Dimensions of Organizational Silence and Intention to Leave. A Quantitative Study among Generation Y Employees in the Private Sector in Jakarta, Indonesia

[1]Lourencia,[2]Jugindar Singh Kartar Singh,
[3]Noraini Binti Ahmad, [4]Devinder Kaur Sarjit Singh

Abstract-- The aim of this study was to examine the influence of the dimensions of organizational silence towards intention to leave by Generation Y employees in the private sector in Jakarta. The three dimensions of organizational silence encompass acquiescent silence, defensive silence and prosocial silence. This was a quantitative study that used a survey method to collect primary data from 158 participants. The target population was generation Y employees engaged in the private sector in Jakarta, Indonesia. The data analysis was done by using SPSS tool version 20. The findings revealed that acquiescent silence and defensive had a positive and significant relationship with intention to leave organizations by Generation Y employees. This study provided additional knowledge of the effects of organizational silence on intention to leave. Based on the findings, human resource managers should examine further the consequences of organizational silence and develop policies and procedures to improve the retention of Generation Y employees in the private sector in Jakarta. Leaders in organizations and human resource managers should implement policies to create a workplace where employees will offer ideas and suggestions and express their views openly and safely. This study is the first to examine the relationship between the dimensions of organizational silence and intention to leave by generation Y employees in Jakarta, Indonesia.

Key words-- organizational silence, acquiescent, prosocial silence, defensive silence, intention to leave

I.   INTRODUCTION

With a population totaling around 260 million individuals, Indonesia is the fourth-largest country in the world in terms of population size. Its ethnic composition is characterized by variety of individuals as the country contains hundreds of different ethnic groups and cultures (Investment Indonesia, 2019). Indonesia has a fast growing economy with a workforce of 133.9 million in 2018 (Investment Indonesia, 2019). The United Nations (UN) report earlier stated that the population of Indonesia is estimated to exceed 270 million by 2025, exceed 285 million by

[1] *Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Email: lourencialay98@gmail.com*
[2] *Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Email: jugindar.singh@apu.edu.my*
[3] *Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Email: noraini@staffmail.apu.edu.my*
[4] *Asia Pacific University of Technology and Innovation, 57000 Kuala Lumpur, Email: devinder.kaur@staffemail.apu.edu.my*

2035 and exceed 290 million by 2045 (Investment Indonesia, 2019). Indonesia's real GDP growth remained broadly stable at 5.1 percent during the first quarter of 2019. Despite global volatility, Indonesia's economy has grown at a consistent pace with quarterly GDP growth remaining between 4.9 to 5.3 percent over the past 3.5 years (The World Bank, 2019). As reported by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Bappenas, it is estimated that Indonesia will see an average growth rate of 6.31 percent between 2020 and 2024 (Gorbiano, 2019). In the year 2017, Indonesia's population was dominated by millennial residents namely the population born between the year 1980 to 2000 amounting to 33.75%, with an almost equal number of males and females (Badan Pusat Statistik, Indonesia 2018). The millennial generation spreads evenly in all provinces in Indonesia and in Jakarta (DKI Jakarta), 37% of the population are millennials (Badan Pusat Statistik, Indonesia, 2018).

As stated in the report by Deloitte Insights, the retention and engagement of employees has jumped to higher levels of importance in the minds of organization leaders (Bersin, 2019). As highlighted in the HR Digest, the employee turnover rates in industries such as customer service, hospitality and retail are as 30%-40%. The report by Deloitte also highlighted that more than 70 percent of millennials want to be creative at work; and more than two-thirds believe it is management's job to provide them with accelerated development opportunities in order for them to stay (Bersin, 2019). In fact, these jobs are designed as such that the new recruit can adapt to the specified role quickly and smoothly. Employee turnover in organizations can result in negative consequences for business organizations because it can cause disruptions in teams and employee relationships (Ghosh, Satyawadi, and Shadman, 2013). The cost of employee turnover can be substantial. The cost includes both monetary and non-monetary cost. The non-monetary cost encompasses loss of knowledge and skills, loss of productivity and new competitive pressures. O'Connel and Kung (2007) also highlighted that employee turnover is costly and the cost of employee turnover include other cost such as loss of productivity and workplace safety issues. Based on past studies, it cost around 50% of an employee's annual salary to hire and train an employee to replace the employee who left (Johnson, Griffeth, and Griffin, (2000). Despite the various concerns and issues, employee turnover remains as the most undervalued and unappreciated facing organizational leaders (Phillips and Connel, 2004).

Past research has revealed several predictors of intention to leave. According to the report by Deliotte, employees have much higher bargaining power today. The report highlighted that to-thirds of all employees that participated in the survey, think they could find a better job in less than 60 days. Therefore, attracting and retaining high performance employees is a is a highly competitive activity (Bersin, 2019). Companies are now investing in analytics tools to figure out why people leave. Researchers have classified the factors that influence intention to leave or turnover into personal, job related, organization- wide and immediate work environment- related factors (Heather, 2003; Lee and Mowday, 1987). Other studies have revealed that affective commitment, normative commitment and goal clarity are the best predictors of employees' intention to stay or leave the organization (Ghosh, Satyawadi, and Shadman, 2013). Other factors that were identified by researchers encompass employee benefits and rewards, training and development opportunities, career development, work environment, and work- life balance (e.g.: Anderson, Coffey and Byerly, 2002; Allen, Shore and Griffeth, 2003). A report by Deloitte Insights highlighted that employees are more committed when they receive clear communication and trust their leadership. Organizational silence has been identified by researchers as one of the causes of intention to leave (Kumar,

Alagappar, and Govindarajo, 2015). Organizational silence can affect organizational change and development and in the longer term affect the growth and development of organizations (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). Morrison (2014) further pointed out that withholding of information by employees can deprive business organizations of potentially useful information. Therefore, employee retention is a critical function of HR and business leaders (Schwartz, et al., 2019). They stated that organizations should not assume that employees have few options in the labor market and therefore, they can neglect their retention strategies out of a false sense of security. Furthermore, millennials are different from previous generations and they prefer work flexibility (PWC, 2011). However, as pointed out by Phillips and Connel (2004), business organizations are not identifying the causes of employee turnover and in addition, the solutions are not matched with the causes of turnover.

There are a number of past studies that examined the determinants of employee retention and turnover. However, past research have not empirically examined the influence of the dimensions of organizational silence towards intention to leave organizations by generation Y employees. In addition, there is a paucity in research on the relationship between organizational silence and intention to leave in Jakarta, Indonesia. Therefore, a study on the impact of the dimensions of organizational silence on intention to leave by generation Y employees is useful. The purpose this study was to investigate the influence of the dimensions of organizational silence on intention to leave. This study will provide further information to employers on the need to provide support to attract and retain generation Y employees. An understanding of the impact of organizational silence may enhance the retention of generation Y employees and minimize the cost associated with turnover of employees.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Intention to leave

Intention to leave is related to turnover intention and according to Phillips and Connell, (2004), turnover of employees refers to the percentage of employees leaving the organization. Intention to leave is the opposite of intention to stay and as stated by Currivan (2000), intention to stay refers to the employees' tendency to stay or continue working in the current organization. Similarly, as stated by Mowday et al., 1982), this is the subjective judgement of an employee regarding his or her intention to leave the current organization in the near future. Intention can be explained by the Theory of Planned Behavior. As explained by Ajzen (1991) in the Theory of Planned Behavior, intentions to perform behaviors of different kinds can be predicted with high accuracy from attitudes toward the behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991). However, as stated by Ajzen (1991), not all intentions result is actual behavior or action. As such, not all employees' intention to leave an organization will be translated into actual quitting of jobs by employees.

The questions of what are the determinants of the employees' intention to leave organizations have been investigated by several researchers. There are also several reasons that cause an employee to quit an organization (Firth et al., 2004; Ramoo, Abdullah, and Piaw, 2013). According to Chan, et al. (2013), the factors that cause employees to leave are complex and encompasses both organizational and individual factors. Some of the reasons stated by Firth et al. (2004) encompass job satisfaction, work related stress, lack of supervisor support, locus of

control, and low self- esteem. Past research has identified job satisfaction as one of the key factor that affect employees' intention to leave (Ramoo, Abdullah and Piaw, 2012; Firth et al., 2004). Other factors such as perceived organizational support and organizational commitment have been found as positive predictors of intent to leave (Cho, Johanson and Guchait, 2009). MacIntosh and Doherty (2010) examined the impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave the organization. The study revealed that organizational culture that explained 50.3% of the variance with intention to leave the organization. Researchers have found that organizational culture is a positive predictor of organizational silence (Sholekhar and Shoghi, 2017). Researchers have observed higher levels of turnover rates with generation Y employees (Twenge, 2007). One of the reasons could be the generation Y employees psychological contract. The fragile employment contract can weaken their commitment level (Blomme, Van Rheede and Tromp, 2010). Naim and Lenka (2018) looked at competency development and pointed out that affective commitment of generation Y employees is related to competency development and this results in intention to stay. Therefore, there is a lack of consistency by researchers relating to the predictors of employees' intention to quit or stay due to different constructs studied and heterogeneity of the research target populations. The predictors of generation Y employees' intention to leave their current organization could also be different from other generations and organizational silence is one of the predictors of employees' intention to leave.

Organizational silence

There are several forces or factors that cause employees to remain silent or withhold information about issues or concerns (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). According to Morrrison and Milliken (2000), the withholding of information relating to problems or issues is referred to as organizational silence. Similarly, Pinder and Harlos (2001) defined organizational silence as an intentional avoidance or absence of voice that involves a number of employees behaviours or intentions that encompasses objection or endorsement. As explained by Morrison and Milliken (2000), employees are sometimes forced or compelled to remain silent regarding certain problems or concerns. Morrison (2014) further summarized that silence is failure to voice, and voice is a choice that is either deliberate or otherwise. Tangirala and Ramanujam (2008) defined organizational silence as an employees behaviour of not sharing and keeping to themselves. Van Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003) stated that intentionally hiding or concealing ideas, opinions and information intentionally can be construed as employee silence. Van Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003) further pointed out that silence is the absence of behaviour which makes it difficult to realize a concern or problem. They further pointed out that silence includes resignation, fear and cooperation. Pinder and Harlos (2001) introduced the term acquiescence which refers to the neglect of existing choice and reluctance to seek out for any. Van Dyne et al. (2003) further introduced defensive and pro-social silence. According to Van Dyne et al. (2003), the act of withholding information due to fear is referred to as defensive silence. Prosocial silence refers to the concealment of job related information with the intention of benefiting other employees or the organization (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Hence, organizational silence is generally referring to employees' choice to remain silent either intentionally or otherwise and organizational silence encompasses acquiescent silence, prosocial silence and defensive silence.

Several determinants of organizational silence have been identified by researchers. One of the determinants of organizational silence is the receiving negative feedback by managers (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). Another determinant of organizational silence pointed out by Morrison and Milliken (2000) is the belief by managers about their employees such as untrustworthiness of employees. Morrison and Milliken (2000) argued that mangers discourage communication because they believe that employees are self- interested and untrustworthy. A study by Fard and Karimi (2015) found an inverse relationship between organizational silence and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Morrison (2014) highlighted that the employee motivation to voice is a function of efficacy which is the employee's perception about the result or consequence of engaging in voice. It also includes the employee perception of the safety or risk, which is related to the consequences of engaging in voice for the employee himself or for the employees' relationships with others. Therefore, as pointed out by Morrison (2014), employees are likely to remain silent if their perception of efficacy and safety is low. Despite the research findings on the dire consequences of organizational silence, it will be difficult to implement changes in organizations towards an organizational climate that encourages communication (Morrison ad Milliken, 2000).

Acquiescent Silence and intention to leave

Acquiescence was proposed by Pinder and Harlos (2001). They suggested two categories of silence namely quiescence silence and acquiescent silence. These two categories have eight dimensions namely voluntariness, consciousness, acceptance, stress level, awareness of alternatives, propensity to voice, propensity to exit and dominant emotions (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). Acquiescence refers to disregarding choice and unwillingness pursue or seek out for any (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). Unlike quiescence employees who share concerns to make a difference in the environment, acquiescent employees prefer not to make any difference in the environment (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). Van Dyne et al. (2003) added that acquiescent silent employees conceal or abstain from sharing information due to their lower level of self-efficacy and disconnection from organizational issues. According to Morrison (2014), acquiescence is a deep form of silence. As explained by Morrison (2014), an acquiescent employee feels ineffective or powerless and have lost any hope of improvement.

Past researchers and scholars have stated that the acquiescent silence behaviour by employees can be dysfunctional and affect organization commitment, job satisfaction and subsequently their intention to leave (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Vakola and Bouradas, 2005). Since acquiescent employees are not engaged in organizational issues, their commitment level to organizations can be low. A study by Laeeque and Bakhtawari (2014) showed that acquiescent silence had a negative and significant impact on organizational commitment. One of the predictors of acquiescent silence is trust and a study by Dedahanov, and Rhee (2015) showed that trust in organizations was inversely related to acquiescent silence. Similarly, a study by Wang and Hsieh (2014) revealed that acquiescent silence by employees was negatively related to their job satisfaction and past studies have shown a positive relationship between job satisfaction and retention of employees. The acquiescent silence by employees concerning issues or problems can result in feelings of not being valued. Such feelings can result in job dissatisfaction and subsequently intention to leave (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). However, some researchers have stated that acquiescent silence by employees can be passive and difficult to detect (Wang and Hsieh, 2014; Morrison

and Milliken, 2002). Therefore, there can be lower unwelcome consequences of acquiescent silence by employees. Based on the above literature concerning acquiescent silence, we propose:

Hypothesis 1. Acquiescent silence exerts a positive influence on intention to leave by generation y employees.

Defensive silence and intention to leave

Employees sometimes don't share information due to doubt, fear or self-protection. This category of organizations silence is referred to as defensive silence (Van Dyne, Ang and Botero, 2003). Van Dyne et al. (2003) explained that employees do not raise organizational issues or conceal the information for fear of being punished, terminated from their jobs or being classified as trouble makers. In short, defensive silence refers to fear of expressing ideas (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Similarly, Schlenker and Weigold (1989) stated that defensive silence refers to an employee's conscious or proactive behaviour to defend himself against any threats. Zheng (2008) stated that defensive silence refers to an interpersonal barrier when employees avoid expressing their opinions without any fear or threat. Wynen et al. (2019) added that due to fear of adverse consequences, employees in organizations are reluctant or hesitant to voice their opinions or speak up. Organizational trust is one of the factors that influences an employee to remain silent and researchers have found that trust is positively related to risk-taking behavior (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001). Therefore, based on literature review, defensive silence generally refers to employee behavior related expressing or disclosing information or opinion due to fear or other external threats.

Defensive silence is likely to result in lower levels of organizational trust (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001) and employees who feel fearful or have a feeling of being threatened are likely to have lower level of organizational commitment (Wong, 2005). A study by Acaray and Akturan (2015) revealed that defensive silence had an inverse relationship with organizational citizenship behavior of employees. Deniz, Noyan and Ertosun (2013) also found an inverse relationship between defensive silence of employees and organizational commitment. Past research has shown the organizational commitment and job satisfaction are negatively related to intention to leave and turnover intention (e.g.; Tarigan and Ariani, 2015). Results of a study by Lim and Sohn (2016) revealed that there was a positive relationship between relationship conflict and defensive silence. In addition, defensive silence fully mediated the relationship between relationship conflict and turnover intention. Based on the above literature concerning defensive silence, we propose:

Hypothesis 2. Defensive silence exerts a positive influence on intention to leave by generation y employees.

Pro social silence and intention to leave

Initially, organizational silence was categorized as either acquiescent or quiescent silence (Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Pinder and Harlos, 2001). Van Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003) later included pro-social silence. According to Van Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003), prosocial silence is others oriented and proactive. Pro-social silence was based on Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) literature and relates to retaining ideas, information or opinions. The objective for retaining such ideas or information by employees is for the benefit of other employees in the organization (Van Dyne et al., 2003). In addition, pro-social silence is behaviour of

employees based on the motive of cooperation that is intentional and focussed on others (Korsgaard et al., 1997). Furthermore, pro-social silence by employees is discretionary behaviour that is motivated by concern for others (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Pro-social silence refers to absence of complaints by employees and their resilience towards inconveniences (Organ, 1998). Therefore, pro-social silence is done deliberately due to concern for other employees or the organization. However, as pointed out by Umphress and Bingham (2011), employees who show a strong concern for others or the organization may execute behaviours that violate laws or core societal values such as failing to report another employee's negative behaviour at work.

Knoll and Van Dick (2012) stated that all dimensions of organizational silence have consequences for employees' experience and turnover intention. As argued by Knoll and Van Dick (2012), there can be contradictory outcomes of pro-social silence by employees. Organization employees may deliberately choose to remain silent due to concern for others or to protect relationships with other employees. This may result in an increase in the employees well-being and satisfaction (Knoll and Van Dick, 2012). A study by Knoll, Hall, and Weigelt (2018) showed that prosocial silence by employees did not reveal any significant and positive effect on burnout. Another study by Deniz, Noyan and Ertosun (2013) also did not find a significant relationship between prosocial silence and commitment. Past studies have found an inverse relationship between organizational commitment intention to leave (e.g.; Tarigan and Ariani, 2015). However, researchers have argued that remaining silent on another employee's wrongdoing may affect the employee emotionally and result in negative emotions such as shame (Edwards et al. 2009). Based on the above literature concerning defensive silence, we propose:

Hypothesis 3. Prosocial silence is related to intention to leave by generation y employees.

III. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Design

The research is an explanatory research that was done to fulfil the objectives and answer the questions (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). This study used a quantitative method to collect primary data. The target population were generation Y employees in Jakarta and convenience sampling was used to collect the data. A survey method was used and self-administered questionnaires were distributed directly to the qualified participants. The research selected the cross sectional time horizon. Data collected was edited, coded and transformed. The analysis was done to get a feel of data, test goodness of data and test the hypothesis of this study.

Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The next step was the identification of the target population. In this study the target population was generation Y employees in the private sector in Jakarta. The target population were qualified to answer the measurement questions of this study (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). The researcher used convenience sampling method because a listing of generation Y employees in Jakarta was not readily available and the sampling frame could not be constructed. The calculation of the sample size was based on the formula by Tabachnik and Fidell (2001). Based on the formula, the sample size required for a multiple regression analysis is $N \geq 50 + 8m$ ('m' is the number of

variables). The sample size proposed by Hair et al. (2010) is 15 to 20 respondents for each construct and the minimum sample size should be 100. For this study the target sample size was 100 participants.

Instrumentation

In this research, primary data was collected by the researcher through questionnaires. The questionnaire for this research had two sections. Section A was the respondents' demographics namely gender, age group, marital status, educational level and length of employment. Section B consisted of the measurement questions on the dependant variable and independent variables. A five point Likert Type scale was used to measure each indicator. The questions to measure the constructs were adopted or adapted from past studies. For the independent variables namely acquiescent silence, defensive silence and pro-social silence, the questions were adopted from the set of questions developed by Van Dyne, Ang and Botero (2003). Questions on the intention to leave construct were adapted based on study by Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978).

Data Collection and editing.

This study was carried out in Jakarta, Indonesia. The gathering of primary data was through a survey that covered generation Y employees. Questionnaires were distributed through the direct distribute and collect method. A qualifying question was included to ensure the participant is qualified. After two months, a total of 163 questionnaires were received. Data editing was done to check omissions, missing values and ensure consistency across respondents. The objective of editing was to reduce errors in data recording, improve legibility, and clarify unclear and inappropriate responses (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). Four questionnaires were removed due to omissions and outliers. Edited data was coded and tabulated into SPSS and later data transformation was done to obtain summated scores of the indicators for each construct.

Data Analyses

The researchers generated both descriptive and inferential statistics using the SPSS version 20 statistical tool. Data analysis involved description of the respondents and checking for normality and reliability of data. Inferential statistics were generated to test the hypothesis. The descriptive statics described the respondents profile. Multivariate analysis tested the relationship that were hypothesized for this study.

IV. RESULTS

Demographic profiles of the respondents

There were 158 participants and based on frequency distribution, there are 62 male respondents (39.2%) and 96 female respondents (60.8%) in this sample. Therefore, based on gender, majority of respondents who participated in this study were females. In the age range of between 23 to 28 years' old, there were 80 participants (50.6%) and in the age range between 29 to 35 years' old there were 47 participants (29.7%). In the age range between 36 to 40 years old, there were 31 participants (19.6%). Therefore, the majority of respondents who participated in this study were in the age range of 23 to 28 years old. Based on marital status, there were 89 single respondents (56.3%) and 69 married respondents (43.7%). Based on the level of education, 34 participants were with diploma or lower

qualification and 119 participants were degree holders. Only 5 respondents had postgraduate qualification. Therefore, majority of respondents who participated in this study were degree holders.

Descriptive Statistics

The measures of central tendency in this study included the mean and measures of variability include the standard deviation and the minimum and maximum values. The mean for the all the variables in this study is and dependent variable is between 2.14 and 2.**60. The standard deviation is also low and acceptable.**

Table1: Descriptive statistics

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Intention to leave	1.00	5.00	2.6092	1.02882
acquiescence	1.00	3.86	2.1438	.65960
Prosocial	1.00	4.60	2.2873	.90249
Defensive	1.00	5.00	2.4696	.85240

Reliability

For reliability of data which looked at the consistency of the responses, the Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each construct using the SPSS statistical tool. This study used Likert questions and to determine whether the scale is reliable, Cronbach's alpha is the most common measure of internal consistency. As shown in Table 2, the Cronbach alpha values for the dependent variable and the three independent variables was 0.859, 832, 914 and 864 respectively. Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) stated that the Cronbach alpha value should be above 0.6. Therefore, the data for this study met the criteria of consistency and reliability of data was not violated.

Table 2: Reliability Cronbach alpha scores

Variables	Cronbach Alpha value
Intention to Leave	.859
Acquiescent silence	.832
Prosocial silence	.914
Defensive silence	.864

Table 3: Normality Test and Multicollinearity

	Skewness		Kurtosis		Multicollinearity	
	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	Tolerance	VIF
Intention to leave	.318	.193	-.495	.384		
Acquiescent	.205	.193	-.497	.384	.578	1.730
Prosocial	.469	.193	-.373	.384	.653	1.531
Defensive	.145	.193	-.103	.384	.718	1.393

Using the SPSS tool, the values for skewness and kurtosis were generated. Skewness refers to measure of the data set symmetry (Pallant, 2010) The skewness shown in Table 3 is positive and this means that the right-hand tail of data distribution will be longer than the left-hand tail. Kurtosis refers to the degree of peakedness of data distribution (Pallant, 2010). In this study, negative kurtosis indicates light tails and flatness of distribution. However, as pointed out by Westfall (2015), kurtosis indicates very little about the peak or center of a distribution. Thus, kurtosis should never be defined in terms of peakedness. The acceptable range of absolute value of skewness and kurtosis is ± 2 (Garson, 2012). In this study, the values of skewness and kurtosis fall within the specified range. A such, the data was normally distributed. To test the model, the research also included collinearity diagnostics and the Durbin-Watson test for auto-correlation. The Durbin-Watson value was 2.172 and this is between the values of between the range of 1.5 to 2.5. Therefore, in this data, there is no first order linear auto-correlation (Chinna, Karunthan and Yuen, 2013). Field (2009) also stated that Durbin Watson values in the range of 1.5 to 2.5 are relatively normal. Multicollinearity that refers to the degree e to which the independent variables have higher than zero correlations were checked (Thompson, 2006). In this study, multicollinearity was checked with the help or tolerance and VIF values. The value for tolerance indicates the percent of variance in the predictor that cannot be accounted for by the other predictors. The value for tolerance is .366 and this is above the cut-off point of 0.10. According to Myers (1990), the suggested tolerance value should be below 0.10. The variance inflation factor (VIF) is 2.7 and this is lower the cutoff point of 10. Scholars have stated that a VIF<10 is acceptable (Hair et al., 2010). Therefore, the issue of multicollinearity where the independent variables are highly correlated does not exist in this study.

Model fit

As shown in Table 4, the R value of .549 shows a moderate level of correlation between the independent and dependent variables. As stated by Field (2009), the R2 is a good gauge of the size of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variables in this study. The coefficient of determination (R square) value of .301 means that around 30 percent of the variance in the intention to leave (dependent variable) is explained by the three dimensions of organizational silence. The F-test is in this study is also significant and awe can assume that this model explains a significant amount of the variance in intention to leave (Field, 2009).

Table 4 Overall Model Fit

Multiple R	.549
Coefficient of Determination (R square)	.301
Adjusted R square	.286
Standard Error of estimate	.928
Durbin Watson	2.172
F Change	12.930
Sig F Change	.000

Table 5 Regression values

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.959	.277		3.464	.001
	Acquiescent	.364	.148	.233	2.464	.015
	Prosocial	.058	.102	.051	.574	.567
	Defensive	.298	.103	.247	2.904	.004

Multiple Regression

The values of the regression coefficient 'B' represent the change in the outcome resulting from a unit change in the predictor (Field, 2009). Based on the multiple regression analysis, only acquiescent silence and defensive silence were significant predictors of intention to leave. Prosocial silence did not have a significant relationship with intention to leave. In addition, defensive silence had a slightly higher impact that acquiescent silence by comparing the standardized coefficients (beta = .247 versus beta = .233). Based on the results, hypothesis H1 and H2 were supported. However, hypothesis H3 was rejected.

V.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this research showed that acquiescent silence and defensive silence had a positive and significant relationship with generation Y intention to leave. The regression analysis further showed that acquiescent silence had a slightly higher impact on intention to leave compared to defensive silence. The results are consistent with past studies. Past studies have shown a negative relationship between acquiescent silence and job satisfaction (Wang and Hsieh, 2014). Job dissatisfaction can result in intention to leave (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). This is similar to the explanation given by (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). As stated by Pinder and Harlos (2001), employees who practice acquiescent silence are less likely and will not readily or willingly change compared to their colleagues who practice quiescent silence. This is attributed to their low level of awareness of their silence and they have given up hope for amelioration. The behavior of employees with acquiescent silence may be purposeful and uninvolved. These employees believe that it is pointless to speak up their ideas or concerns (Van Dyne et al., 2003). These employees believe that opinion or ideas may not be valued by management or supervisors of their organizations (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). They may also feel that they do not have the capability to change a particular situation. One of the reasons for quitting their jobs from the current organization may a due to their low efficacy (Van Dyne et al., 2003). Therefore, acquiescent silence is intentional and organizations need to provide a climate where employees can voice their opinions or ideas and the employees feel that their ideas and opinions are valued.

It was hypothesized that prosocial silence would be positively related to intention to leave by generation Y employees. The results of this study revealed that prosocial silence had a small and insignificant relationship with intention to leave. Prosocial silence by employees can result in stress and burnout and this may subsequently affect

their intention to leave (Knoll, Hall, and Weigelt, 2018). As stated by van Dyne et al., (2003), employees may remain silent or withhold information to protect relationship or for the benefit of their organization or colleagues. Employees may remain silent whereby they tolerate inconveniences or difficulties and refrain from lodging and complaints or grievances. However, such acts can be deemed as unethical behavior whereby it may result in harm for other people such as customers and clients. Therefore, as explained by Umphress and Bingham (2011), prosocial silence behaviors by employees may violate societal values or laws. One example is the employees' failure to provide certain important information concerning the flaws in a product to customers or clients. Hence, the employees may have a strong relationship with other people or attachment to the organization, their behavior may cause harm to the organization or other entities.

In this study, it was hypothesized that defensive silence is positively related to intention to leave. The results based on regression analysis revealed that defensive silence had a positive and significant relationship with intention to leave. The results are also consistent with other past studies. Past studies have revealed that defensive silence by employees is related to organizational commitment (Deniz, Noyan and Ertosun, 2013). Past research have shown that lower levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction are negatively related to intention to leave (e.g.; Tarigan and Ariani, 2015). An employee may deliberately remain silent due to fear of the consequences that may arise if the speak up or voice their opinions (Pinder and Harlos, 2001). In other words, an employee may remain silent and withhold ideas, information, or opinions due to fear. The employee is more aware of the alternatives and the decision to remain silent is made consciously (Van Dyne et al., 2003).

Several practical implications were identified in this study. Acquiescent silence was identified as the most important predictor of generation Y employees' intention to leave an organization. Defensive silence was also identified as a cause of intention to leave among generation Y employees. Therefore, human resource managers and leaders in organizations should place greater emphasis on acquiescent silence and its consequences on employees and the organization. The direct and indirect cost of employees' turnover is high. Human resource managers and leaders should develop and implement policies and procedures to create a work environment where the employees can speak up and voice their opinions and ideas without fear. In the work environment, the organization support and supervisor support are also important to encourage employees to speak up. The behavior of leaders and supervisors should encourage and support employees to make them more confident to speak up and voice their ideas and opinions. Human resource managers, supervisors and leaders should engage in behaviors that show interest and value in the opinions and ideas from the employees. In addition, they should develop and engage in behaviors that create a safe environment for employees to speak up.

This study also made several theoretical contributions. Organizational silence is a relatively new concept and there is still ongoing research on this concept. From the theoretical perspective, this study revealed some new insights such as the significant role of acquiescent silence and defensive silence towards intention to leave by generation Y employees. This study contributed to the existing literature on organizational silence by providing a deeper understanding of relationship between the dimensions of organizational silence namely acquiescent silence, defensive silence and prosocial silence toward employees' intention to quit an organization. This study also

discovered that acquiescent silence was the main predictor of intention to leave.   The findings of this study further added new knowledge and contributed to the existing knowledge on effect of acquiescent silence and defensive silence towards intention to leave.

Several limitations were noted in this study. The limitations of this study paved the way for future recommendations. Firstly, this study was confined to generation Y employees engaged in the private sector in Jakarta. Employees from other sectors and districts may be affected differently and each sector or district may have a distinct culture that may differ from the other sectors or districts. Therefore, it is recommended that the respondents be taken from other sectors or districts in future studies. Secondly, the consequence of organization silence was limited to intention to leave. It is recommended that future studies include additional dependent variables that include employee commitment, employee engagement and organization citizenship behavior. In addition, moderators and mediators can be included to give a better understanding of the relationship between organizational silence and intention to leave. Mediators such as perceived organizational support can provide better understanding. Moderators such as gender can also be included to find out the effect of the moderators on the strength of relationship between organizational silence and intention to leave. Another limitation of this study was the that this study only covered defensive, prosocial and acquiescent silence. There may be other new dimensions such as opportunistic silence. Therefore, future studies can be broadened to include new dimensions of organizational silence. In this quantitative study, closed ended questions were used. There was no face to face contact with the respondents and no probing or open ended questions were asked. In future, it is recommended that a qualitative study based on phenomenology approach be carried out. A phenomenology study refers to the lived experience of the respondents. An in-depth study of respondents who were actually engaged in organizational silence will provide richer and more in-depth information relating to organizational silence. The lived experience of respondents through a phenomenological study will set aside biases and preconceived assumptions about human experiences

REFERENCES

1. Acaray, A. and Akturan, A., 2015. The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational silence. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 207, pp.472-482.
2. Allen, D.G., Shore, L.M. and Griffeth, R.W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. Journal of Management, Vol. 29, pp. 99- 118.
3. Anderson, S.E., Coffey, B.S. and Byerly, R.T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and formal workplace practices: links to work- family conflict and job- related outcomes. Journal of Management, Vol. 28, pp. 787- 810.
4. Badan Pusat Statistik (2018). Statistik gender tematik: Profil generasi milenial Indonesia (Online) Available at https://www.kemenpppa.go.id/lib/uploads/list/9acde-buku-profil-generasi-milenia.pdf (Assessed August 1, 2019)
5. Bersin, J. (2019). Becoming irresistible: A new model for employee engagement. Deloitte Review Issue 16 (Online). Available at https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/deloitte-review/issue-16/employee-engagement-strategies.html (Assessed August 2, 2019).
6. Blomme, R.J., Van Rheede, A., and Tromp, D.M. (2009). The hospitality industry: an attractive employer? An exploration of students' and industry workers' perceptions of hospitality as a career field. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 21(2), 6-17
7. Chinna, K., Karuthan, K. and Yuen, C. W. (2013). Statistical Analysis using SPSS, Pearson, Kuala Lumpur.

8.   Chan, Z.C., Tam, W.S., Lung, M.K., Wong, W.Y. and Chau, C.W. (2013). A systematic literature review of nurse shortage and the intention to leave. Journal of nursing management, 21(4), pp.605-613.

9.   Cho, S., Johanson, M.M. and Guchait, P. (2009). Employees intent to leave: A comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28(3), pp.374-381.

10.   Cooper, D.R. and P.S. Schindler (2014). Marketing research. Boston, MA: McGrawHill Irwin.

11.   Deniz, N., Noyan, A. and Ertosun, O. (2013). The relationship between employee silence and organizational commitment in a private healthcare company. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 99, pp. 691 – 700.

12.   Dedahanov, A. T., and Rhee, J. (2015). Examining the relationships among trust, silence and organizational commitment. Management Decision, 53(8), 1843–1857.

13.   Dirks, K., T. and Ferrin, D., L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings", Organization Science,12, pp. 450–467.

14.   Edwards, M. S., Ashkanasy, N. M., & Gardner, J. (2009). Deciding to speak up or to remain silent following observed wrongdoing: The role of discrete emotions and climate of silence. In J. Greenberg & M. Edwards (Eds.), Employee voice and silence in organizations (pp. 83–109). Bingley: Emerald Press

15.   Fard, P.G., Karimi, F., 2015. The Relationship between Organizational Trust and Organizational Silence with Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of the Employees of University. International Education Studies 8, 219.

16.   Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage.

17.   Firth, L., Mellor, D.J., Moore, K.A. and Loquet, C. (2004). How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?. Journal of managerial psychology, 19(2), pp.170-187.

18.   Gorbiano, M. I. (2019) Manufacturing sector to drive Indonesia's economy: Bappenas. The Jakarta Post February 11, 2019 (Online) Available at https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2019/02/11/manufacturing- (Assessed July 8, 2019)

19.   Hair, J.F., B. Black, B. Babin and R.E. Anderson (2010). Multivariate data analysis. Upper Saddle River,NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

20.   Indonesia Investments (2019). Economy of Indonesia. (Online). Available at   https://www.indonesia-investments.com/culture/economy/item177 (Assessed August 2, 2019).

21.   Knoll, M., Hall, R. J. nd Weigelt, O. (2018). A Longitudinal Study of the Relationships Between Four Differentially Motivated Forms of Employee Silence and Burnout. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. American Psychological Association Inc.

22.   Garson, G. D. (2012). Testing statistical assumptions. Asheboro, NC: Statistical Associates Publishing.

23.   Ghosh, P., Satyawadi, R., Shadman, M. (2013). Who stays with you? Factors predicting employees' intention to stay. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 21, 288–312. doi:10.1108/IJOA-Sep-2011-0511

24.   Heather, A.E. (2003). Building a workplace of choice: using the work environment to attract and retain top talent, Journal of Facilities Management, 2(3), pp. 244- 257.

25.   Johnson, J., Johnson, J., Griffeth, R.W. and Griffin, M. (2000). Factors discrimination functional and dysfunctional sales force turnover", Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 15(6), pp. 399-415.

26.   Kumar, D., Alagappar, P. N., and Govindarajo, N. (2015). The Impact of Organizational Silence on Job Stress, Organisational Commitment and Intention to Leave Among Expatriate Employees. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Science, 9(29), 1-2.

27.   Knoll, M., & van Dick, R. (2012). Do I Hear the Whistle…? A First Attempt to Measure Four Forms of Employee Silence and Their Correlates. Journal of Business Ethics, 113(2), 349–362.

28.   Knoll, M., Hall, R.J. and Weigelt, O. (2018). A longitudinal study of the relationships between four differentially motivated forms of employee silence and burnout. Journal of occupational health psychology.

29.   Korsgaard, M. A., Meglino, B. M. and Lester, S. W. (1997). Beyond helping: do other-oriented values have broader implications in organizations? Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 160–77

30.   Lee, T. and Mowday, R. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: an empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 30(4), pp. 721- 743.

31.   Laeeque, S.H. and Bakhtawari, N.Z. (2014). Employee silence as a determinant of organizational commitment: Evidence from the higher education sector of Pakistan. European Journal of Business and Management, 6(20), pp.46-51.

32.   Lim, J. I., & Sohn, Y. W. (2016). The Influence of the Military Junior Leader's Relationship Conflict on Turnover Intention - The Moderated Mediating Effect of Defensive Silence and Calling. Journal of Human Resource Management Research, 23(1), 303–321.

33.   Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., and Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 408-414

34. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M. (1982). Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
35. MacIntosh, E.W., Doherty, A. (2010). The influence of organizational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave. Sport Management Review, 13, 106–117.
36. Morrison, E.W., Milliken, F.J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. Academy of Management Review, 25, 706–725.
37. Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), pp. 173-197.
38. Mayers, R. H. (1990). Classical and Modern Regression with Applications, PWS10 Kent Publishing Company, 1990.
39. Naim, M.F. and Lenka, U., 2018. Development and retention of Generation Y employees: a conceptual framework. Employee relations, 40(2), pp.433-455.
40. Nunnally, J.C. and I.H. Bernstein (1994). Psychometric theory. 3rd Edn., Sydney: McGraw Hill.
41. O'Connell, M. and Kung, M.C., 2007. The Cost of Employee Turnover. Industrial Management, 49(1).
42. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
43. Pinder, C. C., and Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee Silence: Quiescence and Acquiescence As Responses to Perceived Injustice. Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 20, 349.
44. Phillips, J.J. and Connell, A.O. (2004). Managing employee retention. Routledge.
45. Pallant, J. (2010). Spss survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using spss for windows. Berkshire: Open University Press.
46. PWC, (2011). Millennials at work Reshaping the workplace (Online). Available from https://www.pwc.com/co/es/publicaciones/assets/millennials-at-work.pdf (Assessed 12 April, 2019).
47. Ramoo, V., Abdullah, K.L. and Piaw, C.Y. (2013). The relationship between job satisfaction and intention to leave current employment among registered nurses in a teaching hospital. Journal of Clinical Nursing, 22(21-22), pp.3141-3152.
48. Schlenker, B. R. and Weigold, M. F. (1989). 'Self-identification and accountability'. In Giacalone, R. A. and Rosenfeld, P. (Eds), Impression Management in the Organization. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 21–43.
49. Schwartz, J., Pelster, B., Kwan, A., Neveras, N., Erickson, R. and Szpaichler, S. (2019). Talent 2020: Surveying the Talent Paradox from the Employee Perspective. (Online) Available at https://www2.deloitte.com/insights/us/en/topics/talent/talent-2020 (Assesed August 2, 2019)
50. Sholekar, S. and Shoghi, B., 2017. The Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Silence and Voice of Faculty Members of Islamic Azad University in Tehran. Iranian Journal of Management Studies, 10(1), pp.113-142.
51. Tarigan, V. and Ariani, D.W. (2015). Empirical study relations job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention. Advances in Management and Applied Economics, 5(2), p.21.
52. Tabachnick, B.G. and L.S. Fidell, 2013. Using multivariate statistics. Boston: Pearson.
53. Tangirala, s. and Ramanujam P. (2008). Employee Silence on Critical Issues: The Cross Level Effects Procedural Justice Climate. Personnel Psychology, 61, 37-68
54. Thompson, B. (2006). Foundations of Behavioral Statistics: An InsightBased Approach. New York: Guilford Press.
55. Twenge, J.M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. Journal of Business Psychology, 25, 201-210.
56. The World bank (2019). Indonesia Maintains Steady Economic Growth in 2019. July 1 (online). Available at https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/07/01/indonesia-maintains-steady-economic-growth-in-2019 (Assessed August 1, 2019)
57. Umphress, E. E., & Bingham, J. B. (2011). When employees do bad things for good reasons: Examining unethical pro-organizational behaviors. Organization Science, 26, 621–640.
58. Van Dyne, V.L., Ang, S. and Botero, I. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. Journal of Management Studies, 40, pp. 1360-1392.
59. Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organizational silence: An empirical investigation. Employee Relations, 27, 441–458
60. Wang, Y.-D., and Hsieh, H.-H. (2014). Employees' reactions to psychological contract breach: A moderated mediation analysis. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85(1), 57–66.
61. Westfall, P.H. (2014). Kurtosis as peakedness, 1905–2014. RIP. The American Statistician, 68(3), pp.191-195.

62.   Wong, K.E. (2005). The role of risk in making decisions under escalation situations. Applied Psychology: An international Review, 54, pp.584–607.

63.   Wynen, J., Kleizen, B., Verhoest, K., Lægreid, P., & Rolland, V. (2019). Just keep silent… Defensive silence as a reaction to successive structural reforms. Public Management Review, 1–29.

64.   Yoshimura, K.E. (2003). Employee Traits, Perceived Organizational Support, Supervisory Communication, Affective Commitment and Intent to Leave: Group Differences. Unpublished Master's Thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh NC.

65.   Zheng, X. T. (2008). Survey on Employee Silence and the Impact of Trust on it in China. Acta Psychologica Sinica, 40(2), 219–227.