female"). Managerial hierarchy was measured by asking “Which classification best describes your position?” Participants were given three options: Senior Management, Middle Management, and General Staff. Because a respondent can possess a managerial position but not necessarily be in a supervisory role (no employees directly report to him/her), the supervisory role variable was assessed by asking participants, “In this organization I have at least ONE employee who reports to me directly.” A participant who had at least one subordinate who reported directly to him/her was considered a supervisor. If answered ‘yes’, 1 = supervisor, and ‘no’, 0 = not a supervisor.
Data Screening

Prior to analysis, all 29 items for all 6 dimensions of muted dissent, and 24 items for organizational justice, upward dissent, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were tested using IBM SPSS program for inconsistent data (e.g., out of range data points), missing values, normality, and extreme values at both univariate and multivariate levels. Initial sample size was \( N = 300 \), but 14 cases were deleted because they had complete missing data points on all variables of interest resulting in a final sample of \( N = 286 \).

Missing Data Analysis

The data were screened for missing values using the “Analyze Patterns” function in SPSS. All variables (100%) had at least 1 missing value; 31.4% of the cases had at least 1 missing value, and total missing values were 7.6%. Visual representation of the missing value patterns did not appear to have a systematic pattern, as islands of missing patterns were scattered in a random way.

Because total missing values were 7.6%, which is considered to be above the cutoff of (5%) as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), it was necessary to treat missing values. Missing values were handled using Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML). Enders and Bandalos (2001) found that FIML estimation was more robust than classical methods of treating missing data (e.g., listwise deletion, pairwise deletion, and similar response pattern imputation). In their Monte Carlo simulation study, they found that estimates based on FIML were more robust and unbiased than other
methods (Enders & Bandalos, 2001). The software R with the ‘lavaan’ package (Yves Rosseel, 2012) was used to implement FIML when CFA procedures were performed.

**Normality**

All variables of interest were analyzed for normality. First, frequencies were run with histograms to check for bimodality. There was no issue of bimodality. Then, the standard deviations were analyzed to see any items that had variance less than one-fifth of the range. There was no SD less than .8. After that, skewness and kurtosis were examined. First, the skewness statistics were divided by their standard errors of skewness to get a calculated t-test. I then used $p < .001$ or critical t value of 3.30 as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) to identify items that were statistically significant. The same thing was done for kurtosis. The kurtosis statistics were divided by their standard errors of kurtosis to obtain a calculated t-test. The same cutoff points were used as in the skewness test. This test of normality suggested that assumption of normality was violated. Most of variables showed levels of skewness and/or kurtosis at the univariate level.

At the multivariate level, Mardia's normalized estimate of multivariate kurtosis was calculated using the R software with “psych” package (Revelle, 2014) to test the assumption of multivariate normality. Mardia's normalized coefficient was (21.67), $p < .001$, which was larger than the cutoff value of 5.0 that was recommended by Bentler (2005). This statistic suggests a violation of multivariate normality. Because the violations of normality assumption tend to impact variances and covariances (DeCarlo, 1997), Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR) estimation was employed using Satorra-
Bentler scaled chi-square (Satorra & Bentler, 1988) and corrected fit indices to account for non-normal data. The Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic ($S-B\chi^2$) is a test that makes a scaling correction of the chi-square test when data is non-normally distributed (Bentler & Dijkstra, 1985). Using Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic ($S-B\chi^2$) enables the use of FIML. FIML assumes normality. Using FIML under cases where this assumption is violated can result in biased estimates; however, the condition of normality was met by using MLR estimation along with Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic ($S-B\chi^2$).

Outliers

Prior to testing for outliers, the histograms were examined for any data points sitting on their own on the extremes. Boxplots were also examined to check for possible outliers. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), univariate outliers are cases that have large z scores in excess of 3.29 or less than -3.29. According to this test, no outliers were found for all continuous variables at the univariate level.

However, at multivariate level, 7 cases were found to be multivariate outliers. Mahalanobis distance test was used through linear regression analysis in SPSS. The ID case number was entered to the regression line as the dependent variable, and 53 items as independent variables. With 53 degrees of freedom and a critical chi-square of $\chi^2 = 86.661$ at $p = .001$, 7 cases were found to have Mahalanobis distance greater than the critical $\chi^2 = 86.661$. The alpha level was set to, $p = .001$ as per the suggestion of Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). Although 7 cases were found to be outliers at multivariate level, they were not deleted because the CFA was run with and without multivariate outlier cases and the results did not have significant discrepancies. In addition, because a
robust maximum likelihood and $S-B_{\chi^2}$ were used, any non-normality that was caused by multivariate outliers was addressed.

Data Analysis

Because the data violated normality assumptions, the software R was used with the “lavaan” package (Yves Rosseel, 2012) to perform analyses using Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR) that accounted for non-normal data, generated Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic ($S-B_{\chi^2}$), corrected fit indices, and adjusted for standard errors. One reason for using lavaan is due to its capability of handling missing data and using various estimation methods. In addition, Narayanan (2012) compared eight software packages for structural equation modeling and found that lavaan package generated the same results as other packages. Because AMOS Version 21.0 (Arbuckle, 2012) does not support MLR, its use was limited to producing path diagrams.

Results of First-Order CFA

To determine whether the 6 dimensions of muted dissent retained from study 2 (disengaged, supportive, defiant, relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat) were empirically distinct constructs, a CFA using the lavaan package was performed with MLR estimation along with FIML to handle missing values. (The R programming code developed for this analysis and for the remaining subsequent analyses are found in Appendix Q.) For testing model fit, a rule of thumb suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010) was used by relying on at least one incremental fit index and at least one absolute fit index. For the absolute fit index, RMSEA was used, and for incremental fit index, CFI was used.
The hypothesized model was considered to have a good fit if the following criteria were met: (a) Comparative Fit Index (CFI) > .90, (b) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) < .06 as recommended in the literature (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Marsh, Hau, & Wen, 2004), and (c) standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) with an estimate less than .05 (Byrne, 2010). Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic ($S-B\chi^2$), which is a test that corrects regular Chi-square to account for nonnormality, was also used.

When the confirmatory factor model converged, the output was first screened for any suspicious results. For example, the data were examined for issues like Heywood cases (McDonald, 1985) (e.g., a situation where results produce a negative variance) were present. There were no warning messages from the output for estimates out of range, or negative variance, or negative $R^2$. It is worth noting that the model was identified by fixing the latent factor variances to 1 and means to 0, so that factor loadings, residual variances and intercepts of items could be estimated.

Results of the CFA supported a six-factor model with a good fit $S-B\chi^2 (362, N = 286) = 503.965, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .037 [90% CI = .03, .04], Robust CFI = .96). (Hypothesized model is reported in Figure 18.) Values of CFI range from 0 to 1. The value of 0 means poor fit, and value of 1 means perfect fit. The results of the CFI values above the cutoff point indicated that the hypothesized model adequately described the sample data. In addition, RMSEA values range from 0 to 1. Values closer to zero indicate good fit. In other words, the RMSEA of .037 and 90% CI[03, .04] indicated that we can be 90% confident that RMSEA in the population will fall within the bounds of CI.
Figure 18. Six-Factor measurement model of muted dissent. All values on the figure are standardized estimates. DIS = Disengaged, REL = Relational, DEF = Defiant, FTH = Face threat, SUP = Supportive, INS = Instrumental. S-By2 (362, N = 286) = 503.965, p < .001, Robust RMSEA = .037 [90% CI = .03, .04], Robust CFI = .96.
The corrected chi-square test (S-B \( \chi^2 \)) did not indicate a good fit, but this was expected because both normal \( \chi^2 \) goodness of fit and the scaled \( \chi^2 \) are influenced by sample size, but SRMR was .048, just below the .05 cutoff, indicating a good fit. In addition, the scaled normed S-B \( \chi^2 \) was 1.39 suggesting very good fit. Normed \( \chi^2 \) is estimated by dividing \( \chi^2 \) by degree of freed. In this case, the scaled \( \chi^2 \) was used. Hair et al. (2010) suggested that normed \( \chi^2 \) less than 2.0 is very good, and 2.0 to 5.0 acceptable.

Overall, the measurement model confirmed the results of the exploratory factor analysis from study 2. All factor loadings of the 6 factors were statistically significant at \( p < .001 \). Most of factor loadings exceeded the .70 cutoff (Hair et al., 2010), except one loading for disengaged muted dissent (DIS_6 = .67), two loading for defiant muted dissent (DEF_2 = .69 and DEF_8 = .66), one loading for supportive muted dissent (SUP_4 = .69), and one loading for relational threat (REL_8 = .57). Although these items fell slightly below the cutoff of .70, they were only .01 to .04 below that cutoff. The item (REL_8 = .57) was below the cutoff; however, this item was retained because the factor loading did not fall below the less conservative threshold of .5 (Hair et al., 2010). Yet, this item was flagged as a candidate for potential removal in subsequent analyses if required. All the remaining factor loadings had large estimates indicating an initial support for convergent validity of the six constructs. Standardized factor loadings are displayed in Table 11. The CFA findings provided evidence that the measurement model of the six factors of muted dissent scales provided a good fit. The findings were further validated by comparing the fit of the six-factor model with 5 other models to find out if muted dissent measures were best represented by one-factor, two-factor, three-factor,
four-factor, five-factor, or six-factor structures. These six different factor structures are represented by 6 different models that are described next.

Table 11

*CFA Standardized Factor Loadings of the Six Dimensions of Muted Dissent (N = 286)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Standardized Factor loadings</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Standardized Factor loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>0.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>0.67***</td>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>0.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>0.69***</td>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>0.83***</td>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Model was identified by setting latent factor variances to 1 and means to 0, so that all S.E and t-value of loadings were estimated. ***p < 0.001.
First, all 29 items were set as reflective indicators of one single factor (latent variable). This factor was labeled “model 1.” Model 2 was defined by creating a two-factor model. EFA with PAF was used by fixing the number of factors to be extracted to 2. According to the results of EFA, the first factor was defined by disengaged muted dissent, relational threat, and defiant muted dissent. The second factor-model was defined by face threat, supportive muted dissent, and instrumental threat.

The previous step was repeated by rerunning EFA with PAF and fixing the number of factors to 3, 4, and, finally, 5. For the three-factor model (“model 3”), the first factor was defined by disengaged muted dissent, relational threat, and instrumental threat. The second factor was defined by defiant measures only. The third factor was defined by face threat and supportive muted dissent.

The four-factor model (“model 4”) was defined by disengaged, relational, and instrumental measures as indicative of the first factor. The second factor was determined by supportive measures. Defiant muted dissent determined the third factor, and the fourth factor was established using face threat measures.

For the five-factor model (“model 5”), disengaged muted dissent defined one factor, face threat another factor, supportive muted dissent another factor, and defiant muted dissent fourth factor. Relational threat and instrumental threat represented the final factor. Model 6 is the model that was tested in the previous section with six dimensions of muted dissent (disengaged, supportive, defiant, relational, face, and instrumental threat). Consequentially, model 6 was used as the baseline model.
Next, a CFA was run for each nested model separately (model 1 to model 6) and their fit indices were compared with the baseline model (model 6). Chi-square ($\chi^2$) difference test $\Delta \chi^2$ is usually used to assess model comparison to find the best fitting model. For this study, however, the Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic (S-B$\chi^2$) was used. Research indicated that scaled chi-square cannot be used to conduct Chi-square difference test $\Delta \chi^2$ due to the fact that the difference between two scaled $\chi^2$ is not distributed like $\chi^2$ (Satorra & Bentler, 2001).

In response to this issue, researchers have determined how to perform a chi-square difference test for the S-B$\chi^2$ scaled statistic (Bryant & Satorra, 2012; Satorra, & Bentler, 2010). To perform a scaled difference chi-square, an EXCEL macro developed by Bryant and Satorra (2013) was used. S-B$\chi^2$ difference test was employed here because the 5 other models have exactly the same number of variables as the main model. Constraints were imposed on model 1 to model 5; hence, these models were nested, enabling assessment of the S-B$\chi^2$ difference test. Table 12 displays fit estimates for the 6 models. Table 12 shows that the $\Delta (S-B\chi^2)$ between model 6 with 6 factors and model 1 with one factor is 1675.68. This value is a chi-square distribution with $df = 15$ ($df$ of model 1 – $df$ of model 6) which was statistical significant $p < .001$ indicating that the six-factor model significantly outperformed the one-factor model. The six-factor model was also better than model 2, model 3, model 4, and model 5. Other fit indices, like robust CFI and robust RMSEA, also suggested that the 6 factor model was better than the other models (see Table 12).
Table 12

**Model Comparison Using Satorra-Bentler Scaled Difference Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model No.</th>
<th>No. of Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(S-B $\chi^2$)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta$ (S-B $\chi^2$)</th>
<th>Robust CFI</th>
<th>Robust RMSEA 90%CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>2429.82</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1675.68***</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1693.16</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>877.61***</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1313.34</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>667.93***</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>878.38</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>280.37***</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>625.46</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>96.02***</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>503.97</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Model 6 is the comparison model. ***$p < 0.001$
Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Knowing that the results of the 6 factor-model significantly outperformed the other 5 models, the next step was to validate whether the psychometric properties of these 6 factors showed evidence of construct validity. To meet this aim, convergent and discriminant validity were assessed using guidelines elaborated by Hair et al. (2010).

Criteria for Convergent Validity

Convergent validity provides evidence that items of a construct share a common proportion of variance as an indication that they measure exactly the same construct. Hair et al. (2010) suggested that, for convergent validity to be established, three criteria should be assessed. First, standardized factor loadings should be at least .50 although .70 is preferable. The authors provided a rationale behind this rule in the context of item communality also referred to as variance extracted: “the square of a standardized factor loading represents how much variation in an item is explained by the latent factor” (Hair et al., 2010, p. 686). They suggested that, for the convergent validity of a construct, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) should be .50 or higher. If AVE is less than .50, this would mean that, on average, the items of a construct explain a variance less than 50%, indicating that “more error remains in the items than variance explained by the latent factor structure” (p. 686). Variance extracted of an item is equivalent to communality in regular Factor Analysis, and is determined by calculating the square of the standardized loading. For the AVE, the formula provided by Hair et al. (2010, p. 6870) was used:
Where $\lambda_i$ is a standardized loading and $n$ is the number of items. The second criterion for establishing convergent validity, as stated by Hair et al. (2010), is that Construct Reliability (CR) should be .70 or higher, but CR between .60 and .70 is acceptable if supported by good fit indices from the model. It is worth noting that the coefficient alpha of reliability used here is not the same as Cronbach's alpha, although they both test reliability. CR coefficient can understate reliability (Hair et al., 2010). The following formula as suggested by Hair et al. (2010) was used to calculate CR.

$$ CR = \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i\right)^2}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i\right)^2 + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_i\right)^2} $$

Where $\lambda_i$ is a standardized loading, $n$ is the number of items, and $\delta$ is error variance.

**Criteria for Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity is “the degree to which a construct is truly distinct from other constructs” (Hair et al., 2010, p. 687). In other words, establishing discriminant validity for a construct is an indication that the construct is capable of capturing a phenomenon that other measures do not. The findings of nested model comparisons as explained in earlier sections (see Table 12 from preceding sections) provided evidence of
discriminant validity. For example, when the six-factor model was compared with the one-factor model, this process was like testing whether the items that produced 6 factors could also produce one factor. The results suggested that a six-factor solution was better than the 1-factor model and was better than the other constrained models with a 2, 3, 4, or 5 factor structure.

Discriminant validity was further verified by using a more rigorous test involving comparing AVE values for any two constructs as recommended by Hair et al. (2010). The criterion for establishing discriminant validity through this approach is that the AVE of a construct should be larger than its squared correlation value with other constructs. Hair et al. explained, “the logic here is based on the idea that a latent construct should explain more of the variance in its item measures that it shares with another construct” (p. 688). To accomplish this test, AVE and CR were manually calculated using formulas provided above in MS Excel.

Results of Convergent and Discriminant Validity

The standardized loadings of the 6 factors of muted dissent were analyzed. All of them were statistically significant at p < .001. It was possible to find p-values for all item loadings because, in model identification, all loadings and fixed latent variances were set to 1 and latent means to 0. Construct reliabilities were then calculated using previous formulas. The reliability for the 6 factors were as follows: disengaged = .90, relational = .79, defiant = .81, face threat = .93, supportive = .90, and instrumental = .85.

All reliabilities exceeded the recommended cutoff of .70. In terms of AVE, five muted dissent constructs had AVEs above the .50 threshold, indicating strong support for
convergent validity. One exception was the relational threat construct with an AVE = .49; however, that was just .01 below the cutoff. Therefore, this statistic was not a big concern because the model was supplemented by a very good fit. These findings suggested that convergent validity was satisfied for all constructs. Table 13 illustrates all values of AVEs and CRs along with description of how they were calculated.

For discriminant validity, the AVEs for all 6 constructs were compared with their squared correlations. All AVEs for all constructs were above the squared correlations of other constructs; hence, the criteria for discriminant validity were met. This fact indicated that all 6 dimensions of muted dissent measured different phenomena. Table 14 summarizes the psychometric properties of the muted dissent scales and their discriminant and convergent validity.
Table 13

*Standardized Loadings, Average Variance Extracted, and Construct Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>REL</th>
<th>DEF</th>
<th>FTH</th>
<th>SUP</th>
<th>INS</th>
<th>$\lambda^2$</th>
<th>$\delta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Extracted 0.59 0.49 0.52 0.72 0.61 0.59
Construct Reliability 0.90 0.79 0.81 0.93 0.90 0.85

*Note:* Item reliabilities are the squared factor loadings or communalities ($\lambda^2$). Error variances ($\delta$) variances were calculated by subtracting each item’s reliability from 1 (1 - $\lambda^2$). (DIS = Disengaged; REL = Relational; DEF = Defiant; FTH = Face threat; SUP = Supportive; INS = Instrumental). All loadings above are significant at $p < 0.001$. 
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Table 14

**Convergent and Discriminant Validity For Muted Dissent Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Disengaged</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>Defiant</th>
<th>Face Threat</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face Threat</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td><strong>0.72</strong></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td><strong>0.61</strong></td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>0.55***</td>
<td>0.66***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td><strong>0.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construct Reliability 0.90 0.79 0.81 0.93 0.90 0.85

Note. Values below the diagonal are correlation values among scales, values on the diagonal are Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and values above the diagonal are squared correlations. *p < 0.05. **p < 0.01. ***p < 0.001

As can be seen from Table 14, overall, the muted dissent constructs are significantly correlated. The single exception is the correlation between defiant muted dissent and supportive muted dissent. During phase one, the qualitative findings suggested three sub-themes of protective muted dissent (relational, instrumental, and face threat). In this study, these three constructs were found to have moderate to high correlations. For example, the correlation between relational and instrumental threat was \((r = .66, p < .001)\), instrumental and face threat was \((r = .48, p < .001)\), and relational and face threat \((r = .4, p < .001)\). This pattern led me to test whether relational, instrumental, and face threat constructs were defined by a higher-order dimension (protective muted dissent) as the qualitative findings had suggested. The next section illustrates steps taken to test the second-order CFA with protective muted dissent as a hierarchical construct.
Results: Protective Muted Dissent as a Higher-Order CFA

Guidelines suggested by Brown (2006) were used to assess second-order CFA. Brown recommended using the higher-order structure CFA measurement model to test a theory and to provide a more parsimonious model. Three general steps were followed for running a higher-order CFA as suggested by Brown (2006). First, the correlations of these three factors were examined. Brown (2006) claimed that, if there is no correlation among the first-order factors, there is no justification to run a second-order factor analysis. This requirement was met as the previous section provided support that relational, instrumental and face threat had moderate to highly significant correlations. Second, the first-order CFA of instrumental, relational, and face threat latent constructs were conceptually valid and produced a good measurement model fit. The final step suggested by Brown is to fit the second-order factor model by allowing the correlation among factors to be freely estimated. Because step 1 was met, the following subsections demonstrate procedures and results of step 2 and step 3.

First-Order Measurement Model

First, a test was conducted of a measurement model involving three constructs (relational, instrumental, and face threat) that were hypothesized to form a meaningful conceptual higher-order construct (protective muted dissent). The measurement model was identified by setting latent variance at 1 for the three latent constructs. This process began with checking the output for any negative variances or standardized weights that were out of range. Results of measurement model using MLR estimation with FIML
exhibited a good fit $\chi^2_{(62, N = 286)} = 105.382, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .05 [90% CI = .034, .064], Robust CFI = .97, and Robust SRMR = .05) (see Figure 19).
Second-Order Measurement Model

Meeting the requirement of good fit at a first-order measurement level laid the foundation for testing whether protective muted dissent accounted for the variation in the first-order constructs. Prior to testing for final second-order model with all dimensions of muted dissent, a single hierarchical CFA model was tested. Employing MLR with FIML, the model exhibited a good fit S-B$\chi^2$ (62, $N = 286$) = 105.382, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .05 [90% CI = .034, .064], Robust CFI = .97, and Robust SRMR = .05) (see Figure 20).

The present findings provide strong evidence that protective muted dissent accounted for proportions of variation in face threat, instrumental threat, and relational threat. Because protective muted dissent showed strong evidence of being a second-order construct, the data were then tested with 3 muted dissent first-order constructs (disengaged muted dissent, defiant muted dissent, and supportive muted dissent). This CFA model was tested with MLR. Missing values were handled using FIML approach. The latent variances of the three first-order constructs and one single second-order construct were set to 1.0. As in previous CFAs, all items were allowed to load on one construct only. In addition, error terms of the indicators were not allowed to correlate.

The proposed model (depicted in Figure 21) exhibited strong evidence of a good fit S-B$\chi^2$ (368, $N = 286$) = 556.898, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .042 [90% CI = .036, .049], Robust CFI = .95, and Robust SRMR = .07). With the exception of the S-B$\chi^2$ statistic, and SRMR, robust CFI and RMSEA were within the range of good fit. These findings suggest that there is supportive evidence that the theoretical framework of muted dissent, as conceptualized in this research, is defined by 3 first-order factors (disengaged,
supportive, and defiant muted dissent), and one second-order factor (protective muted dissent) that is defined by three first-order constructs: face threat, instrumental threat, and relational threat.

*Figure 20.* Second-Order CFA of protective with three first-order factors. All values on the figure are standardized estimates. REL = Relational, FTH = Face threat, INS = Instrumental. The 13 first-order factor loadings and the 3 loadings at the second-order structure are significant at $p < 0.001$. S-By$^2$ (62, $N = 286$) = 105.382, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .05 [90% CI = .034, .064], Robust CFI = .97, and Robust SRMR = .05).
Figure 21. Final Four-Factor measurement model. All values on the figure are standardized estimates. DIS = Disengaged, REL = Relational, DEF = Defiant, FTH = Face threat, SUP = Supportive, INS = Instrumental, PRO = Protective. All loadings are significant at $p < 0.001$. With an exception of standardized covariance between DEF and SUP, the remaining standardized covariances are significant at $p < 0.001$. S-B$\chi^2$ (368, $N = 286) = 556.898, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .042 [90% CI = .036, .049], Robust CFI = .95, and Robust SRMR = .07)
Results of Research Questions and Hypotheses

This section reports the final findings of the research. The data relevant to the research questions and hypotheses were tested to establish nomological validity. The preceding analyses showed supportive evidence that the scales assessing muted dissent have convergent and discriminant validity. In this section, nomological validity is assessed to confirm that the newly proposed constructs composing muted dissent make theoretical sense. This goal was pursued by testing whether the constructs of muted dissent correlated with other measures (validation measures) that were theoretically expected to correlate. A measurement model was tested by including the final four main muted dissent constructs and the four validation measures: organizational justice, upward dissent, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Selected items on the validation measures were reverse coded as needed. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted by employing robust maximum likelihood estimation. Latent variances were set to be freely estimated, and the first factor loading was fixed for each construct to 1.0. The data were examined for any suspicious values, like negative variances or values exceeding standardized range. There were no such issues.

The baseline model (the independent model) that examined the hypothesis that all variables were not associated was easily rejected $S-B \chi^2 (1378, N= 286) = 8248.494, p < .001$. The hypothesized model that tested that there are correlations between constructs of interest was supported $S-B \chi^2 (1294, N= 286) = 2047.097, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .045 [90% CI = .042, .049], Robust CFI = .89, and Robust SRMR = .08). As seen, the
Satorra-Bentler scaled statistic (S-B $\chi^2$) was significant; however, as discussed earlier, this test has been criticized for being sensitive to sample size. CFI fell slightly below the threshold of .90, and SRMR above the cutoff .05.

Consequently, model diagnostic procedures were performed to see why the CFI was below the cutoff. First, the standardized loadings were examined. All standardized loadings were statistically significant and most, albeit not all, were above the .70 cutoff. For example, the upward dissent scale that was created using 9 items showed 4 items with standardized loadings below the less conservative .50 threshold. Similarly, the organizational commitment scale (measured by 5 items) showed one item with standardized loading below .50.

Hair et al. (2010) suggested that items with standardized loading below .50 could be removed. However, the authors cautioned that, because this is a confirmatory phase, any modification to the model should be minor. They defined minor modification by stating, “If more than 20% of the measured variables are deleted, then the modifications cannot be considered minor” (p. 691). With this caution in mind, post hoc model modifications were performed in order to develop a significantly better model fit. Based on the Lagrange multiplier test (Modification Indices), several modifications were proposed but were not consistent with the conceptual theory of the hypothesized model. Relying on Hair et al.’s (2010) guidelines, two items were deleted that were less than .20 standardized loadings: one item of organizational commitment (“I would not mind to work for a different company if the nature of the job was similar”) and one item from
upward dissent scale (“I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren’t working to my supervisor or someone in management”).

Following these modifications, the model improved significantly with S-B$\chi^2$ (1193, $N = 286$) = 1818.343, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = 0.043 [90% CI = .039, .047], Robust CFI = .91, and Robust SRMR = .08). The improved model is depicted in Figure 22. To assess whether this improvement of the model after deleting two items was a statistically significant improvement, a S-B$\chi^2$ difference test was performed to examine improvement by comparing the two models, before modification and after modification. Results were Satorra-Bentler S-B$\chi^2$ difference (101, $N = 286$) = 233.1593, $p < .001$. This statistic indicated that the performed modification contributed to model improvement.

*Results of H1 to H4*

To test nomological validity, all correlations (standardized covariances depicted in Figure 22) between muted dissent measures and validation measures were examined. Correlations between the muted dissent scales and other administered validation measures were significantly correlated as expected, except hypothesis 4c, which was not supported. Disengaged muted dissent negatively correlated with organizational justice ($r = -.60, p < .001$).
Figure 22. Eight-Factor CFA with validation measures. All values on the figure are standardized estimates. DIS = Disengaged, REL = Relational, DEF = Defiant, FTH = Face threat, SUP = Supportive, INS = Instrumental, PRO = Protective. Validation measures include (JSA = Job satisfaction, UPD = Upward dissent, COM = Organizational commitment, and JUS = Organizational justice). $S$-$B \chi^2 (1193, N = 286) = 1818.343, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = 0.043 [90% CI = .039, .047], Robust CFI = .91, and Robust SRMR = .08).
Hypothesis 1a was supported indicating that respondents who reported high levels of justice in their corresponding organization reported low levels of disengaged muted dissent. H1b tested whether there was a negative relationship between protective muted dissent and organizational justice. Participants who reported being treated unfairly in their organizations (low levels of justice), reported high levels of muted dissent due to self-protection ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$).

Four general dimensions of muted dissent were also hypothesized to have a negative correlation with reports of upward dissent. As expected, upward dissent related negatively with disengaged muted dissent ($r = -.52$, $p < .001$), thus establishing support for H2a. Similarly, H2b was supported: upward dissent was negatively associated with protective muted dissent. H2c focused on the relationship between upward dissent and supportive muted dissent and the data suggested a significant negative correlation ($r = -.22$, $p < .01$). In addition, upward dissent was negatively and significantly correlated with defiant muted dissent ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$). This finding supported H2c.

H3a and H3b examined whether there was a negative relationship between job satisfaction and disengaged muted dissent ($r = -.63$, $p < .001$), and job satisfaction and protective muted dissent ($r = -.41$, $p < .001$). These two hypotheses were supported as well. Besides job satisfaction, I also wanted to know if employees who reported high levels of organizational commitment would be less likely to engage in muted dissent. H4a focused on whether respondents with low levels of commitment to their organization reported high levels of disengaged muted dissent. Results indicated support for H4a ($r = -.64$, $p < .001$). Similarly, there was a negative correlation between organizational
commitment and protective dissent ($r = -.34$, $p < .001$); hence, H4b was supported. Like protective muted dissent, defiant muted dissent was negatively related with organizational commitment ($r = -0.24$, $p < .01$). This finding supported H4d.

The aforementioned hypotheses were based on literature review and past studies. With the newly proposed constructs (e.g., defiant muted dissent), research questions were postulated. For example, RQ1a examined whether there is a relationship between defiant muted dissent and organizational justice. A negative relationship was found ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$). In addition, the data suggest that there is no association between supportive muted dissent and organizational justice (RQ1b).

RQ2a and RQ2b concerned the relationship between job satisfaction and two muted dissent scales (defiant and supportive). For RQ2a, a negative relationship was found between job satisfaction and defiant muted dissent ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$); however, for RQ2b there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and supportive muted dissent. Table 15 reports correlations between muted dissent measures and validation measures.

These results provide a strong indication of the nomological validity of the muted dissent scales. Moreover, the relationships among the muted dissent scales themselves are positive and statistically significant, which is an indication that these scales measure a common phenomenon of interest. The only exception is a correlation between defiant muted dissent and supportive muted dissent. The relationship between those two constructs was not significant (see Table 15). On the other hand, the relationships between disengaged dissent and defiant dissent was ($r = .26$, $p < .001$); disengaged and
supportive muted dissent was \( r = .21, p < .01 \); disengaged and protective muted dissent was \( r = .7, p < .001 \), defiant and protective muted dissent was \( r = .33, p < .001 \); and supportive and protective muted dissent was \( r = .53, p < .001 \).

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>DEF</th>
<th>SUP</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>JSA</th>
<th>JUS</th>
<th>COM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>-0.63***</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.41***</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS</td>
<td>-0.60***</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>-0.64***</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>0.85***</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPD</td>
<td>-0.52***</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.70***</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. JSA = Job satisfaction, JUS = Organizational justice, COM = Organizational commitment, UPD = Upward dissent, DIS = Disengaged, DEF = Defiant; SUP = Supportive; PRO = Protective), \( p < 0.001. * p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01. *** p < 0.001 \)

Results of RQ3 Individual and Contextual Differences

RQ3 asked whether there were statistically significant differences among the four main dimensions of muted dissent based on the following variables: biological sex (male, female), supervisory role (supervisor, not a supervisor), hierarchy (general staff, middle manager, senior manager), and job tenure. Prior to testing means differences, four averaged scales of the muted dissent dimensions were created, and Cronbach’s alpha was calculated. First, the 6 items of disengaged muted dissent were averaged to produce one
composite score for each participant ($M = 3.02, SD = 0.91, \alpha = .89$). A composite score was computed for the 6 items for supportive muted dissent ($M = 3.5, SD = 0.91, \alpha = .90$), and the 4 items for defiant muted dissent ($M = 3.10, SD = 0.87, \alpha = .81$). For protective muted dissent, the 3 subscales of protective muted dissent (face threat, instrumental threat, and relational threat) were averaged to produce one composite score for each participant ($M = 3.32, SD = 0.76, \alpha = .70$).

**Gender and Supervisory Role**

Prior to conducting independent $t$-test, Levene’s test was used to evaluate the assumption that population variances between males and females and between supervisors and nonsupervisors were equal. In the case of this data, the variances were very similar between biological sex and all four dimensions of muted dissent as Levene’s test yielded a non-significant $p$-value. However, the assumption of homogeneity of variance between the supervisor group and the non-supervisor group and two of the muted dissent scales (protective and defiant) was violated, warranting the use of a $t$-test for unequal variance.

While there was no significant difference between male and female employees with respect to defiant, protective, and supportive muted dissent, an independent $t$-test showed a significant difference between men and women with respect to disengaged muted dissent $t(239) = -2.51, p < .05$. This finding suggested that female employees engaged in disengaged muted dissent more ($M = 3.3$) than their male counterparts ($M = 2.93$). While the difference between supervisors and nonsupervisors toward disengaged, protective, and supportive dissent was not significant, supervisory role showed
statistically significant difference when examining defiant muted dissent \( t(240) = 2.31, p < .05 \). This finding suggested that nonsupervisors were more likely to engage in defiant muted dissent \( (M = 3.25) \), than supervisors \( (M = 2.9) \). Table 16 reports results of the t-tests.

*Muted Dissent and Organizational Hierarchy*

Participants were asked the following question, “which classification best describes your position?” with three choices offered: Senior Management, Middle Management, and General Staff. Levene’s test showed no violation of homogeneity of variance. Results indicated significant differences among senior managers, middle managers, and general staff in the way they manifested disengaged muted dissent \( F(2, 238) = 3.31, p < .05 \), and protective muted dissent \( F(2, 244) = 6.10, p < .01 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-Test Statistics between Gender, Supervisory Role, and Four Dimensions of Muted Dissent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaged Muted Dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant Muted Dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Muted Dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Muted Dissent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the three levels of management showed no significant difference with respect to defiant and supportive muted dissent. Means plots for protective and disengaged dissent showed a significant difference across managerial hierarchy. As can be seen from Figure 23, employees who were low on the hierarchy tended to engage more in protective and disengaged dissent than employees who reported to be high on the hierarchy in their corresponding organization.

As shown in Figure 23, employees at lower levels of the hierarchy tended to remain silent regarding issues they did not agree with due to self-protection from harming relational, face, and instrumental aspects, with an average mean of 3.4 (on a 5-point scale). On the other hand, employees at senior levels reported having less desire to suppress their dissent, with a mean of 2.80. This pattern was also true for disengaged muted dissent as well. Employees with less hierarchical power reported higher levels of disengaged muted dissent with $M = 3.20$ compared to their senior manager counterparts whose mean was 2.62.
Figure 23. Plotting mean differences with organizational hierarchy and two dimensions of muted dissent (disengaged and protective). Lower and upper bounds of 95% CI of means are depicted on the graph.

Muted Dissent and Job Tenure

Building on the literature that suggests there is an association between work experience and speaking up behavior, a one-way ANOVA was run to assess the relationship between job tenure and dimensions of muted dissent. No significant relationship was found between job tenure and protective, supportive, or defiant muted dissent. Interestingly, disengaged muted dissent was found to vary across five categories of job tenure ("less than 1 year", "1 to 2 years", "2 to 5 years", "5 to 10 years", and "more than 10 years"). The assumption of homogeneity of variance across all groups was met, and overall omnibus ANOVA yielded a significant result of $F(4, 236) = 3.29, p < .05$). Mean differences among these five categories toward disengaged muted dissent are provided in Figure 24 with 95% CIs.
Figure 24. Plotting mean difference with job tenure and disengaged muted dissent. Lower and upper bounds of 95% CI of means are depicted on the graph.

As can be seen from Figure 24, employees with less job experience reported feeling safer when expressing disagreements; however, as they advanced in job tenure, they tended to disengage from expressing dissent due to the realization that expressing dissent was futile. There was a decline in disengaged muted dissent for employees who had completed a minimum 2 to 5 years at their workplace, then a rise in disengaged muted dissent from 10 years and onward.

In summary, this section reported results of research questions and hypotheses (see Table 17 for summary of hypotheses results). All hypotheses were supported except one. Although these hypotheses were originally formulated to be tested using regular correlation, the final measurement model was also examined at a more rigorous level by...
retesting these hypotheses using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). Findings of SEM are reported next.

Table 17

**Summary of Hypotheses Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Overall justice will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Overall justice will be negatively related to protective muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Upward dissent will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Upward dissent will be negatively related to protective muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c</td>
<td>Upward dissent will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d</td>
<td>Upward dissent will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Job satisfaction will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Job satisfaction will be negatively related to protective muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Organizational commitment will be negatively related to disengaged muted dissent.</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Organizational commitment will be negatively related to protective muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4c</td>
<td>Organizational commitment will be negatively related to supportive muted dissent</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4d</td>
<td>Organizational commitment will be negatively related to defiant muted dissent</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1a</td>
<td>Is defiant muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ1b</td>
<td>Is supportive muted dissent associated with reports of overall justice?</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2a</td>
<td>Is defiant muted associated with job satisfaction?</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2b</td>
<td>Is supportive muted dissent associated with job satisfaction?</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results of Structural Equation Modeling**

Robust maximum likelihood was employed to estimate structural model and missing values were handled using FIML approach. Organizational justice was set as an exogenous variable predicting the four main dimensions of muted dissent because the literature suggests that organizational justice predicts silence behavior (e.g., Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). Outcome variables (validation variables) were set as endogenous variables predicted by the muted dissent scales because an association was found between silence and some outcome variables (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) (e.g., Avtgis et al., 2007; Kassing, 1997; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011; Morrison & Milliken; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). The hypothesized model is shown in Figure 25.
Figure 25. Structural Equation Model. All values on the figure are standardized estimates. DIS = Disengaged, REL = Relational, DEF = Defiant, FTH = Face threat, SUP = Supportive, INS = Instrumental, PRO = Protective. Validation measures include (JSA = Job satisfaction, UPD = Upward dissent, COM = Organizational commitment, and JUS = Organizational justice). S-B$\chi^2$(1205, $N = 286$) = 2089.647, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .051 [90% CI = .047, .054], and Robust CFI = .87.
There was acceptable support for the hypothesized model $S-B\chi^2 (1205, N = 286) = 2089.647, p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .051 [90% CI = .047, .054], and Robust CFI = .87. CFI fell below the threshold of .90. No post hoc model modifications were performed as doing so would have resulted in moving from the confirmatory to the exploratory stage, which would require a new dataset. The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) was .11, which was above the cutoff of .05 as recommended by Byrne (2010). SRMR indicated that the model explained estimated parameters to within an average error of .11. Thus, SRMR and CFI did not indicate a good fit. Given that the CFI estimate fell below the threshold of .90 and SRMR was above .05, the CI of RMSEA indicated a good fit because the upper value of CI was .054, which means there is 90% confidence that the RSEA value in the population will fall within the bounds of .047 and .054.

The model suggested that organizational justice negatively and significantly predicted disengaged muted dissent ($\beta = -.72, p < .001$), defiant muted dissent ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$), and protective muted dissent ($\beta = -.51, p < .001$). Figure 26 displays all standardized effects of the hypothesized model. According to these data, organizational justice did not predict supportive muted dissent. While the outcome variable of upward dissent was not significantly predicted by defiant and supportive muted dissent, upward dissent was significantly and negatively predicted by disengaged muted dissent ($\beta = -.17, p < .05$) and protective muted dissent ($\beta = -.58, p < .001$).
Figure 26. Hypothesized Structural Equation Model with standardized effects. The number of indicators were depicted for the purpose of illustration that the model was tested using latent variables, and number of indicators above for the latent variables do not necessarily represent actual number of indicators for each latent construct. $p < 0.05$. **$p < 0.01$. ***$p < 0.001$. S-B$\chi^2$ (1205, $N = 286$) = 2089.647, $p < .001$, Robust RMSEA = .051 [90% CI = .047, .054], and Robust CFI = .87.

The outcome variable job satisfaction was negatively and significantly predicted by disengaged muted dissent ($\beta = .68$, $p < .001$), and protective muted dissent ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$). Interestingly, job satisfaction was positively and significantly predicted by supportive muted dissent ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$). Defiant muted dissent, on the other hand, showed no significant influence on job satisfaction. The outcome variable, organizational commitment, was significantly and negatively predicted by disengaged muted dissent ($\beta = -.72$, $p < .001$), but was predicted positively by supportive muted dissent ($\beta = .22$, $p <$
however, organizational commitment was not significantly predicted by defiant and protective muted dissent.

Post Hoc Analyses Not Part of Hypotheses Testing

The aim of this section was to conduct a series of post hoc analyses to establish recommendations for future studies. I began by analyzing different demographic contextual variables to see if the four main dimensions of muted dissent differed across individual characteristics and contexts. These variables include age, organizational size, and sector (e.g., private, public).

Muted Dissent Across Age Groups

Levene’s statistic was used to test the assumption of homogeneity of variance. A one-way analysis of variance was employed to examine the relationship between muted dissent scales and age. The test indicated no difference between disengaged, defiant, and supportive dissent among the six age groups (18 to 24 years; 25 to 34 years; 35 to 44 years, 45 to 54 years, 55 to 64 years, and more than 65 years). However, an overall significant difference was found between age groups and protective muted dissent $F(5, 241) = 2.30, p < .05$. This result revealed that younger employees (18 to 24 years, and 25 to 34 years) engaged more in protective muted dissent than employees who reported being in the 35 to 44 or 45 to 54 age groups.

Muted Dissent and Organizational Size

Next, organizational sized was examined as a possible influence on muted dissent. A value of 1 was assigned to all organizations with 1 to 99 employees, 2 for employees
working for organizations between 100 to 999 employees, and 3 for organizations larger than 1000 employees. One-way ANOVA found no overall significant difference.

**Muted Dissent and Sector (public, private, and both)**

The sample allowed for an examination of whether muted dissent was being manifested differently across three sectors (public organizations, private organizations, and hybrid [semi-private] organizations). While a one-way ANOVA suggested a nonsignificant difference between sector and disengaged, protective, and defiant muted dissent, there was overall significant difference between the three sectors and supportive muted dissent $F(2, 238) = 4.75, p < .01$. Posthoc tests using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels of .016 were conducted (with three comparisons among the three sectors .05/3 = .016). Findings revealed that employees in the private sector ($M = 3.80, SD = 0.82$) engaged in supportive muted dissent more than employees in the public sector ($M = 3.40, SD = 0.93$). Multiple comparisons test showed semi-private to not be significantly different from the two other sectors.

**Chapter Summary**

This Chapter has described the method employed in study 3 (the confirmatory factor analysis) and SEM. In addition, the Chapter reviewed the steps and processes used to establish construct validity (convergent, discriminant, and nomological validity). Findings showed strong support for all three types of validity. Furthermore, hypotheses and research questions were formulated in this Chapter with results showing a strong support for the hypotheses.
Specifically, the CFA and SEM procedures provided empirical evidence that muted dissent consisted of four general distinct constructs (disengaged, supportive, defiant, and protective muted dissent). In addition, these procedures provided evidence that protective muted dissent was a second-order factor defined by relational, face, and instrumental threat. In the next Chapter, these findings will be discussed along with their practical and theoretical implications as well as limitations of the study and directions for future research.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

General Discussion

As evidenced in the literature, employee involvement, employee voice, and employee dissent are imperative for both individual and organizational success (e.g., Avtgis et al., 2007; Garner, 2009; Graham, 1986; Hegstrom, 1990; Kassing 1997, 2011a; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Redding, 1985; Sprague & Ruud, 1988; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005); however, the crux of the dilemma is that employees in general are reluctant to speak up about organizational problems (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Sprague & Ruud, 1988; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005) as speaking up might lead to negative repercussions (see, for example, Kish-Gephart, Detert, Treviño, & Edmondson, 2009; Milliken, Morrison, & Hewlin, 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005).

In this research, rigorous attention was paid to examining the motives supporting dissent suppression and theorizing about the suppression process. While most reviewed definitions conceptualized silence as a general construct by focusing on silent behavior toward general forms of communication, such as ideas, views, suggestions, advice, and concerns (Brinsfield, 2012; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003), this research separated itself by focusing on issues pertinent to dissenting viewpoints.

The primary aim of this research was to investigate how and why employees sometimes suppress their dissent and choose to remain silent. Employing a total of four studies in two phases (one exploratory qualitative study in phase one, and three quantitative studies in phase two including a pilot study, EFA study, and CFA/SEM
study), the research attempted to explore, develop, measure, and validate an organizational muted dissent model. The exploratory qualitative study sought to address the motives underlying dissent avoidance (muted dissent as conceptualized in this research).

Several insights were salient in the qualitative exploratory phase. For example, respondents were very aware of their genuine objection and disagreement about organizational practices and policies, but intentionally suppressed their views due to perceived or experienced threats (protective muted dissent), due to feelings of resignation (disengaged muted dissent), due to prosocial motives (supportive muted dissent), and due to implicit attainable coping strategies (defiant muted dissent). Findings suggested these four general dimensions of organizational muted dissent as well as three subcategories of protective muted dissent: face threat, relational threat, and instrumental threat.

Following the development of the conceptual model in phase one, phase two aimed at developing measures of muted dissent, testing the psychometric properties of the scales, and establishing construct validity. The results from the Exploratory Factor Analysis in study 2 of phase two showed that the construct of muted dissent as conceptualized in this research is composed of six dimensions: disengaged, defiant, supportive, face threat, relational threat, and instrumental threat.

In study 3 of phase two, Confirmatory Factor Analysis suggested that the dimensions of muted dissent were conceptually distinct with coefficient construct reliability ranging from .79 to .90. Subsequent analyses provided empirical evidence of construct validity for the muted dissent scales. For example, high and significant
standardized loadings of items of each dimension exhibited an average variance extracted exceeding the cutoff value of .50. This finding provided evidence that the indicators for each dimension of muted dissent exhibited in common a high proportion of variance, which was an indication of convergent validity.

Findings also suggested strong evidence that the three first-order muted dissent constructs and one second-order construct with three sub-factors were unique and captured aspects of phenomena that were not captured by other tested constructs. This outcome was an indication that the dimensions of muted dissent are truly distinct. Discriminant validity was also evident in the data. For instance, six models, each with a different number of factors (1 to 6) were compared using Satorra-Bentler S-B $\chi^2$ difference test. The results indicated that the two-factor model was better than the one-factor; the three-factor model was better than the two-factor model; the four-factor model was better than the three-factor model; the five-factor model was better than the four-factor model, and the six-factor model was better that the five-factor model. Importantly, the six-factor model (disengaged, supportive, defiant, relational threat, instrumental threat, and face threat) was the superior model.

The overall pattern of intercorrelations among the six scales of muted dissent revealed significant correlations, which was an indication that these subscales were conceptually and theoretically related. After establishing convergent and discriminant validity for the newly proposed measures, the correlations with other existing measures (validation measures) were then assessed to see if these correlations made theoretical sense and to, thereby, establishing nomological validity.
The findings showed strong support for the nomological validity of the muted dissent scale. As expected, significant negative correlations were found between muted dissent measures and their corresponding validation measures for all but one of the tested hypotheses. What follows is a discussion of these hypotheses and their significance.

**Discussion of Hypothesis 1**

Hypothesis 1 (H1a and H1b) assessed whether organizational justice was negatively related to disengaged and protective muted dissent. As expected, a negative relationship between organizational justice and disengaged muted dissent was statistically and negatively significant ($r = -.60, p < .001$). It can thus be suggested that respondents who belonged to organizations with low levels of perceived organizational justice were more likely to exercise higher levels of disengaged muted dissent. Similarly, respondents who reported low levels of perceived organizational justice reported higher levels of protective muted dissent ($r = -.45, p < .001$).

These results are consistent with those of other studies and suggest that suppressing dissent views is negatively related to organizational justice (Tangirala & Ramanujam, 2008). In contrast, individuals tend to be more expressive if they believe that they are treated fairly because they believe they can be effective and can influence their environment (Thibault & Walker, 1975). Structural equation modeling also suggested that low levels of organizational justice could be responsible for high levels of disengaged muted dissent ($\beta = -.72, p < .001$) and high levels of protective muted dissent ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$). This finding corroborates the ideas of Pinder and Harlos (2001), who suggested that employee silence is a response to a perceived injustice.
In summary, respondents who reported lack of justice in their corresponding organizations showed a tendency to suppress their dissenting views to avoid retaliation from authority, to avoid harm of relationships, and to avoid self-embarrassment. Individuals who reported low levels of organizational justice tended to be more disengaged, believing it was futile to speak up. This finding supports arguments that exist in the organizational silence literature (e.g., Brinsfield, 2009; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne et al., 2003).

Discussion of Research Question 1

Research question 1 sought to test whether organizational justice was related to defiant muted dissent (RQ1a) and supportive muted dissent (RQ1b). The results of the study did not show a significant relationship between organizational justice and supportive muted dissent; however, this finding has not been previously described. This was true for the structural model as well. The regression coefficient for organizational justice and supportive muted dissent was not significant.

On the other hand, a significant negative relationship between organizational justice and defiant muted dissent ($r = -.18, p < .05$) was found. Analogously, the structural model suggested that organizational justice negatively predicts defiant muted dissent ($\beta = -.22, p < .01$). The observed decrease in defiant muted dissent could be attributed to the existence of high levels of organizational justice that create a safe environment for the expression of dissent and, thereby, support low levels of defiant muted dissent.
Discussion of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 (H2a, H2b, H2c, and H2d) examined whether there was an association between the four general dimensions of muted dissent and upward dissent. Results indicated that respondents who reported higher levels of disengaged, defiant, supportive, or protective muted dissent tended to express less upward dissent. Importantly, protective muted dissent had the highest correlation with upward dissent ($r = -.70, p < .001$) compared with disengaged ($r = -.52, p < .001$), supportive ($r = -.22, p < .01$), and defiant muted dissent ($r = -.21, p < .05$). A possible explanation for protective muted dissent having the strongest correlation could be the fact that protective muted dissent is based on fear of negative consequences. Negative consequences in this study have been conceptualized in terms of relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat. Moreover, respondents were from a collectivistic culture (Hofstede, 1980). Research indicates that collectivists tend to avoid argument Croucher et al. (2009) while individuals from individualistic cultures tend to express argument (e.g., Avtgis & Rancer, 2002; Sen, 2005). This finding confirms the results of the qualitative study. For instance, in the qualitative study, 17 (74%) participants reported that boundaries between personal and professional life were, to a great extent, permeable. They reported that, because these boundaries are blurred, interpersonal relationships are affected when dissent is expressed. In order to avoid influencing an interpersonal relationship, participants reported having suppressed their dissent. One of the issues that emerges from these findings is that it is difficult to ask individuals in the workplace to separate interpersonal from professional
realities simply because it is not easy to do. It is worth noting that this view is not a
generalization but an implication limited to the respondents of this study.

In addition, these findings are also consistent with findings suggested by phase
one of the study. Interviews indicated that individuals avoided criticism and dissent most
of the time. For some participants, muted dissent functioned as respect. As one of the
participants said, “we keep silent because it functions as respect.” Another participant
reported having avoided the act of dissent because dissent, to people in Oman, was a
face-threatening act. He explained, "We think that everything of disagreement is an
embarrassment."

Furthermore, it was not surprising to see, among the four main muted dissent
dimensions, protective muted dissent having the highest negative correlation with upward
dissent. This was true even in the structural equation model where protective muted
dissent showed the highest effect size ($\beta = -.58, p < .001$), followed by disengaged muted
dissent ($\beta = -.17, p < .05$), while defiant and supportive muted dissent did not
significantly predict upward dissent. This result showed that protective muted dissent
accounts for more significant portions of variance in upward dissent followed by
disengaged muted dissent. Generally, individuals who were more concerned about
possible threats due to speaking up were less likely to express upward dissent.

This result might be explained by the hierarchal nature of the protective construct.
Protective muted dissent is a second-order construct measured by three types of negative
consequences (face, instrumental, and relational threat). These threats inhibit respondents
from expressing dissent to authority, so respondents choose to engage in protective muted
dissent. For instance, participants avoid upward dissent due to concerns about losing or damaging relationships at work (relational threat), concerns about being poorly evaluated in job performance, concerns about being given unfair job assignments, and concerns of promotion, and training (instrumental threat), and finally, they did not want to be viewed as troublemakers (face threat). Interestingly, these findings confirm the qualitative findings.

The most interesting finding was that defiant muted dissent in the structural model did not show a significant influence on upward dissent. This result has not previously been described, but it makes theoretical sense. As discussed earlier, defiant muted dissent occurs when an individual implicitly activates hidden dissent through prolonging or disagreeing with the public position, but does not verbally express disagreement when discussing the situation. It follows that defiant muted dissent might be considered a coping mechanism. In other words, defiant muted dissent is a means by which individuals implicitly express dissent, but intentionally suppress their views due to perceived or experienced threats. Hence, it was not surprising to see the non-significant influence of defiant muted dissent on upward dissent because respondents reported having used implicit channels, like putting off requested actions, to express dissent. This finding provides empirical evidence that some cultures might exercise non-typical forms of dissent expression. This result questions Kassing’s (2011a) argument that dissent is considered dissent only if it meets three conditions: it must be expressed to someone; it must entail disclosure of disagreement; and, it must be expressed against organizational policies and/or practices.
In summary, correlational analysis showed a negative association between the four main muted dissent scales and upward dissent. The negative relationship with upward dissent was expected because muted dissent and upward dissent can occur concurrently. The negative relationship does not mean that individuals who engage in muted dissent never express upward dissent. What the correlation suggested here was that individuals who reported higher levels of muted dissent also reported lower levels of upward dissent. Van Dyne et al. (2003) suggested that employee silence does not imply an absence of voice. This present finding seems to be consistent with other studies. For example, Brinsfield (2009), in his study of silence motives, found a negative relationship between employee voice and dimensions of silence motives.

Discussion of Research Question 2

Research Question 2 sought to investigate the relationship between defiant muted dissent and job satisfaction (RQ2a), and between supportive muted dissent and job satisfaction (RQ2b). Results revealed a negative relationship between defiant muted dissent and job satisfaction ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$). This statistic was a relatively low correlation. As a result, in the structural model the finding did not provide empirical support that defiant muted dissent significantly influenced job satisfaction.

While standardized covariance between supportive muted dissent and job satisfaction showed a nonsignificant positive correlation, the structural model showed a significant positive effect ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$). A closely related construct to supportive muted dissent is prosocial silence (Van Dyne et al., 2003); few studies have examined the relationship between prosocial silence and job satisfaction. In one study that has explored
this issue, Knoll and Van Dick (2012) found a negative relationship between prosocial silence and job satisfaction, whereas this study found a positive relationship. At first glance, this finding seems to be a contradictory; however, prosocial silence was conceptualized as a general construct by focusing on silent behavior toward general forms of communication, such as ideas, views, suggestions, advice, and concerns (Brinsfield, 2012; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003).

However, supportive muted dissent in this study is limited to issues of dissenting. While Knoll and Van Dick (2012) operationalized prosocial dissent in terms of supporting individuals only, in this research supportive muted dissent was operationalized based on supporting both the individual and the organization. Knoll and Van Dick (2012) used three items to measure prosocial silence; (“I remain silent at work because I do not want to hurt the feelings of colleagues or superiors”; “I remain silent at work because I do not want to embarrass others”; and “I remain silent at work because I do not want other to get into trouble”). Apparently, their items mainly focus on being concerned about and thoughtful of other individuals. Similarly, Brinsfield (2012) operationalized prosocial silence through a focus on individuals.

On the other hand, in supportive muted dissent, items were included for supporting individuals (e.g., “I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development”) and organizations (e.g., “I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity”). This approach is how supportive muted dissent was differentiated from prosocial silence in addition to limiting its specificity in terms of
dissenting views. Therefore, it was not surprising to see that supportive muted dissent had a positive influence on job satisfaction.

This was also true in hypothesis 4c where a negative relationship had been predicted between supportive muted dissent and organizational commitment, but that relationship was not found. The structural model provided an unexpected positive relationship between organizational commitment and supportive muted dissent ($\beta = .22, p < .001$). In hindsight, the effect of supportive muted dissent on both job satisfaction and organizational commitment makes sense. Individuals who tend to remain silent at work regarding issues with which they do not agree and who choose to refrain from speaking up in order to avoid harming other employees, or to avoid a negative impact on organizational tasks do so due to the existence of some sort of commitment. An individual would avoid harming others or organizational tasks because of the existence of some sort of commitment to and/or satisfaction from some aspect of the job. In summary, a positive effect of muted supportive dissent on job satisfaction and organizational commitment is an indication that muted dissent is not always a negative organizational behavior.

**Discussion of Hypothesis 3**

The aim of hypothesis 3 was to assess the relationship between disengaged muted dissent and job satisfaction (H3a), and between protective muted dissent and job satisfaction (H3b). As expected, the results of this study revealed a negative and significant relationship between job satisfaction and disengaged muted dissent ($r = -.63, p < .001$), and job satisfaction and protective muted dissent ($r = -.41, p < .001$). These
findings are consistent with those of Avery and Quinones (2002) who suggested that, if employees experience lack of opportunity to express their views, they experience dissatisfaction, and Knoll and Van Dick (2012) who found a negative relationship between job satisfaction and two types of silence (acquiescent and quiescent).

These results were further analyzed in a structural latent space. Both disengaged ($\beta = -.68, p < .001$) and protective muted dissent ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$) accounted for negative and significant portions of variance in job satisfaction. Interestingly, disengaged muted dissent had more effect on job satisfaction. In other words, when disengaged muted dissent goes up by 1 standard deviation, job satisfaction goes down by 0.68 standard deviations. The implication of this finding is that disengaged and protective muted dissent might influence feedback processes and might influence effective organizational processes (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). Specifically, members of organizations who believe that speaking up is not worth the effort reported low levels of job satisfaction.

Discussion of Hypothesis 4

Results revealed that organizational commitment was negatively and significantly related to disengaged muted dissent ($r = -.64, p < .001$), protective muted dissent ($r = -.34, p < .001$), and defiant muted dissent ($r = -.24, p < .01$) (see discussion of RQ 2 for the discussion of H4b). Using SEM, disengaged muted dissent negatively and significantly predicted organizational commitment ($\beta = -.72, p < .001$), but was positively and significantly predicted by supportive muted dissent (see discussion of RQ 2 for further discussion of this unexpected finding). The most interesting finding is the big
effect of disengagement from speaking up and organizational commitment. Respondents who reported high levels of disengaged muted dissent reported lower levels of commitment. This result might be explained by the fact that respondents experienced feelings of futility, believing that their views and concerns would be ignored had they spoken up. This fact influenced their commitment levels at work; thus, the findings make good logical sense.

**Discussion of Research Question 3**

RQ4 sought to examine whether there was a significant difference between four main dimensions of muted dissent and biological sex, supervisory role, hierarchical position, and job tenure. Results of study 3 phase two revealed no significant difference between biological sex and 3 muted dissent dimensions namely: supportive, defiant, and protective. This finding confirmed the results of phase one (qualitative data) where 15 participants expressed the belief that there was no noticeable difference between the sexes. Disengaged muted dissent was the only dimension that varied across male and female employees \( t(239) = -2.51, p < .05 \). Although, this result differs from that published by Knoll and Van Dick (2012), other studies have found that sex might be related to silence (e.g., Harlos, 2010; LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Molseed, 1989; Pinder & Harlos, 2001).

A statistical difference was also found between respondents who reported having a supervisory role and those who were not supervisors, but this difference was limited to defiant muted dissent. To find out if dimensions of muted dissent were manifested differently across levels of hierarchy, the data were assessed to determine whether
general staff would have a greater tendency to suppress dissent than their counterparts (middle and senior managers). The results showed a statistical difference between disengaged and muted dissent and the three levels of hierarchy (general staff, middle managers, and senior managers). General staff who did not have positional power were more likely to avoid dissent than middle and senior managers. Analogously, middle managers were likely to avoid dissent and remain silent compared with their senior manager counterparts. These results match those observed in earlier studies pertinent to employee silence (Milliken et al., 2003; Whiteside & Barclay, 2012).

In addition, disengaged muted dissent was found to be associated with job tenure. This study revealed that respondents with less than 1 year of job experience reported feeling safe expressing their disagreements. However, as employees spent more time in organizations, they engaged more in disengaged muted dissent, but about at the 4 year mark, the level of disengaged muted dissent went down, and after 5 years of experience, the participants in this research manifested higher levels of disengaged muted dissent. One explanation for this finding can be attributed to the fact that, in Oman, many employees are promoted when they complete 4 years. Probably due to promotion, employees feel that they can influence the environment and, as a result, express dissent for the purpose of improvement, but that does not last long. Within a year following promotion, they start to suppress their dissenting views more than before (disengaged muted dissent).
Research Implications

A model of muted dissent was developed in this study and the constructs comprising the model are promising. The constructs have been conceptualized and differentiated from existing competing constructs. In the following section, theoretical and practical implications of the study and the model are discussed.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this dissertation are promising for advancing our understanding of the scope and nature of organizational dissent, voice, and silence. For example, previous studies of silence and dissent have shown that employees remain silent or avoid upward dissent due to a fear of negative consequences (e.g., Brinsfield, 2013; Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Milliken et al., 2003; Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Van Dyne et al., 2003) or fear of retaliation (Kassing, 1997), but no attempts were made to conceptually and operationally define the types and scope of the perceived negative consequences. Therefore, this research provides deeper insights into the types and scope of negative consequences (e.g., relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat) or what is conceptualized here as protective muted dissent.

Moreover, most definitions of dissent emphasize the verbalization of dissent (e.g., Garner, 2009; Kassing, 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b). As a consequence of privileging the verbal form of dissent, we neglect other, implicit forms that might exist in other cultures. For instance, it is clear from this study that defiant muted dissent is one form of implicit dissent that individuals might employ as a form of objection and protest behavior. This
form of muted dissent is promising and should help researchers to study dissent or silence using theoretical frameworks that can account for a wide range of cultural differences.

In addition, the findings of this study can enrich literature related to suppressive forms of communication by employing muted dissent as a multidimensional construct; this will provide additional avenues for future studies. Moreover, existing models of organizational silence, such as acquiescent and quiescent silence (Pinder & Harlos, 2001) and acquiescent, defensive, and ProSocial Silence (Van Dyne et al., 2003) can be examined in light of the muted dissent model suggested in this study.

Furthermore, previous models of organizational dissent (e.g., Garner, 2009; Kassing, 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b) assumed that dissent is a desirable behavior. Similarly, previous models of employee silence operate on the underlying assumption or implication that silence is not desirable (e.g., “I therefore use the term silence to reflect 'failure to voice'” (Morrison, 2011, p. 380)). The word “failure” here implies that silence is a passive behavior and is not desirable. In contrast, the findings of this dissertation suggest that not all types of muted dissent are undesirable. As indicated earlier, supportive muted dissent has a positive effect on commitment and job satisfaction. This finding provides a significant contribution to the literature.

Although silence has been viewed as an active behavior, as in the case of prosocial silence (Brinsfield, 2012; Knoll & Van Dick, 2012; Van Dyne et al., 2003), prosocial silence has not been empirically tested to determine whether or not prosocial silence is a desirable act. One of the few studies found that has examined prosocial silence and job satisfaction was conducted by Knoll and Van Dick (2012); however, they
found a significant negative relationship between prosocial silence and job satisfaction ($r = -.21, p < .05$). This finding is suggestive that even prosocial silence that is assumed to be an active behavior is negatively related to job satisfaction.

On the other hand, it was evident in this dissertation that supportive muted dissent showed a positive correlation with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Therefore, the muted dissent model as suggested in this dissertation can account for broader aspects of organizational realities. Moreover, as Morrison (2011) pointed out, “by and large, the voice literature has conceptualized voice as a dichotomous choice (speak up or remain silent) and has not focused very much on employees’ choices about how to voice their views or concerns” (p. 399). The findings associated with defiant muted dissent are in response to Morrison’s call for more exploration of the ways in which employees use implicit methods to express opposition.

Another theoretical contribution of this study is the unique factor-structure and the measurement of that structure that showed acceptable to strong reliability and construct validity. This outcome will help to advance empirical research on dissent and silence literature. In terms of methodological contribution, this dissertation employed mixed-method design and consistency of findings across methods and samples showed a strong support for the muted dissent model.

Practical Implications

There are a number of practical implications of the muted dissent model. For example, organizations claim to appreciate the value of employee feedback. Paradoxically, however, feedback that might threaten or challenge authority can lead to
retaliation. Argyris (1977) suggested that organizations have powerful institutional norms and games that often stop employees from expressing what they know. Similarly, Morrison and Milliken (2000) asserted, "organizations are generally intolerant of dissent" (p. 706), resulting in employees avoiding speaking up about organizational problems or providing feedback. When this happens, only positive news will reach authority, and suppressed negative news might never reach decision makers. This pattern can negatively affect organizational functioning and performance. Morrison (2011) provided the following effects of possible consequences of suppressive communication:

Many well-known organizational tragedies—for example, the Columbia space disaster, the crash of United Airlines flight 173, the demise of Enron, and the British Petroleum oil-rig explosion—were caused or exacerbated by the failure of employees to convey information about irregularities to those in positions of authority. (p. 374)

The findings of this study provide empirical evidence of muted dissent motives. These results could help researchers and practitioners to better understand muted dissent motives and act accordingly.

There is also a cultural element from this study. For example, it is imperative to understand how different individuals express dissent. This study suggested that respondents from Oman (collectivists) employ defiant muted dissent as a mechanism of implicit dissent expression. In addition, the muted dissent instrument can be used by human resource managers to diagnose the motives for muted dissent.
Limitations and Future Research

Some research limitations are worth comment. There was a low response rate from female participants. The low participation rate from female respondents was stable across the four studies. For example, during the interview study, only 4 females (19%) volunteered to be interviewed. In the pilot study (study 1), there were 11 (31.4%) female participants. In the EFA study (study 2), there were 61 female participants, and in the final CFA study (study 3), only 70 (28.2%) females participated. An explanation for the low response rate of women could be the fact that Oman is a gender-segregated society, and because I relied on snowball sampling, it was obvious that most participants would come from my personal network, and networks of my friends—and these people would be male. Future studies should use different sampling procedures to achieve more variability in the sample.

Another limitation of the study was that muted dissenting views were limited to general dissenting views. Had the study been limited to a specific issue or topic of dissent, different results might have emerged. Therefore, future studies should focus on specific dissenting views, such as muted dissent about unethical issues, about procedural issues, or about interpersonal issues. Moreover, the study assessed occurrence of muted dissent for a general audience (e.g., direct supervisor, higher-ups, authority, management). Thus, future research might examine muted dissent between employees and their direct supervisors only, or employees and higher-ups, and so forth. Similarly, this study examined muted dissent at all levels of organizations. In phase one of this study, some participants indicated that they felt safe to express dissent at the departmental
level as compared to the organizational level. Therefore, future studies should use organizational levels as a moderating variable.

This study was limited to a sample from a collectivistic culture. The muted dissent model should be tested in other cultures as well. Although developed scales of muted dissent in this study showed good psychometric properties, further studies are needed to provide additional evidence of construct reliability and validity. Future studies can also look at different antecedents and outcomes potentially related to dimensions of muted dissent. In addition, this was a cross-sectional study where causal inference was not an option; hence, future studies might develop more insights of causality from longitudinal designs to see how hypothesized relationships change over time. Finally, ANOVA suggested some differences between different dimensions of muted dissent and grouping variables (e.g., supervisory role, individual’s hierarchical position, job tenure). Moderation effect was not tested for these variables due to the scope and limitation of the study; this consideration is an important issue for future research.

Conclusion

The expression of opposition might not be appreciated in organizations; hence, people often avoid dissent and giving voice to grievances due to the perceived negative consequences. To advance our understanding of motives of dissent avoidance, this study was conducted. The study unfolded in two phases. Phase one aimed at examining an exploratory qualitative study to discover how organizational members describe and respond to organizational dissent in the workplace. Exploratory study suggested general themes of dissent avoidance and these themes contributed in developing Muted Dissent
Model that comprises total of six constructs: disengaged muted dissent, supportive muted dissent, defiant muted dissent, protective muted dissent, relational, instrumental, and face threat. The last three constructs were sub-themes of protective muted dissent; hence, a final model comprised of four general constructs.

Phase two of the study sought to operationalize muted dissent constructs, develop and validate the scale. Phase two consisted of 3 studies. Items for the scale were generated and reviewed by expert reviewers, and then study 1 (pilot study) was conducted to refine measurements. Study 2 conducted exploratory factor analysis to reduce number of items and to assess factor structure. Six factors were found confirming qualitative data with strong reliability. Then these factors were further analyzed if they were distinct. This crosschecking was done in study 3 by employing confirmatory factor analysis. Convergent and discriminant validity were empirically tested and results showed a strong evidence of construct validity.

Relational threat, face threat, and instrumental threat were analyzed as first-order factors if they would form a single second-order factor (protective muted dissent), the results were confirmed. Finally, structural equation modeling examined the final four main muted dissent scales (disengaged, protective, supportive, and defiant) with validation measures (organizational justice, upward dissent, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment). The findings of the structural model showed a strong evidence of nomological validity.
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Title of Research: An Exploratory Study of Employee Dissent Behavior: The case of Oman

Researcher: Adil Al-Busaidi

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You should receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study

This study is being done because I'm interested in knowing whether employees feel comfortable communicating ideas, disagreements, work frustrations, and dissatisfaction to management. I'm very much interested to understand when people feel comfortable speaking up and when they do not feel safe to do so.

In this interview, I would like to know about your own experiences on issues related to speaking up in an organizational setting.

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to share your experiences, feelings, and factors that hinder and stimulate you to speak up to authority and management.

You should not participate in this study if you think you work for the public sector, or you do not have at least 2 years of work experience in your current organization.

Your participation in the study will last about 30 to 45 minutes based on a one on one interview that will occur at a confidential location.

If you feel uncomfortable answering any questions during the interview, feel free to skip those questions.

Risks and Discomforts

Risks or discomforts that you might experience are: 1) you may feel discomfort talking or complaining about your employer in a negative way. 2) You may also feel discomfort talking about co-workers and managers in a negative way. However, you should feel safe about this because everything you say will be completely confidential. Your employer may not approve of things you say in this interview. To protect you, we have scheduled the interview in a confident location, and will not record your name in association with this study.
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APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Before we start, I would like to tell you a little bit about this study. I am interested in knowing whether employees feel comfortable communicating their ideas, disagreements, work frustrations, and dissatisfaction to management. I am very much interested to understand when people feel comfortable speaking up and when they do not feel safe to do so.

In this interview, I would like to know about your own experiences on issues related to speaking up in an organizational setting. Please feel free to express anything comes to mind, your experiences, feelings, and both factors that hinder and stimulate you to speak up. All information will be kept confidential.

1. Demographics
   - Age
   - Years of employment in current organization? Lifetime work experience?
   - sex
   - Education
   - Job title/department

2. In General, how comfortable are you in speaking to your managers about work-related issues that concern you?

3. Can you share an example of a time when you felt unable or unwilling to speak up to people who are above you (if you cannot think of an example, in general can you tell me issues, problems that you feel unsafe to speak up to your management).
   - Do you remember any situation where you disagreed with decisions made or concerns about work environment but you felt unsafe to express your ideas and instead chose to keep silent?
   - What stopped you from speaking up?
4. If you cannot express your disagreement directly to management, do you find other ways to communicate your concerns? What? How? Why?

5. Can you share with me an instance where you observed a wrongdoing by management and you chose to keep silent?

6. Can you share with me an instance where you observed a wrongdoing by a coworker and you chose to keep silent?
   - Can you explain what happened?

7. Can you share an example where you raised an issue to management about issues that you find yourself don't agree with? (if you cannot think of an example, can you share with me issues, problems that you feel safe to speak up or disagree to management).

8. What strategies (messages) did you use to express your disagreements, opinions, and concerns?

9. Do you have a specific example where you had a contradictory dialogue with your boss?
   - Can you tell me about it?
   - What messages did you use to express your dissatisfaction or disagreement?

10. Any recommendations to employees for ways that enable them to express their disagreement?

11. Any recommendations to organizations for creating better democratic environment where employees express dissatisfaction and disagreement freely?
**APPENDIX E: INITIAL PROPOSED MUTED DISSENT MEASURES**

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your degree of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and workplace frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

SD= Strongly Disagree; D= Disagree; U= Undecided; A=Agree; SA= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disengaged Muted Dissent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, and inefficiencies about organizational policies and practices to my supervisor or management because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is futile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is not possible to make changes in this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is likely that managers will not take actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe my concerns will not be addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I believe that speaking up will not change things around here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I know that complaining is just a waste of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Managers take my suggestions seriously (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTIVE Muted Dissent: INSTRUMENTAL THREAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, and inefficiencies about organizational policies and practices to my supervisor or management because</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raising criticisms will affect my job evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bringing attention to problems will affect my appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I'm likely to be promoted if I disagree with organizational practices (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm likely to be nominated for training, If I criticize management (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t want to impact my job evaluation rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criticizing management means less training opportunities for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t want to miss job promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I fear losing job benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not fear poor job rating (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I fear negative consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTIVE Muted Dissent: RELATIONAL THREAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, and inefficiencies about organizational policies and practices to my supervisor or management because</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My manager mixes up between job and personal issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don’t want to harm my relationship with my manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don’t want to damage my relationship with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>In this company criticizing something means criticizing someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think people here mix between job and personal issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People here do not mix between personal and professional issues (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Criticizing management in this organization will not harm my relationship with managers (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I want to retain good relations with management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I know that speaking up means damaging relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I fear losing relationships with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTIVE Muted Dissent: FACE THREAT**

I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, and inefficiencies about organizational policies and practices to my supervisor or management because

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I don't want to be viewed as a complainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don't like to be labeled as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don’t want to damage my positive image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I don’t want people to have negative impression about me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t want to be viewed as a negative person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don’t want management to have bad impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t want management to look at me as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I don’t want to be seen as the person who always criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don’t want to embarrass myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don’t care when people label me as a complainer (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORTIVE Muted Dissent**

I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, and inefficiencies about organizational policies and practices to my supervisor or management because

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I don’t want to get others in trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don’t want to hurt others' feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don't want to affect my supervisor’s prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I don’t want to damage management reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t want to embarrass others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don’t care if I hurt other’s feelings (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Others’ career development is important to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I don’t want to delay tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don’t want my criticisms to diminish work performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don’t want to hinder tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFIANT Muted Dissent**

Think about a situation in which you failed to express your true disagreement to your supervisor or management regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you don’t agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies you employ as a way to express your disagreement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I keep delaying my manager’s requests hoping he/she will change his/her mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I delay taking actions hoping management will reassess the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests that I disagree with hoping he/she will change his/her mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I don't tell my supervisor when I disagree with workplace decisions, but I implement what I truly see as right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I comply in front of management but I do what I see is right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I challenge management by taking different actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do what is good for the business even if that will contradict management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I prolong taking actions toward decisions that I don't agree with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I keep delaying action hoping management will forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I keep delaying taking actions hoping management will re-evaluate their decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: REFINED MUTED DISSENT ITEMS

Operationalizing Muted Dissent

Question Stem

In organizations, we observe practices, policies, and decisions that we do not agree with. We experience situations in which we feel frustrated and dissatisfied with managerial imperatives. However, we might not speak up regarding wrongdoing, unfair treatment, and frustrations. We nod our heads; we say that we agree, and we might even superficially support decisions in front of management although we do not really agree. Instead, we might observe what we define as a wrongdoing by management or by authority, but decide to remain silent. We might observe a mistake or error in judgment and never speak up.

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your level of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

SD= Strongly Disagree; D= Disagree; N= Neither agree nor disagree; A=Agree; SA= Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISENGAGED MUTED DISSENT</th>
<th>PROTECTIVE MUTED DISSENT: RELATIONAL THREAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 It is difficult to make changes in this organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I believe that speaking up will not change things around here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I know that complaining is just a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Managers take my concerns seriously (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Other employees have tried to change things in the past, but have failed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I believe my concerns will be addressed (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 My manager might take my comments personally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I do not want to harm my relationship with my manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I do not want to damage my relationship with management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I think people here take work-related disagreements personally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 People here do not mix personal and professional issues (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Criticizing management in this organization will not harm my relationship with managers (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Higher-ups might take my views personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I know that speaking up means damaging relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I fear losing relationships with management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTIVE MUTED DISSENT: INSTRUMENTAL THREAT**

In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I fear losing job benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is likely that I will be promoted if I <strong>disagree</strong> with organizational practices (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It is likely that I will be nominated for training if I criticize management (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Speaking up might impact my job evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do not want to miss job promotion opportunities due to speaking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pointing out problems will affect my appraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I fear receiving unfair job assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTECTIVE MUTED DISSENT: FACE THREAT**

In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a complainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not want to damage my positive image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not want people to have a negative impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a negative person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not want management to have a bad impression of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I might embarrass myself by complaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do not care when people label me as a complainer (R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPORTIVE MUTED DISSENT**

In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do not want to get others in trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not want to hurt others' feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not want to affect my supervisor’s prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not want to damage management’s reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not want to embarrass others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not mind if my opinions upset others (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not want to delay tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do not want to hinder tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEFIANT MUTED DISSENT**

Think about a situation in which you failed to express true disagreement to your supervisor or
higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you don’t agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies do you usually employ as a way to express your disagreement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I avoid raising disagreements with my supervisor when discussing a situation, but I implement what I truly see as right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I comply in front of management, but I do what I see as right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I tend to buy more time to implement decisions with which I do not agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I delay taking action, hoping management will re-evaluate their decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I hesitate to take action, hoping management will forget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do what is good for the business even if that will contradict management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: PILOT STUDY SURVEY

Q1.1 Informed Consent Form
You are invited to participate in a research study on Employee Silence. This study is conducted by Adil Al-Busaidi, a Doctoral Student from Ohio University. This study will take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. You will be asked to complete an online survey about a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, you will be asked to indicate your degree of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and workplace frustrations with organizational policies and practices. You should participate in this study if you meet the following conditions:

- You are a full or a part time employee working in Oman (private or public sector)
- Both Omanis and Non-Omanis (Expatriates) are eligible to participate in this study.
- You are at least 18 years old or older.

Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your participation in this research will be completely confidential and data will be averaged and reported in aggregate.

Although your participation in this research may not benefit you personally, it will help us understand reasons and motives of silence at work. It will also help us understand reasons employee suppress their views and opinions. There are no risks to individuals participating in this survey beyond those that exist in daily life. If you have questions about this project, you may contact Mr. Adil Al-Busaidi, aa396510@ohio.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664. Please print a copy of this consent form for your records, if you so desire.

Q1.2 I have read and understand the above consent form, I certify that I am 18 years old or older and, I indicate my willingness voluntarily take part in the study.

- Yes
- No

Q2.1 In organizations, we observe practices, policies, and decisions that we do not agree with. We experience situations in which we feel frustrated and dissatisfied with managerial imperatives. However, we might not speak up regarding wrongdoing, unfair treatment, and frustrations. We nod our heads; we say that we agree, and we might even superficially support decisions in front of management although we do not really agree. Instead, we might observe what we define as a wrongdoing by management or by authority, but decide to remain silent. We might observe a mistake or error in judgment and never speak up.

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your level of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

The following will give you an opportunity to tell us about your experience. Please answer openly and truthfully.

Q2.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_1</td>
<td>Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td>It is difficult to make changes in this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIS_7 I believe that speaking up will not change things around here
DIS_8 I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears
DIS_9 I know that complaining is just a waste of time
DIS_10 Managers take my concerns seriously
DIS_11 Other employees have tried to change things in the past, but have failed.
DIS_12 I believe my concerns will be addressed

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?

Q2.3 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?

3.1 Think about a situation in which you failed to express true disagreement to your supervisor or higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you do not agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies do you usually employ as a way to express your disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?
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| DEF_8 | I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| DEF_9 | I hesitate to take action, hoping management will forget | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| DEF_10 | I do what is good for the business even if that will contradict management | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?

Q3.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| FTH_1 | I do not want to be viewed as a complainer | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_2 | I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_3 | I do not want to damage my positive image | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_4 | I do not want people to have a negative impression of me | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_5 | I do not want to be viewed as a negative person | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_6 | I do not want management to have a bad impression of me | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_7 | I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_8 | I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_9 | I might embarrass myself by complaining | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| FTH_10 | I do not care when people label me as a complainer | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?

Q4.1 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| SUP_1 | I do not want to get others in trouble | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_2 | I do not want to hurt others’ feelings | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_3 | I do not want to affect my supervisor’s prestige | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_4 | I do not want to damage management's reputation | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_5 | I do not want to embarrass others | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_6 | I do not mind if my opinions upset others | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_7 | I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_8 | I do not want to delay tasks | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_9 | I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SUP_10 | I do not want to hinder tasks | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Q4.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| INS_1 | Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| INS_2 | I fear losing job benefits | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| INS_3 | It is likely that I’ll be promoted if I disagree with organizational practices | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| INS_4 | It’s likely that I’ll be nominated for training if I criticize management | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| INS_5       | Speaking up might impact my job evaluation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INS_6       | Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INS_7       | I do not want to miss job promotion opportunities due to speaking up | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INS_8       | Pointing out problems will affect my appraisals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INS_9       | Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| INS_10      | I fear receiving unfair job assignments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Do you have any suggestions for improving the above questions?

5.1 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

| JUS_1       | Overall, I’m treated fairly by my organization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JUS_2       | In general, I can count on this organization to be fair | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JUS_3       | In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JUS_4       | Usually, the way things work in this organization are not fair | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JUS_5       | For the most part, this organization treats its employees fairly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JUS_6       | Most of the people who work here would say they are often treated unfairly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Q5.2 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

| UPD_1       | I am hesitant to raise questions or contradictory opinions in my organization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_2       | I don't question management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_3       | I'm hesitant to question workplace policies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_4       | I don't tell my supervisor when I disagree with workplace decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_5       | I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_6       | I speak with my supervisor or someone in management when I question workplace decisions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_7       | I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_8       | I don't express my disagreement to management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UPD_9       | I tell management when I believe employees are being treated unfairly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Q5.3 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

| JSA_1       | Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job opportunities for promotion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JSA_2       | Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job training | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JSA_3       | Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job rewards in relation with performance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JSA_4       | Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Q5.4 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

| COM_1       | I would not mind to work for a different company if the nature of the | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Q6.1 1. In this organization I have at least ONE employee who reports to me directly. |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ☐ Yes                          | ☐ No                           |

| Q6.2 2. Where are you employed? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ☐ Private Sector              | ☐ Public Sector               |
| ☐ Semi-Private/Public (e.g., this an organization that is owned by both public & private companies) | ☐ Self-employed; Entrepreneur |

| Q6.3 3. What is your gender? |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ☐ Female                      | ☐ Male                        |

| Q6.4 4. What is your age? |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ☐ 18 to 24 years            | ☐ 25 to 34 years              |
| ☐ 35 to 44 years            | ☐ 45 to 54 years              |
| ☐ 55 to 64 years            | ☐ 65 years and over           |

| Q6.5 5. What is the highest level of education you have completed? |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ☐ Less than High School                                          | ☐ High School / GED        |
| ☐ Some College                                                  | ☐ 2-year College Degree    |
| ☐ 4-year College Degree                                         | ☐ Masters Degree           |
| ☐ Doctoral Degree                                               | ☐ Professional Degree (JD, MD) |

| job was similar | I believe that company's values and my values are similar | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| COM_2           |                                                                 |
| I am proud to say that I am working for this organization     | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| COM_3           |                                                                 |
| This organization encourages me to put the maximum effort in order to be more productive | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| COM_4           |                                                                 |
| I am very satisfied with my choice to come and work for this organization in comparison with other opportunities I had when I was looking for a job. | ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ |
| COM_5           |                                                                 |
Q6.6 6. How many employees work in your organization?
- 1–10
- 11–50
- 51–100
- 100+

Q6.7 7. In which industry are you employed?
- Oil and Gas
- Telecommunications
- Manufacturing
- Hospitality
- Banking & Finance
- Construction
- Government
- Educational Services
- Health Care
- Real Estate
- Transportation or Warehousing
- Rental and Leasing
- Wholesale Trade or Retailers
- Media
- Others ____________________

Q6.8 8. Which classification best describes your position?
- Senior Management
- Middle Management
- General Staff

Q6.9 9. I'm an Omani Citizen?
- Yes
- No

Q6.10 10. What is your country of origin?

Q6.11 11. How long have you been living in Oman?
- Less than '1' year
- 1- 2 years
- 2- 5 years
- 5- 10 years
- More than 10 years
APPENDIX H: MONTE CARLO STUDY

#----------------------------------------------------
# Specifying Population Model
#----------------------------------------------------

popModel <- ' 

# Specifying latent variables

Instrumental =~ 0.7*x15 + 0.7*x13 + 0.7*x14 
Relational =~ 0.7*x18 + 0.7*x16 + 0.7*x17 
FaceThreatening =~ 0.7*x21 + 0.7*x19 + 0.7*x20 
Submissive =~ 0.7*x01 + 0.7*x02 + 0.7*x03 + 0.7*x04 
Supportive =~ 0.7*x05 + 0.7*x06 + 0.7*x07 + 0.7*x08 
Defiant =~ 0.7*x09 + 0.7*x10 + 0.7*x11 + 0.7*x12 
Overall_Justice =~ 0.7*x22 + 0.7*x23 + 0.7*x24 + 0.7*x25 + 0.7*x26 + 0.7*x27 
Org_Commitment =~ 0.7*x28 + 0.7*x29 + 0.7*x30 + 0.7*x31 + 0.7*x32 
Job_Satisfaction =~ 0.7*x33 + 0.7*x34 + 0.7*x35 + 0.7*x36 
Upward_Dissent =~ 0.7*x37 + 0.7*x38 + 0.7*x39 + 0.7*x40 + 0.7*x41 + 0.7*x42 + 0.7*x43 + 0.7*x44 + 0.7*x45

# Below is the second-order factor
Protective =~ 0.3*Instrumental + 0.3*Relational + 0.3*FaceThreatening

# Defining Covariances
# For scale setting, I fixed factors @ 1.00 instead of fixing marker variable 
# or effects coding

Submissive ~~ 1.0*Submissive 
Submissive ~~ 0.24*Supportive 
Submissive ~~ 0.2*Defiant 
Submissive ~~ 0.424*Protective 
Submissive ~~ -0.36*Overall_Justice 
Submissive ~~ -0.3*Org_Commitment 
Submissive ~~ -0.5*Job_Satisfaction 
Submissive ~~ -0.3*Upward_Dissent 

Supportive ~~ 1.0*Supportive 
Supportive ~~ 0.2*Defiant
Supportive ~~ 0.495*Protective  
Supportive ~~ -0.2*Overall_Justice  
Supportive ~~ -0.05*Org_Commitment  
Supportive ~~ -0.21*Job_Satisfaction  
Supportive ~~ -0.28*Upward_Dissent  

Defiant ~~ 1.0*Defiant  
Defiant ~~ 0.2*Protective  
Defiant ~~ -0.2*Overall_Justice  
Defiant ~~ -0.2*Org_Commitment  
Defiant ~~ -0.2*Job_Satisfaction  
Defiant ~~ -0.2*Upward_Dissent  

Protective ~~ 1.0*Protective  
Protective ~~ -0.13*Overall_Justice  
Protective ~~ -0.1*Org_Commitment  
Protective ~~ -0.26*Job_Satisfaction  
Protective ~~ -0.29*Upward_Dissent  

Overall_Justice ~~ 1.0*Overall_Justice  
Overall_Justice ~~ 0.3*Org_Commitment  
Overall_Justice ~~ 0.3*Job_Satisfaction  
Overall_Justice ~~ 0.3*Upward_Dissent  

Org_Commitment ~~ 1.0*Org_Commitment  
Org_Commitment ~~ 0.3*Job_Satisfaction  
Org_Commitment ~~ 0.2*Upward_Dissent  

Job_Satisfaction ~~ 1.0*Job_Satisfaction  
Job_Satisfaction ~~ 0.3*Upward_Dissent  

Instrumental ~~ 1.0*Instrumental  
Relational ~~ 1.0*Relational  
FaceThreatening ~~ 1.0*FaceThreatening  
Upward_Dissent ~~ 1.0*Upward_Dissent  

#----------------------------------------------------  
#Specifying Analysis Model  
#----------------------------------------------------

analyzeModel <- '  
Instrumental =~ x15+x13+x14  
Relational =~ x18+x16+x17  
FaceThreatening =~ x21+x19+x20
Submissive = x01 + x02 + x03 + x04
Supportive = x05 + x06 + x07 + x08
Defiant = x09 + x10 + x11 + x12
Overall_Justice = x22 + x23 + x24 + x25 + x26 + x27
Org_Commitment = x28 + x29 + x30 + x31 + x32
Job_Satisfaction = x33 + x34 + x35 + x36
Upward_Dissent = x37 + x38 + x39 + x40 + x41 + x42 + x43 + x44 + x45
Protective = Instrumental + Relational + FaceThreatening

# Running a Monte Carlo simulation from simsem package
#----------------------------------------------------
#loading simsem package to run simulation
library(simsem)
Output <- sim(nRep=1000, analyzeModel, n=170, generate=popModel, lavaanfun = "cfa", std.lv = TRUE)
summary(Output)

#Plotting sampling distributions of fit indices with fit indices cutoffs
plotCutoff(Output, 0.05)
indices <- c("rmsea","cfi","srmr","chiq")
plotCutoff(Output, 0.05,usedFit = indices)
savePlot(filename="fit4diagrams2.png",type="png")

#Summary of parameter estimates and standard error across replications
summaryParam(Output)

#Finding powers of parameters
#----------------------------------------------------

#nVal = The sample size values that users wish to find power from.
power <- getPower(Output,nVal=170,alpha = 0.05)
names(power)

#power for all parameteres
print(power)

#Selecting parameters whose power is less than .8
FilteredPower <- as.data.frame(power)
colTitle <- c("Power")
dimnames(FilteredPower)[[2]] <- colTitle
newPow <- subset(FilteredPower,subset=(Power<0.8))
print(newPow)

# Selecting parameters whose power is > .8
FilteredPower2 <- as.data.frame(power)
colTitle <- c("Power")
dimnames(FilteredPower2)[[2]] <- colTitle
newPow2 <- subset(FilteredPower2,subset=(Power>0.8))
print(newPow2)

# Finding power of parameters for the protect(second-order)
protectiveParam <- c("Protective =~ Instrumental","Protective =~ Relational",
                   "Protective =~ FaceThreatening","Submissive =~ Protective",
                   "Supportive =~ Protective","Defiant =~ Protective",
                   "Overall_Justice =~ Protective","Org_Commitment =~ Protective",
                   "Job_Satisfaction =~ Protective","Upward_Dissent =~ Protective")
protectivePow <- power[protectiveParam]
print(protectivePow)
cleanProtectivePow <- as.data.frame(protectivePow)
colTitle <- c("Power")
dimnames(cleanProtectivePow)[[2]] <- colTitle
print(cleanProtectivePow)

save.image("CFA_Final_Model.RData")

# Remarks: SEM model
#----------------------------------------------------
## For SEM Power Analysis for parameters I used the three additional
### and added to the above code:-(see below):-#
###STEP 1###: Under population model I removed covariances so I could add
#regression weights
###STEP 2###: Under population model I added the following regression paths
# but left factors fixed @ 1.0
# Org_Commitment ~ -.2*Submissive + -.2*Supportive + -.2*Defiant + -.2*Protective
# Job_Satisfaction ~ -.2*Submissive + -.2*Supportive + -.2*Defiant + -.2*Protective
# Upward_Dissent ~ -.2*Submissive + -.2*Supportive + -.2*Defiant + -.2*Protective
# Submissive ~ -.2*Overall_Justice
# Supportive ~ -.2*Overall_Justice
# Defiant ~ -.2*Overall_Justice
# Protective ~ -.2*Overall_Justice

###STEP 2###: Under Analysis model, I added the following regression paths
# Org_Commitment ~ Submissive+Supportive+Defiant+Protective
# Job_Satisfaction ~ Submissive+Supportive+Defiant+Protective
# Upward_Dissent ~ Submissive+Supportive+Defiant+Protective
# Submissive ~ Overall_Justice
# Supportive ~ Overall_Justice
# Defiant ~ Overall_Justice
# Protective ~ Overall_Justice

#-----------------------------------------------
APPENDIX I: STATISTICAL POWER AND SAMPLE SIZE

Power and Sample size for CFA model as generated from the software developed by Preacher and Coffman (2006).

#Computation of minimum sample size for test of fit

rmsea0 <- 0.05 #null hypothesized RMSEA
rmseaa <- 0.04 #alternative hypothesized RMSEA
d <- 913 #degrees of freedom
alpha <- 0.05 #alpha level
desired <- 0.8 #desired power

#Code below need not be changed by user
#initialize values
pow <- 0.0
n <- 0
#begin loop for finding initial level of n
while (pow<desired) {
  n <- n+100
  ncp0 <- (n-1)*d*rmsea0^2
  ncpa <- (n-1)*d*rmseaa^2
  #compute power
  if(rmsea0<rmseaa) {
    cval <- qchisq(alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
    pow <- pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
  } else {
    cval <- qchisq(1-alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
    pow <- 1-pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
  }
}

#begin loop for interval halving
foo <- -1
newn <- n
interval <- 200
powdiff <- pow - desired
while (powdiff>.001) {
  interval <- interval*.5
  newn <- newn + foo*interval*.5
  ncp0 <- (newn-1)*d*rmsea0^2
  ncpa <- (newn-1)*d*rmseaa^2
  #compute power
  if(rmsea0<rmseaa) {
    cval <- qchisq(alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
    pow <- pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
  } else {
    cval <- qchisq(1-alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
    pow <- 1-pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
  }
}
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ncpa <- (newn-1)*d*rmseaa^2
#compute power
if(rmsea0<rmseaa) {
  cval <- qchisq(alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
  pow <- pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
}
else {
  cval <- qchisq(1-alpha,d,ncp=ncp0,lower.tail=F)
  pow <- 1-pchisq(cval,d,ncp=ncpa,lower.tail=F)
}
powdiff <- abs(pow-desired)
if (pow<desired) {
  foo <- 1
}
if (pow>desired) {
  foo <- -1
}
minn <- newn
print(minn)
APPENDIX J: IRB APPROVAL STUDY 2

The amendment, detailed below, and submitted for the following research study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at Ohio University.

Project: When Speaking Up Makes No Difference: Exploring the Dimensions of Organizational Muted Dissent

Amendment: Title change. Recruit US workers as well as from Oman. Questionnaire changes. Drawing for incentive.

Primary Investigator: Adil S. Al-Busaidi
Co-Investigator(s):

Advisor: Claudia Hale
Department: Communication Studies

Robin Stack, OIP, Human Subjects Research Coordinator
Office of Research Compliance

April 28, 2014
APPENDIX K: FINAL ENGLISH QUESTIONNAIRE

Q1.1 Informed Consent Form
You are invited to participate in a research study on Employee Silence. This study is conducted by Adil Al-Busaidi, a Doctoral Student from Ohio University. This study will take approximately 10-15 minutes of your time. You will be asked to complete an online survey about a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, you will be asked to indicate your degree of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and workplace frustrations with organizational policies and practices. You should participate in this study if you meet the following conditions:

- You are a full or a part time employee working in Oman (private or public sector)
- Both Omanis and Non-Omanis (Expatriates) are eligible to participate in this study.
- You are at least 18 years old or older.

Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your participation in this research will be completely confidential and data will be averaged and reported in aggregate.

Although your participation in this research may not benefit you personally, it will help us understand reasons and motives of silence at work. It will also help us understand reasons employee suppress their views and opinions. There are no risks to individuals participating in this survey beyond those that exist in daily life. If you have questions about this project, you may contact Mr. Adil Al-Busaidi, aa396510@ohio.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664. Please print a copy of this consent form for your records, if you so desire.

Q1.2 I have read and understand the above consent form, I certify that I am 18 years old or older and, I indicate my willingness voluntarily take part in the study.

○ Yes
○ No
Q2.1 In organizations, we observe practices, policies, and decisions that we do not agree with. We experience situations in which we feel frustrated and dissatisfied with managerial imperatives. However, we might not speak up regarding wrongdoing, unfair treatment, and frustrations. We nod our heads; we say that we agree, and we might even superficially support decisions in front of management although we do not really agree. Instead, we might observe what we define as a wrongdoing by management or by authority, but decide to remain silent. We might observe a mistake or error in judgment and never speak up.

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your level of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

The following will give you an opportunity to tell us about your experience. Please answer openly and truthfully.

Q2.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIS_1</th>
<th>Raising concerns about bad business practices to management is useless</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td>It is difficult to make changes in this organization</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>I know managers will not take my concerns seriously</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td>It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>I believe that speaking up will not change things around here</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td>I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_9</td>
<td>I know that complaining is just a waste of time</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_10</td>
<td>Managers take my concerns seriously</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_11</td>
<td>Other employees have tried to change things in the past, but have failed.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_12</td>
<td>I believe my concerns will be addressed</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.3 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REL_1</th>
<th>My manager might take my comments personally</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL_2</td>
<td>I do not want to harm my relationship with my manager</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_3</td>
<td>I do not want to damage my relationship with</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

380
In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone.
I think people here take work-related disagreements personally.
People here do not mix personal and professional issues.
Criticizing management in this organization will not harm my relationship with managers.
Higher-ups might take my views personally.
I know that speaking up means damaging relationships.
I fear losing relationships with management.

| REL_4 | management |
| REL_5 | I think people here take work-related disagreements personally |
| REL_6 | People here do not mix personal and professional issues |
| REL_7 | Criticizing management in this organization will not harm my relationship with managers |
| REL_8 | Higher-ups might take my views personally |
| REL_9 | I know that speaking up means damaging relationships |
| REL_10 | I fear losing relationships with management |

3.1 Think about a situation in which you failed to express true disagreement to your supervisor or higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you do not agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies do you usually employ as a way to express your disagreement.

| DEF_1 | I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind |
| DEF_2 | I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation |
| DEF_3 | I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor’s requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind |
| DEF_4 | I avoid raising disagreements with my supervisor when discussing a situation, but I implement what I truly see as right |
| DEF_5 | I comply in front of management, but I do what I see as right |
| DEF_6 | I tend to buy more time to implement decisions with which I do not agree |
| DEF_7 | I delay taking action, hoping management will re-evaluate their decisions |
| DEF_8 | I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree |
| DEF_9 | I hesitate to take action, hoping management will forget |
| DEF_10 | I do what is good for the business even if that will contradict management |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_4</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_5</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_6</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_7</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_9</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF_10</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTH_1</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a complainer</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td>I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_3</td>
<td>I do not want to damage my positive image</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td>I do not want people to have a negative impression of me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_5</td>
<td>I do not want to be viewed as a negative person</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td>I do not want management to have a bad impression of me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td>I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td>I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_9</td>
<td>I might embarrass myself by complaining</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_10</td>
<td>I do not care when people label me as a complainer</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4.1 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>I do not want to get others in trouble</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_2</td>
<td>I do not want to hurt others’ feelings</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_3</td>
<td>I do not want to affect my supervisor’s prestige</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>I do not want to damage management's reputation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>I do not want to embarrass others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_6</td>
<td>I do not mind if my opinions upset others</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_8</td>
<td>I do not want to delay tasks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>I do not want to hinder tasks</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4.2 In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| INS_2 | I fear losing job benefits                      | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_3 | It is likely that I'll be promoted if I disagree with organizational practices | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_4 | It's likely that I'll be nominated for training if I criticize management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_5 | Speaking up might impact my job evaluation | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_6 | Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_7 | I do not want to miss job promotion opportunities due to speaking up | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_8 | Pointing out problems will affect my appraisals | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_9 | Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| INS_10 | I fear receiving unfair job assignments | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| 5.1 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------|------|------|-----|------|
| JUS_1 | Overall, I'm treated fairly by my organization | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| JUS_2 | In general, I can count on this organization to be fair | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| JUS_3 | In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| JUS_4 | Usually, the way things work in this organization are not fair | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| JUS_5 | For the most part, this organization treats its employees fairly | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| JUS_6 | Most of the people who work here would say they are often treated unfairly | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| Q5.2 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------|------|------|-----|------|
| UPD_1 | I am hesitant to raise questions or contradictory opinions in my organization | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_2 | I don't question management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_3 | I'm hesitant to question workplace policies | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_4 | I don't tell my supervisor when I disagree with workplace decisions | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_5 | I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_6 | I speak with my supervisor or someone in management when I question workplace decisions | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_7 | I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting inefficiency in my organization | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| UPD_8 | I don't express my disagreement to management | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
UPD_9 | I tell management when I believe employees are being treated unfairly

| | | | | |

Q5.3 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSA_1</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA_2</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA_3</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job rewards in relation with performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA_4</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5.4 Indicate your degree of agreement in the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM_1</td>
<td>I would not mind to work for a different company if the nature of the job was similar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_2</td>
<td>I believe that company's values and my values are similar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_3</td>
<td>I am proud to say that I am working for this organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_4</td>
<td>This organization encourages me to put the maximum effort in order to be more productive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_5</td>
<td>I am very satisfied with my choice to come and work for this organization in comparison with other opportunities I had when I was looking for a job.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q35 Q1. On a scale from 0-10 (0 being completely unwilling, 10 being completely willing), how W WING are you to express the following situations at work?

| | | | | | | | | | | |

Q51 When you are dissatisfied with managerial decisions, how W WING are you to express objection and disagreements to authority?

| | | | | | | | | | |

Q52 When you observe wrongdoing or poor business practices, how W WING are you to question management?

| | | | | | | | | | |

Q53 When you experience disagreements and dissatisfaction at work how W WING are you to express your frustrations to your immediate supervisor.

| | | | | | | | | | |
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Q32 When you experience disagreements and dissatisfaction at work how WILLING are you to express your frustrations to your supervisor’s manager.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q44 Q2. In your organization, if you have an access to individual(s) deemed to be in positions to have an influence or to make needed changes, how LIKELY will you raise the following concerns to them (0 being Not at all Likely, 10 being Extremely likely):

Q49 How likely will you speak up if you experienced unfair treatment

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q37 How likely will you report if you noticed someone else being treated unfairly

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q38 How likely will you report your concern if you noticed an unethical situation

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q39 How likely will you raise your concern if you noticed an unethical situation

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q40 How likely will you speak up if you experienced concerns or disagreements with organizational decisions and polices

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q41 How likely will you speak up if you have concerns about a co-worker’s competence or performance

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42 How likely will you speak up if you have concerns about your immediate supervisor’s competence

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q43 How likely will you speak up if you have concerns about competencies of someone in higher-ups

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6.1 1. In this organization I have at least ONE employee who reports to me directly.
- Yes
- No
Q6.2 2. Where are you employed?
- Private Sector
- Public Sector
- Semi-Private/Public (e.g., this an organization that is owned by both public & private companies)
- Self-employed; Entrepreneur

Q6.3 3. What is your gender?
- Female
- Male

Q6.4 4. What is your age?
- 18 to 24 years
- 25 to 34 years
- 35 to 44 years
- 45 to 54 years
- 55 to 64 years
- 65 years and over

Q6.5 5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- Less than High School
- High School / GED
- Some College
- 2-year College Degree
- 4-year College Degree
- Masters Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Professional Degree (JD, MD)

Q6.7 6. How many employees work in your organization?
- 1-4
- 5-9
- 10-19
- 20-49
- 50-99
- 100-249
- 250-499
- 500-999
- 1000 or more
Q6.7 7. In which industry are you employed?
- Oil and Gas
- Telecommunications
- Manufacturing
- Hospitality
- Banking & Finance
- Construction
- Government
- Academic or Researcher
- Educational Services
- Health Care
- Real Estate
- Transportation or Warehousing
- Rental and Leasing
- Wholesale Trade or Retailers
- Media
- Others ____________________

Q6.8 8. Which classification best describes your position?
- Senior Management
- Middle Management
- General Staff

Q6.9 9. How long have you been working for your current employer?
- Less than ‘1’ year
- 1- 2 years
- 2- 5 years
- 5- 10 years
- More than 10 years

Q6.10 10. I'm an Omani Citizen?
- Yes
- No

Q6.11 11. What is your country of origin?

Q6.12 12. How long have you been living in Oman?
- Less than ‘1’ year
- 1- 2 years
- 2- 5 years
- 5- 10 years
- More than 10 years
- Never
APPENDIX L: FINAL ARABIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Q1.1

يرفعت دكتوراه في أحد الأبحاث التي تقوم بها عادل البوسعيدي، طالب دكتوراه في جامعة أوهايو، بعنوان "السياقات". إجابة النص الأصلي ما بين 10 إلى 15 دقيقة فقط. كل ما يطلب منك هو إكمال السياقات المتوفرة على الإنترنت حول الأسباب التي تجعل الشخص ما يزيد عن مشكلة واحداً في العمل أو يفصل السياقات. اعتمد على طبعة العلاقة التي تربطك بالشركاء أو الإدارة في مكان العمل، ستكون عند من الأسئلة لم تكن في أي مدى تتفق أو لا تتفق مع الأسباب التي تجعلك تفصل السياقات إذا رأيت أموراً فيها طموح أو تفاؤل تدريكي في مكان العمل أو شعورك بعدم الافت(rec) أو عدم الرضا أو حبيت الأمين أو السياسة والممارسات المهنية في مكان العمل. لا يبدأ من استبعاد الشروط العامة لك تشارك في هذا السياقات

- موظف في القطاع العام أو الخاص في سلطة عملاق عماني أو أجنبي

Q1.2

أقترح بالموافقة على المشاركة وآخرين بأن عملي يتجاوز 18 عاماً وأؤكد استعدادي للمشاركة

بشكل تطوعي في هذه الدراسة.

نعم

لا

Q2.1

أثناء عملنا في المواقع، نسبي إلى تحسين الأداء من خلال المفهوم والإجراءات الإيجابية حول القضايا المهمة بالنسبة لنا (مثل

مشاهدة ممارسات خاطئة، تعمل فعالًا، شعور بعدم الراحة خالية الأمل من سياسات أنظمة الحياة التي تعمل بها (في بعض الأحيان

تعتبر إلى مواقع تعرف فيها أن وجهات نظرنا يمكن أن تساهم في تحسين الإيجابية ولكننا لا تتفق مع الجملة، سواء كان ذلك

وهي الإجراءات خطيًا، ورومانسية وتقوم بأعمال ومواقف أو تملؤها في ذات المجال للذين في ذلك، فيما قد يشترك ما يمكن أن نقول إنه ممارسات خاطئة من جانب الإدارة أو جهة معنوية، رغم ذلك تلتزم الصمت أو أنا ترى الخطأ

ولا تنتهي تحت عادة أو تزعم لفظ الصلاحيات في أحداث التغيير

ما يلي عبارة عن قائمة بالإجابات التي قد تختلف على تفاصيل في العمل، فقانون تفاصيل بصورة مشتركة أو إدارتك في

العمل، هناك مساحة لتغيير مع الأسباب التي قد تجعلك صامتاً في المواقف غير الأخلاقية أو غير المانية أو يخص صحة عدم موافقة ودعم

رضائك في علاقة من سياقات وممارسات جهة عامل.

توفر لك الأسئلة الثالثة الفرصة لك تدفعت عن خبراتك وتجربتك في مكان العمل وكل ما عليك هو أن تجيب بصدق ونزاهة على الأسئلة.
Q2.2 في هذه الجهة، أتفادي الحديث مع المشرف، الإدارة أو الجهات العليا عن المشاكل والأخطاء ووجه القصور وعدم اتفاقي مع السياسات والإجراءات المطبقة لأن رفع الشكاوى عن الممارسات السيئة إلى الإدارة لا فعّ ولا فائدة منه:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>أدانت</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>أتفق تماما = ف</th>
<th>أتفق ≠ ف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_1</td>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td>DIS_4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td>DIS_8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_9</td>
<td>DIS_10</td>
<td>DIS_11</td>
<td>DIS_12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.3 في هذه الجهة، أتجنب الإشارة في حديثي مع المشرفين، الإدارة أو المسؤولين الكبير عن أي مشاكل أو انتقادات أو أخطاء وجوائز قصور أو عدم اتفاق مع سياسات وممارسات الجامعة لأنه:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>أدانت</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>أتفق تماما = ف</th>
<th>أتفق ≠ ف</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REL_1</td>
<td>REL_2</td>
<td>REL_3</td>
<td>REL_4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_5</td>
<td>REL_6</td>
<td>REL_7</td>
<td>REL_8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL_9</td>
<td>REL_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q3.1 في موقف ما لم تتمكن فيه عن التعبير عن عدم رضاك أو عدم اتفاقك مع مشرفك أو إدارتك العليا بخصوص ممارسات الأعمال السيئة أو التعامل غير العادل في العمل أو عن قرارات لا توافق عليها، أي مما ينطوي على إتباعه في الغالب كوسيلة للتعبير عن اعتراضك، أقعد أمان أن سيغير رأيه مع فريق التنسيق الفوري لطلبات مشرف في الموقف الذي لا أرى به، يأثر في كم من الموقف، ولكني أطبق ما أراه صحيحاً.

في هذا الموقف، أقدر أحياناً الاتخاذ الفوري لطلبات مشرف في الموقف الذي لا أرى به يأثر في كم من الموقف، ولكني أطبق ما أراه صحيحاً.

Q3.2 في هذه الجهة، أقدر أحياناً الاتخاذ الفوري لطلبات مشرف في الموقف الذي لا أرى به يأثر في كم من الموقف، ولكني أطبق ما أراه صحيحاً.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الخت</th>
<th>ف</th>
<th>م</th>
<th>خ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن ينظر لي على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن ينظر إلى أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتаратيع الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratيع الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتаратيع الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratيع الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratيع الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>DEF_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الخت</th>
<th>ف</th>
<th>م</th>
<th>خ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن ينظر لي على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن ينظر إلى أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لا أريد أن يكون للتaratium الإيجابية على أي أني كثيراً الشكوك</td>
<td>FTH_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
في هذه الجهة، أتفادى الحديث مع المشرف، الإدارة أو الجهات العليا عن المشاكل والأخطاء وأوجه الفساد وعدم اتفاق مع السياسات والإجراءات المطبقة لأن:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>قضية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أتنبأ في مسائل الأخرين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_2</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أجرم مشاعر الأخرين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_3</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أثرت على مكانة مشرفي في العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أخرب سمعة الإدارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أذى الأخرين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_6</td>
<td>لا أهتم بما إذا كان رأي سيزعج الأخرين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن يثير كلامي بشكل سلب على التطور الوظيفي للآخرين</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_8</td>
<td>لا أ Abed يكون رأي سببا في تأخر الأعمال</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن يؤدي تقف إلى تخفيض إنتاجية المؤسسة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن أوقع سير العمل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

وفي هذه الجهة، أتفادى الحديث مع المشرف، الإدارة أو الجهات العليا عن المشاكل والأخطاء وأوجه الفساد وعدم اتفاق مع السياسات والإجراءات المطبقة لأن:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>قضية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td>إنتقدنا ساوت على تقديم الوظيفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_2</td>
<td>أخشى من فقدان المزايا الوظيفية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_3</td>
<td>على الأرجح سيتم ترقيتي إذا لم أوافق مع الممارسات الخاصة بالشركة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_4</td>
<td>على الأرجح سيتم تشجيعي للتدريب إذا قمت بانتقاد الإدارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_5</td>
<td>قد يؤثر التنقاد على تقديم الوظيفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td>مناهج الدراسة ربما يؤثر على فرص تدريبي المحتملة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_7</td>
<td>لا أ Abed أن يكون إعتراضي للسياسات المطلاقة سببا في فقدان ترقتي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_8</td>
<td>الإشارات إلى المشاكل سيؤثر على تقديم الوظيفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td>أخف أن يؤدي لحديث عن المشاكل إلى تقيي مهام وظيفية غير عادلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

عدد مدى اتفاقك مع الجمل والتعبيرات التالية:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>قضية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUS_1</td>
<td>إجماليا، يتم معاملتي بنزاهة وعدل في جهة عملي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS_2</td>
<td>بشكل عام، يمكنني القول بأن هذه الموسسة عادلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS_3</td>
<td>بشكل عام، أتفاغ مع معايير عادلة في هذا المكان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS_4</td>
<td>عادية، الممارسات الإدارية في هذه الموسسة غير عادلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS_5</td>
<td>غالبًا، تعامل هذه المؤسسة مع موظفيها بعدل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUS_6</td>
<td>معظم العاملين هنا يقولون أنه في الغالب لا يتم معاملتهم بعدل</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q5.2 حدد مدى انتفاقك مع الجمل والتعبارات التالية**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>فق</th>
<th>م</th>
<th>خ</th>
<th>تحت</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أتريد في توجيه أسستني أو اعتراضي في الجهة التي أعمل بها لا أتفق الإدارة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أتريد في توجيه اعتراض حول سياسات العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>لا أشعر بالذراع عندما لا أوافق على القرارات المتخذة في العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أتقدم المشرف أو أي أحد في الإدارة إذا رأيت أن هناك تغيرات تنظيمية لا قادة من عمال العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أحدثت مع مسؤولي أو مع شخص في الإدارة عندما أعرض على قرارات العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أقدم مقتراحي للإدارة أو للمشرف عن تصحيح أوجه القصور في مكان العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>لا أعبر للإدارة عن اعتراضي في بيئة العمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أقوم بإبلاغ الإدارة عندما أرى أن هناك موقفين لا يحصلون على المعاملة العادلة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5.3 حدد مدى انتفاقك مع الجمل والتعبارات التالية**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>فق</th>
<th>م</th>
<th>خ</th>
<th>تحت</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>بشكل عام، أنا راض جدا عن فرصي في الترقية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>بشكل عام، أنا راض جدا عن التدريب الوظيفي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>بشكل عام، أنا راض جدا على مكافأت العمل المتعلقة بالأداء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>بشكل عام، أنا راض جدا عن وظيفتي</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q5.4 حدد مدى انتفاقك مع الجمل والتعبارات التالية**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>فق</th>
<th>م</th>
<th>خ</th>
<th>تحت</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>لا أشعر في العمل في أي شركة أخرى إذا كانت طبيعة العمل مشابهة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أتعت أن هناك تشابه بين المهن التي أقوم بها وقيم الشركة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أشعر بالذم عندما أقول إنني آبل في هذه الشركة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أتمنى الشركة على أن أعمل قصرا جهدًا حتى تكون أكثر إنتاجية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>أشعر بالذم عندما أقبل العمل في هذه الشركة مقاربًا بما كان أشوا من عروض عندما كنت أبحث عن عمل.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UPD_1 UPD_2 UPD_3 UPD_4 UPD_5 UPD_6 UPD_7 UPD_8 UPD_9**

**JSA_1 JSA_2 JSA_3 JSA_4**

**COM_1 COM_2 COM_3 COM_4 COM_5**
الرجاء اختيار استعدادكم للقيام بالتالي (0 = غير مستعد تماماً، 10 = مستعد تماماً)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>السؤال</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إذا لديك الإمكانية للوصول إلى المسؤول الذي يبدع التأثير أو بيده الصلاحية لإحداث التغيير في بيئة العمل إلى أي مدى سترفع له الشكاوى أو تعبر عن اعتراضك عن الممارسات التالية: (0 = غير محتمل على الإطلاق, 10 = محتمل جداً)
ما مدى احتمال تعبيرك عن اعتراضك إذا واجهت معاملة غير عادلة في العمل؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن ترفع شكوى إذا لاحظت أن موظف آخر يلقى معاملة غير منصفة؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تعبر عن استيائك إذا رأيت أمورًا فيها ظلم أو تخلفات تقليدية في مكان العمل؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تعبر عن استيائك إذا رأيت أمورًا فيها ظلم أو تخلفات تقليدية في مكان العمل؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إذا شعرت بعدم الاتفاق أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إن كنت تشعر بعدم الاحترام أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إذا رأيت معاملات وإجراءات تنظيمية تفتقر للجودة؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إن كنت تشعر بعدم الاتفاق أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إن كنت تشعر بعدم الاتفاق أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إن كنت تشعر بعدم الاتفاق أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

ما مدى احتمال أن تتكلم إن كنت تشعر بعدم الاتفاق أو عدم الرضا أو خيبة الأمل من السياسات والممارسات المهنية؟

| 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

في هذه الشركة، هناك شخص واحد على الأقل تحت إشراف المدير.

نعم ☐ 
لا ☐

أين تعمل؟

في القطاع الخاص ☐
في القطاع العام ☐
الجهات الشبه الحكومية / المشاريع المشتركة ☐
صاحب عمل حر، رائد أعمال ☐

ما الجنس؟

أنثى ☐
ذكر ☐
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Q6.4 4. من العمر؟
- من 18 إلى 24 عام
- من 25 إلى 34 عام
- من 35 إلى 44 عام
- من 45 إلى 54 عام
- من 55 إلى 64 عام
- 65 عام وأكثر

Q6.5 5. ما هو أعلى مستوى تعليمي حصلت عليه؟
- أقل من الثانوية
- ثانوية / شهادة التعليم العام
- الدراسة لفترة في الكلية
- ستنيتين في الكلية (دبلوم)
- كلية أربع سنوات (بكالوريوس)
- ماجستير
- دكتوراه
- شهادة مهنية (طبيب MD أو شهادات مهنية معتمدة دولية)

Q6.7 6. كم عدد الموظفين الذين يعملون في الجهة التي تعمل بها؟
- 1-4
- 5-9
- 10-19
- 20-49
- 50-99
- 100-249
- 250-499
- 500-999
- 1000 أو أكثر

Q6.7 7. في أي المجالات التالية تعمل؟
- نفط وغاز
- تصنيع
- الضيافة
- بنوك وتمويل
- الإنشاءات
- حكومة
- إكاديمي أو بحث
- خدمات تعليمية
- رعاية صحية
- العقارات
- نقل ومستودعات
- تأجير وتمويل
- التجارة بالجملة أو الجزءة
- إعلام
- أخرى
Q6.8 ما هو تصنيفك الوظيفي؟
- الإدارة العليا
- الإدارة الوسطى
- الوظائف العامة

Q6.9 منذ كم سنة وأنت تعمل في هذه المؤسسة؟
- أقل من سنة
  - 1-2 سنة
  - 2-5 سنة
  - 5-10 سنة
  - أكثر من 10 سنوات

Q6.10 هل أنت عماني/ة؟
- نعم
- لا

Q6.11 ما هو بلدك الأصلي؟

Q6.12 منذ كم سنة وأنت تعيش في سلطنة عمان؟
- أقل من سنة
  - 1-2 سنة
  - 2-5 سنة
  - 5-10 سنة
  - أكثر من 10 سنوات
  - لم أعيش في عمان أبداً
APPENDIX M: RECRUITING SCRIPT

My name is Adil Al-Busaidi and I am a student at Ohio University. I am currently conducting research for my doctoral dissertation.

The study is titled “When Speaking Up Makes No Difference: Exploring the Dimensions of Organizational Muted Dissent”

In this study, I would like to know why you might want to remain silent regarding situations you see as unethical or unfair at work or situations where you disagree with, are dissatisfied with, or are frustrated with organizational policies and practices.

You should participate in this study if you meet the following conditions:

1. You are a full or a part time employee working in Oman
2. Both Omanis and Non-Omanis (Expatriates) are eligible to participate in this study
3. You are at least 18 years old or older.

Your participation in the study will take about 10-15 minutes.

I would greatly appreciate if you can participate in this study no later than May 14th 2014. It will also be very helpful if you could forward this message to other people in your social networks.

To participate in Arabic
http://goo.gl/nRTMH9

To Participate in English
http://goo.gl/0vsG5B

If you have any questions about the study or the survey, please feel free to contact me at aa396510@ohio.edu. I appreciate your support!

Thank you for your support and for helping embodying scientific research culture in Oman.

Remark: Best viewed using PC browser. The content will not be fully displayed if opened using smart phones.

Thank you,
### APPENDIX N: FLAGGED ITEMS FOR POTENTIAL DELETION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagged Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Bi-modal</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Min/Max Range</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Outliers</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIS_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_10R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS_12R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items for Disengaged Muted Dissent**

**Items for Relational Threat**

**Items for Defiant Muted Dissent**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagged Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Bimodal</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Min/Max Range</th>
<th>Normality</th>
<th>Outliers</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTH_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTH_10R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for Face Threat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_6R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for Supportive Muted Dissent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_3R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_4R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX O: INTER-ITEM CORRELATIONS

|     | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10    | 11    | 12    | 13    | 14    | 15    | 16    | 17    | 18    | 19    | 20    | 21    | 22    | 23    | 24    | 25    | 26    | 27    | 28    | 29    |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| DIS_3| -     | DIS_4 | -     | DIS_5 | 0.57 | DIS_6 | 0.49 | DIS_7 | 0.50 | DIS_8 | 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 |
| DIS_4| -     | DIS_5 | 0.57 | DIS_6 | 0.49 | DIS_7 | 0.50 | DIS_8 | 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 |
| DIS_5| 0.57 | DIS_6 | 0.49 | DIS_7 | 0.50 | DIS_8 | 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 |
| DIS_6| 0.49 | DIS_7 | 0.50 | DIS_8 | 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 |
| DIS_7| 0.50 | DIS_8 | 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| DIS_8| 0.69 | REL_1 | 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_1| 0.20 | REL_2 | 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_2| 0.03 | REL_3 | 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_3| 0.24 | REL_4 | 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_4| 0.19 | REL_5 | 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_5| 0.24 | REL_6 | 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_6| 0.25 | REL_7 | 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |
| REL_7| 0.30 | REL_8 | 0.34 | REL_9 | 0.26 | DEF_1 | 0.19 | DEF_2 | 0.19 |

*Correlation is significant at \( p < 0.05 \).* **Correlation is significant at \( p < 0.01 \) level (2-tailed)
In organizations, we observe practices, policies, and decisions that we do not agree with. We experience situations in which we feel frustrated and dissatisfied with managerial imperatives. However, we might not speak up regarding wrongdoing, unfair treatment, and frustrations. We nod our heads; we say that we agree, and we might even superficially support decisions in front of management although we do not really agree. Instead, we might observe what we define as a wrongdoing by management or by authority, but decide to remain silent. We might observe a mistake or error in judgment and never speak up.

Below is a list of reasons why someone might or might not speak up about a problem at work. Thinking specifically about your interactions with your supervisor or management at work, indicate your level of agreement with the reasons you might want to remain silent regarding unethical and unfair situations at work, or regarding your disagreements, dissatisfactions, and frustrations with organizational policies and practices.

**Disengaged Muted Dissent:**
In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| DIS_3 | I know managers will not take my concerns seriously |
| DIS_4 | It is likely that managers will not be responsive to my complaints |
| DIS_5 | Criticizing organizational problems in this organization is just a waste of time |
| DIS_6 | Other employees have raised concerns to managers but nothing happened |
| DIS_7 | I believe that speaking up will not change things around here |
| DIS_8 | I know my ideas will fall on deaf ears |

**Defiant Muted Dissent:**
Think about a situation in which you failed to express true disagreement to your supervisor or higher-ups regarding bad business practices, unfair treatment at work or decisions that you do not agree with. Which of the following indirect strategies do you usually employ as a way to express your disagreement.

| DEF_1 | I keep delaying my manager’s requests, hoping he/she will change his/her mind |
| DEF_2 | I delay taking action, hoping management will reassess the situation |
| DEF_3 | I avoid immediate implementation of my supervisor's requests if I disagree with those requests because I hope he/she will change his/her mind |
| DEF_8 | I delay taking actions on decisions with which I do not agree |

**Supportive Muted Dissent:**
In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

<p>| SUP_1 | I do not want to get others in trouble |
| SUP_4 | I do not want to damage management’s reputation |
| SUP_5 | I do not want to embarrass others |
| SUP_7 | I do not want to negatively impact others’ career development |
| SUP_9 | I do not want my criticisms to reduce organizational productivity |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUP_10</th>
<th>I do not want to hinder tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Face Threat:**
In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| FTH_2 | I do not like to be labeled as a troublemaker |
| FTH_4 | I do not want people to have a negative impression of me |
| FTH_6 | I do not want management to have a bad impression of me |
| FTH_7 | I do not want management to look at me as a troublemaker |
| FTH_8 | I do not want to be seen as the person who always criticizes |

**Relational Threat:**
In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| REL_1 | My manager might take my comments personally |
| REL_4 | In this organization criticizing something means criticizing someone |
| REL_8 | Higher-ups might take my views personally |
| REL_9 | I know that speaking up means damaging relationships |

**Instrumental Threat:**
In this organization, I avoid pointing out problems, criticisms, errors, inefficiencies, and disagreements with organizational policies and practices to my supervisor, management or higher-ups because

| INS_1 | Raising criticisms will affect the evaluation of my job |
| INS_6 | Criticizing management could affect my potential training opportunities |
| INS_9 | Raising concerns to higher-ups could affect my promotion |
| INS_10 | I fear receiving unfair job assignments |

**Overall Organizational Justice** (Ambrose & Schminke, 2009)

| JUS_1 | Overall, I'm treated fairly by my organization |
| JUS_2 | In general, I can count on this organization to be fair |
| JUS_3 | In general, the treatment I receive around here is fair |
| JUS_4R | Usually, the way things work in this organization are not fair (R) |
| JUS_5 | For the most part, this organization treats its employees fairly |
| JUS_6R | Most of the people who work here would say they are often treated unfairly (R) |

**Upward Dissent** (Kassing, 2000b)

<p>| UPD_1R | I am hesitant to raise questions or contradictory opinions in my organization (R) |
| UPD_2R | I don’t question management (R) |
| UPD_3R | I'm hesitant to question workplace policies (R) |
| UPD_4R | I don’t tell my supervisor when I disagree with workplace decisions (R) |
| UPD_5 | I bring my criticism about organizational changes that aren't working to my supervisor or someone in management |
| UPD_6 | I speak with my supervisor or someone in management when I question workplace decisions |
| UPD_7 | I make suggestions to management or my supervisor about correcting |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPD_8R</th>
<th>I don’t express my disagreement to management (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPD_9</td>
<td>I tell management when I believe employees are being treated unfairly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Satisfaction** (Hackman & Oldham, 1980)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JSA_1</th>
<th>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job opportunities for promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSA_2</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA_3</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job rewards in relation with performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA_4</td>
<td>Generally speaking, I'm very satisfied with my job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Commitment** (Porter et al., 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COM_1R</th>
<th>I would not mind to work for a different company if the nature of the job was similar (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COM_2</td>
<td>I believe that company's values and my values are similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_3</td>
<td>I am proud to say that I am working for this organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_4</td>
<td>This organization encourages me to put the maximum effort in order to be more productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM_5</td>
<td>I am very satisfied with my choice to come and work for this organization in comparison with other opportunities I had when I was looking for a job.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q: LAVAAN SYNTAX

rm(list=ls())
#Reading spss file
library(foreign)
mydata <- read.spss("CFA_FINAL.sav", use.value.labels = TRUE, to.data.frame = TRUE,
  max.value.labels = Inf, trim.factor.names = FALSE, use.missings = to.data.frame)
#Making sure that ITEMS are numeric
names(mydata)
class(mydata$DIS_8)
#Making sure that categorical variables are set to factors
class(mydata$GENDER)
#Excluding categorical variables
mydata2 <- subset(mydata, select =
c(-SUPERVISER, -SECTOR, -GENDER,
-AGAE, -EDUCATION, -ORG_SIZE, -ORG_SIZE_2,
-INDUSTRY, -HIERARCHY, -TENURE,
-OMANI, -COUNTRY, -LIVED_OM))
names(mydata2)

#*****************************************************************************
#TESTING mardia normalized coefficient
#using psych library
#*****************************************************************************
library(psych)
mardia(mydata2)

#*****************************************************************************
#CFA MODEL WITH 6 FACTORS
#*****************************************************************************
#Loading 'lavaan' library
library(lavaan)
mymodel <-'
DISENGAGED =~ NA*DIS_3 + DIS_4 + DIS_5 + DIS_6 + DIS_7 + DIS_8
RELATIONAL =~ NA*REL_9 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_1
DEFIANT =~ NA*DEF_8 + DEF_3 + DEF_2 + DEF_1
FACE_THREAT =~ NA*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
SUPPORTIVE =~ NA*SUP_10 + SUP_9 + SUP_7 + SUP_5 + SUP_4 + SUP_1
INSTRUMENTAL =~ NA*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1
' #fixing variances of latent variables to 1.0
DISENGAGED ~~ 1*DISENGAGED
RELATIONAL ~~ 1*RELATIONAL
DEFIANT ~~ 1*DEFIANT
FACE_THREAT ~~ 1*FACE_THREAT
SUPPORTIVE ~~ 1*SUPPORTIVE
INSTRUMENTAL ~~ 1*INSTRUMENTAL'
#*****************************************************************************
#Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- cfa(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(fit)
summary(fit, estimates = TRUE, fit.measures = TRUE)
#to get standardized solution
standardizedSolution(fit)
fitMeasures(fit)
#subsetting parameters with Modification Indices > 10
ModInd <- modindices(fit)
subset(ModInd, mi > 10)

#CFA MODEL WITH 3 FIRST-ORDER FACTORS

mymodel <- 'RELATIONAL =~ NA*REL_9 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_1
FACE_THREAT =~ NA*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
INSTRUMENTAL =~ NA*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1

#Fixing variances of latent variables
RELATIONAL ~~ 1*RELATIONAL
FACE_THREAT ~~ 1*FACE_THREAT
INSTRUMENTAL ~~ 1*INSTRUMENTAL
',

#Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- cfa(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
           estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
summary(fit, fit.measures = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(fit)
coef(fit)
fitted(fit)
parTable(fit)
fitMeasures(fit, c("cfi", "rmsea"))
ModInd <- modindices(fit)
subset(ModInd, mi > 10)

#SINGLE HEIRARCHICAL-CFA MODEL WITH 3 FIRST ORDER FACTORS

mymodel <- 'RELATIONAL =~ 1*REL_9 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_1
FACE_THREAT =~ 1*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
INSTRUMENTAL =~ 1*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1
PROTECTIVE =~ NA*INSTRUMENTAL + FACE_THREAT + RELATIONAL

#Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- cfa(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
           estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
standardizedSolution(fit)
summary(fit, fit.measures = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(fit)
coef(fit)
fitted(fit)
fitMeasures(fit, c("cfi", "rmsea"))
ModInd <- modindices(fit)
subset(ModInd, mi > 10)

# MEASUREMENT MODEL WITH 3 FIRST-ORDER AND 1 SECOND ORDER FACTOR

mymodel <- 'DISENGAGED =~ NA*DIS_3 + DIS_4 + DIS_5 + DIS_6 + DIS_7 + DIS_8
RELATIONAL =~ 1*REL_9 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_1
DEFIANT =~ NA*DEF_8 + DEF_3 + DEF_2 + DEF_1
FACE_THREAT =~ 1*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
SUPPORTIVE =~ NA*SUP_10 + SUP_9 + SUP_7 + SUP_5 + SUP_4 + SUP_1
INSTRUMENTAL =~ 1*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1
PROTECTIVE =~ NA*INSTRUMENTAL + FACE_THREAT + RELATIONAL

# fixing variances of latent variables
DISENGAGED ~~ 1*DISENGAGED
DEFIANT ~~ 1*DEFIANT
SUPPORTIVE ~~ 1*SUPPORTIVE
PROTECTIVE ~~ 1*PROTECTIVE
'

# Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- cfa(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(fit)
summary(fit, estimates = TRUE, fit.measures = TRUE)
# to get standardizedSolution
standardizedSolution(fit)

# FINAL MEASUREMENT MODEL WITH VALIDATION MEASURES

mymodel <- 'DISENGAGED =~ 1*DIS_3 + DIS_4 + DIS_5 + DIS_6 + DIS_7 + DIS_8
DEFIANT =~ 1*DEF_8 + DEF_3 + DEF_2 + DEF_1
SUPPORTIVE =~ 1*SUP_10 + SUP_9 + SUP_7 + SUP_5 + SUP_4 + SUP_1
RELATIONAL =~ 1*REL_9 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_1
FACE_THREAT =~ 1*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
INSTRUMENTAL =~ 1*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1
JUSTICE =~ 1*JUS_1 + JUS_2 + JUS_3 + JUS_4R + JUS_5 + JUS_6R
UP_DISSENT =~ 1*UPD_1R + UPD_2R + UPD_3R + UPD_4R + UPD_6 + UPD_7 + UPD_8R + UPD_9
JOB_SATIS =~ 1*JSA_1 + JSA_2 + JSA_3 + JSA_4
COMMITMENT =~ 1*COM_5 + COM_2 + COM_3 + COM_4

# second order factor, fixing loading 1
PROTECTIVE =~ 1*RELATIONAL + FACE_THREAT + INSTRUMENTAL
#FREEING variances of latent variable
RELATIONAL ~~ NA*RELATIONAL
FACE_THREAT ~~ NA*FACE_THREAT
INSTRUMENTAL ~~ NA*INSTRUMENTAL
PROTECTIVE ~~ NA*PROTECTIVE
DISENGAGED ~~ NA*DISENGAGED
DEFIANT ~~ NA*DEFIANT
SUPPORTIVE ~~ NA*SUPPORTIVE
JUSTICE ~~ NA*JUSTICE
UP_DISSENT ~~ NA*UP_DISSENT
JOB_SATIS ~~ NA*JOB_SATIS
COMMITMENT ~~ NA*COMMITMENT

# Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- cfa(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
          estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
sum <- summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
parameterEstimates(fit)
summary(fit, estimates = TRUE, fit.measures = TRUE)
# to get standardizedSolution
std <- standardizedSolution(fit)
std

ModInd <- modindices(fit)
# sub-setting parameters with MI > 10
subset(ModInd, mi > 10)

###############################################################
# FINAL SEM MODEL
###############################################################

mymodel <- '
DISENGAGED =~ 1*DIS_3 + DIS_4 + DIS_5 + DIS_6 + DIS_7 + DIS_8
DEFIANT =~ 1*DEF_8 + DEF_3 + DEF_2 + DEF_1
SUPPORTIVE =~ 1*SUP_10 + SUP_9 + SUP_7 + SUP_5 + SUP_4 + SUP_1
RELATIONAL =~ 1*REL_1 + REL_8 + REL_4 + REL_9
FACE_THREAT =~ 1*FTH_8 + FTH_7 + FTH_6 + FTH_4 + FTH_2
INSTRUMENTAL =~ 1*INS_10 + INS_9 + INS_6 + INS_1
JUSTICE =~ 1*JUS_6R + JUS_2 + JUS_3 + JUS_4R + JUS_5 + JUS_1
UP_DISSENT =~ 1*UPD_9 + UPD_2R + UPD_3R + UPD_4R + UPD_6 + UPD_7 + UPD_8R + UPD_1R
JOB_SATIS =~ 1*JSA_4 + JSA_2 + JSA_3 + JSA_1
COMMITMENT =~ 1*COM_5 + COM_2 + COM_3 + COM_4
# second order factor, fixing loading to 1
PROTECTIVE =~ 1*RELATIONAL + FACE_THREAT + INSTRUMENTAL

FREEING variances of latent variable
RELATIONAL ~~ NA*RELATIONAL
FACE_THREAT ~~ NA*FACE_THREAT
INSTRUMENTAL ~~ NA*INSTRUMENTAL
PROTECTIVE ~~ NA*PROTECTIVE
DISENGAGED ~~ NA*DISENGAGED
DEFIANT ~~ NA*DEFIANT
SUPPORTIVE ~~ NA*SUPPORTIVE
JUSTICE ~~ NA*JUSTICE
UP_DISSENT ~~ NA*UP_DISSENT
JOB_SATIS ~~ NA*JOB_SATIS
COMMITMENT ~~ NA*COMMITMENT
# Regressions
#-------------------------------
COMMITMENT ~ DISENGAGED + DEFIANT + SUPPORTIVE + PROTECTIVE
UP_DISSENT ~ DISENGAGED + DEFIANT + SUPPORTIVE + PROTECTIVE
JOB_SATIS ~ DISENGAGED + DEFIANT + SUPPORTIVE + PROTECTIVE
DISENGAGED ~ JUSTICE
DEFIANT ~ JUSTICE
SUPPORTIVE ~ JUSTICE
PROTECTIVE ~JUSTICE
# Orthogonal factors: in lavaan by default correlates DVs
###so we have to fix these correlation to zero as below
UP_DISSENT ~~ 0*JOB_SATIS
UP_DISSENT ~~ 0*COMMITMENT
JOB_SATIS ~~ 0*COMMITMENT

# Satorra-Bentler scaled test statistic and robust standard errors
fit <- sem(mymodel, data = mydata, missing = "fiml",
estimator = "MLR", mimic = "Mplus")
sum <- summary(fit, estimates = FALSE, fit.measures = TRUE)
sum
parameterEstimates(fit)
summary(fit, estimates = TRUE, fit.measures = TRUE)
# to get standardizedSolution
std <- standardizedSolution(fit)
std
ModInd <- modindices(fit)
# subsetting parameters with MI > 40
subset(ModInd, mi > 40)

# POST-HOC ANALYSES: MEANS PLOT
library(ggplot2)
library(gplots)
# HIERARCHY
# displaying multiple graphs on a single diagram
par(mfrow=c(1,2))
plotmeans(mydata$DISENGAGED_S ~ mydata$HIERARCHY, ci.label=T,
digits=2, xlab="Organizational Hierarchy", ylab="Disengaged Muted Dissent",
mean.labels=F, legends=c("Senior Managers","Middle Managers","General Staff"))
plotmeans(mydata$PROTECTIVE_S ~ mydata$HIERARCHY, ci.label=T,
digits= 2, xlab="Organizational Hierarchy", ylab= "Protective Muted Dissent",
mean.labels=F, legends=c("Senior Managers","Middle Managers","General Staff"))
#-------------------------------------------------------------
# TENURE
#-------------------------------------------------------------
plotmeans(mydata$DISENGAGED_S ~ mydata$TENURE, ci.label=T,
digits= 2, xlab="Job Tenure", ylab= "Disengaged Muted Dissent",
mean.labels=F)