# Organizational trust and organizational silence: the factors Predicting organizational commitment.

**Helmiati [1] \*, Muhammad Rasyid Abdillah [2], Rizqa Anita [3], Leny Nofianti [3], Nor Balkish Zakaria [4]**

[1] *Faculty of Tarbiya and Teaching Science, Universities Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*
[2] *Faculty of Economics, Universities Lancang Kuning, Indonesia*
[3] *Faculty of Economics and Social Science, Universities Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*
[4] *Accounting Research Institute, University Technology MARA, Malaysia*
*\*Corresponding author E-mail:*

## Abstract

This study examines the impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction among academics in Indonesia. A total of 309 respondents from private sector higher education institutions participated in this research. The result from partial least square-structural equation modeling analysis reveal that organizational trust has a negative effect on organizational silence, and organizational silence has a negative effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In other words, individuals with low trust tend to do silence at the organization, not satisfied with the job and low commitment. In addition, the result also suggests the effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment is indirectly influenced by organizational silence and job satisfaction.

*Keywords*: *Organizational Trust; Organizational Silence; Job Satisfaction; Organizational Commitment.*

## 1. Introduction

There has been an increase in the study of organization silence among organizational researchers since this concept was introduced by Morrison & Milliken in 2000. Morrison & Milliken (2000) further see the silence condition of an organization as a critical barrier to organizational change and development. Vakola & Bouradas (2005) further explore consequences of organizational silence. They found that climate of silence is a cause of reducing job satisfaction and organizational commitment. And, this is a reason why change and development management program fail at an organization.

Organizational silence is the organization level phenomenon where "employees withhold ideas, information, and opinion about work-related improvement" (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne et al., 2003; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Organizational silence is the organization level phenomenon where "employees withhold ideas, information, and opinion about work-related improvement" (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Van Dyne et al., 2003). The condition of employees which not cares about the organization leads to individuals have negative feelings toward their job (Nikolaou et al., 2011; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). This condition also causes individuals have the low commitment toward the organization (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015). Meanwhile, one of the causal factors of condition of silence is the lack of trust from individuals toward their organization (Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011). The lack of trust about competence, reliability, and benevolence of their organization become deciding factors why individuals do not trust their organization (Ellonen et al., 2008; Dedahanov et al., 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011).

The researcher who comprehensive explore antecedents and consequences of organizational silence have still rare (Dedahanov et al., 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Although there is study has explored antecedents (i.e. organizational trust) and consequences (i.e. organizational commitment) of organizational silence (Dedahanov et al., 2015). However, this study only discusses organizational silence in term of the individual level. Whereas, scholars have differentiated phenomenon of silence into two levels (organizational and individual level phenomenon). And still the lack of studies on the organizational level phenomenon. For these reasons, we need to investigate the antecedents and consequences of organizational silence in the context of organizational level phenomenon.

Considering that the lack of empirical study which comprehensively explores antecedent and consequences of organizational silence in the context of the organizational level phenomenon, and in response to the scholarly calls for more studies, the current study explores the comprehensive antecedent and consequences of organizational silence. Antecedent chosen in this study is organizational trust and consequences chosen are job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The aim of the current study is to explore the impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction among academics in Indonesia. The first step in this paper would discuss the literature review and hypothesis development of the study, while the second step presents the research method including data collection, measurement information and PLS analysis. In the third step, empirical results are presented. The final step in this paper concludes with a discussion and limitations of this study.

# 2. Literature review

## 2.1. Organizational trust and organizational commitment

Organizational trust refers to "the positive expectations individuals have about the competence, reliability and benevolence of organizational members, as well as the institutional trust within the organization" (Ellonen et al., 2008). Definition of organizational trust particularly touches on the expectation or belief that organization (colleague, leader, and institution) will act predictably and not be entirely in their own interests (Chen et al., 2015). Research on trust has identified both the interpersonal and impersonal types of organizational trust (Ellonen et al., 2008). The interpersonal trust could be divided into two dimensions. First, lateral trust refers to "trusting" relationship with co-workers. While second, vertical trust concern to "trusting" relationship between employees and leaders (Costigan et al., 1998; Ellonen et al., 2008; Nikolaou et al., 2011). The other type of organizational trust is the institutional trust which could be characterized as "the trust of its members in the organization's vision and strategy, its technological and commercial competence, its fair processes and structures, as well as its human resources policies" (Ellonen et al., 2008; Nikolaou et al., 2011).

Organizational trust gives a positive emotional exchange between an organization and its employees (Chen et al., 2015). Thus, the scholar's always associate organizational trust with organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2015; Martins et al, 2017; Ng, 2015; Vanhala et al., 2016, Romle et. al., 2015). Organizational commitment refers to "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday et al., 1979). Individual's commitment to the organization focused on "a bond linking individuals to the organization" (Chang et al., 2015). The commitment could be characterized by at least three related factors (Porter et al., 1974; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005): (1) a strong belief and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organizational (Anugerah et al., 2016a; Anugerah et al., 2016b; Abdillah et al., 2016b).

Individual's commitment toward their organization is built thru a reasoning mutual trust between organization and individuals (Martins et al., 2017). The trust shared between the parties entered into the relationship tend to build a strong employees commitment within an organization. Previous studies reveal that organizational trust has a positive effect on organizational commitment (Chen et al., 2015; Fard & Karimi, 2015; Martins et al, 2017; Vanhala et al., 2016). This explains that individuals with strong organizational commitment caused of individuals trust in their organization. Conversely, individual which do not trust in organization and management tend to have a low commitment toward the organization (Tlaiss & Elamin, 2015). Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

H₁: Organizational trust directly has a positive effect on organizational commitment.

## 2.2. Organizational silence and organizational commitment

Organizational silence refers to "the collective-level phenomenon where employees to withhold their opinion and concern about organizational problems" (Morrison & Milliken, 2000). This condition in an organization could "the major obstacles to change programs" (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005) because employees would "withhold express ideas, information, and opinions about work-related improvements" (Van Deyne et al., 2003). And this is also one of the reasons why change management program fails (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Researchers have distinguished the phenomenon of silence into two levels. Firstly, the organizational level phenomenon which "focuses on organizational silence as a re-

sponse to fear and culture of silence" and used the term "organizational silence" (Morrison & Milliken, 2000; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Secondly, the individual level phenomenon which focusing more on employee level of silence and used the term "employee silence" (Pinder & Harlos, 2001; Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015). "Silence" of this study follows the term "organizational silence" that is perceived to be the organizational level phenomenon. The current research uses the individual as a unit of analysis and tries to measure climate of silence dimensions as they are perceived by individuals (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005).

Organizational silence leads to feelings employees of not being valued, perceived lack of control and cognitive dissonance which produced negative feels toward organization such as low organizational commitment (Morisson & Milliken, 2000; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Previous studies revealed that organizational silence has a negative effect on organizational commitment (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015; Fard & Karimi, 2015). This suggests that organization which has the condition wherein their employees withhold their opinion and concern about organizational problems tend to have the low commitment toward the organization. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

H₂: Organizational silence has a negative effect on organizational commitment.

## 2.3. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment

Generally, Job satisfaction is "a positive feeling towards one's job" (Srivastava, 2013). Job satisfaction in a narrow context refers to "the feelings or a general attitude of the employees in relation to their jobs and the job components such as the working environment, working conditions, training, reward, and opportunities for promotion" (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Gunlu et al., 2010). Numerous studies tried to explain the concept and relate job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gunlu et al., 2010; Jernigan et al., 2002; Mowday et al., 1979; Mowday et al., 1982; Porter et al., 1974; Srivastava, 2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are considered as an employee attitude toward the organization (Gunlu et al., 2010). However, job satisfaction and commitment might be seen in several ways (Mowday et al., 1982). Job satisfaction refers to "a kind of response to a specific job or job-related issues", whereas, commitment refers to "a more global response to an organization" (Gunlu et al., 2010; Mowday et al., 1982). Therefore, commitment more consistent than job satisfaction over time and takes longer after one is satisfied with his/her job (Gunlu et al., 2010).

Some of the scholars have debated the issue whether job satisfaction is the predictor of organizational commitment or vice versa (Srivastava, 2013). However, most of the empirical research has revealed job satisfaction as predictors of organizational commitment (Gaertner, 1999; Gunlu et al., 2010; Jernigan et al., 2002; Srivastava, 2013). Previous studies showed that job satisfaction has a positive effect on organizational commitment (Gunlu et al., 2010; Srivastava, 2013). This suggests that individuals with the high job satisfaction cause individual are commitment toward the organization. Conversely, the employees which have low job satisfaction tend to not committed toward the organization. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

H₃: Job satisfaction has a positive effect on organizational commitment.

## 2.4. Indirect effect toward organizational commitment

Mayer et al's (1995) have explained the characteristics of trustor and trustee at an organization. Trustee's characteristics are competence, reliability, and benevolence (Ellonen et al., 2008; Dedahanov et al., 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011). Individuals would assess competence, reliability, and benevolence of their organization (leader, co-worker, and institution) before they expose or withhold ideas, information, and opinions about their organizational problems. In situations of reduced trust, individuals more

like to withhold their opinion and concern about the organization. Conversely, in situations of increased trust, individuals more like to expose ideas, information, and opinions about their organization. Previous studies revealed that organizational trust has a negative effect on organizational silence (Dedahanov et al., 2015; Fard & Karimi, 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011). This explains that individuals with low trust in the organization tend to withhold ideas, information, and opinions about their organization. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

$H_{1a}$: Organizational trust has a negative effect on organizational silence.

Several studies have explored the consequences of maintaining (or failing to maintain) trusting relations (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Jain, 2016). Individuals which trust in the organization leads they to engage in more cooperative behaviors and it increases job satisfaction (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Jain et al., 2016). The positive consequences of maintaining trusting relations cause individual's emotions or feelings such as joy, enthusiasm, pleasure, pride, happiness, delight, and fulfillment about the job (Jain, 2016). Previous studies showed that organizational trust has a positive effect on job satisfaction (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Jain et al., 2016). This suggests that individuals with high trust in the organization tend to have a positive feeling towards their job. Conversely, when situations of reduced trust, individuals tend to have negative emotions toward their job. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

$H_{1b}$: Organizational trust has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

The organization with silence culture cause "individuals in the middle of a paradox where most individuals know the truth about certain issues and problems within the organization yet dare not speak that truth to their supervisors" (Nikolaou et al., 2011). When the phenomenon of silence exists in the organization, could create dissatisfaction among the organization members (Beer and Eisenstat, 2000; Morrison and Milliken, 2000; Nikolaou et al., 2011). Previous studies showed that organizational silence has a negative effect on job satisfaction (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011; Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). This explains that organization which has the condition wherein their employees withhold their ideas, information, and opinions about their organization tend to have a negative feeling towards their job. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

$H_{1c}$: Organizational silence has a negative effect on job satisfaction.

"The core of mediation analysis is that the assumes a sequence of relationships in which an antecedent variable affects a mediating variable, which then affects a dependent variable" (Nitzl et al., 2016). The mediation is one way that a researcher can explain the process or mechanism by which one variable affects another" (MacKinnon et al., 2007). The past studies have discussed the direct effect of organizational trust toward organizational silence (Dedahanov et al., 2015; Fard & Karimi, 2015; Nikolaou et al., 2011) and job satisfaction (Fard & Karimi, 2015; Jain et al., 2016). Then, organizational silence (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005; Dedahanov & Rhee, 2015; Fard & Karimi, 2015) and job satisfaction (Gunlu et al., 2010; Srivastava, 2013) also influence on organizational commitment. This suggests that organizational silence and job satisfaction might represent the mediators in this study. In this way, the impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment may be mediated through organizational silence and job satisfaction. Based on the explanation, we suggest the following hypothesis:

$H_{1d}$: Organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through organizational silence

$H_{1e}$: Organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through job satisfaction.

$H_{1f}$: Organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction.

# 3. Methodology

## 3.1. Data collection

The empirical data for the study was collected by means of a survey questionnaire on 15 Private Higher Education Institutions in Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia consisting of school of economics, school of computer science, school of political and social science, school of pharmacy, school of teaching science, school of health, school of tourism, school of engineering, school of language, and school of law. Where previously, an invitation was sent to 24 Private Higher Education Institutions. A total 390 questionnaires distributed, 312 were returned. Review result of responses revealed that 3 responses were not sufficiently completed. Furthermore, a total of 309 responses was usable, giving a highly effective response rate of 79.23 percent. The majority of respondents were male (51.45 percent) and only 1.94 percent has a Doctoral educational background. As much as 66.34 percent respondents were age between 35 until 45 years. Furthermore, 60.66 percent of the participants have been working for the same organization for over five years.

## 3.2. Measures

Organizational trust is a second-order confirmatory variable consisting of three dimensions that are lateral trust, vertical trust, and institutional trust (measured in formative). The dimensions of organizational trust were measured in reflective using 46 items, which developed from Ellonen et al. (2008). Alternative answers items were rated on a 5–point Likert scale. Score one indicates that employees do not have a trust toward the organization and a score of five indicates that employees have a high trust toward the organization. "Lateral trust" example item from this scale includes "the employees in this organizational unit have a strong sense of justice". The α (alpha coefficient) reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.932. "Vertical trust" example item includes "the leaders in this organizational unit have much knowledge on the work that needs to be done". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.958. "Institutional trust" example item includes "the management of this organizational unit communicates openly of things that are important to me". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.957.

Organizational silence is a second-order confirmatory variable consisting of four dimensions that are top management attitude to silence, supervisor attitude to silence, communication opportunities, and employee silence behavior (measured in formative). The dimensions of organizational silence were measured in reflective using 22 items (unfavorable items), which developed from Vakola & Bouradas (2005). Alternative answers items were rated on a 5–point Likert scale. Score one indicates that low organizational-silence and a score of five indicates that high organizational-silence. "Top management attitude to silence" example item (5-items) includes "top management of the company encourages employees to express their disagreements regarding company issues". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.892. "Supervisor attitude to silence" example item (5-items) includes "I believe that my supervisor considers different opinions or disagreements as something useful". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.900. "Communication opportunities" example item includes "communication with colleagues from other departments is satisfactory". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.889. "Employee silence behavior" example item (7-items) includes "how often do you express your disagreements to your managers concerning your company's issues". The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.927.

Job satisfaction was measured in formative using 4 items, which developed from Vakola & Bouradas (2005). Alternative answers

items were rated on a 5–point Likert scale. Score one indicates that employees do not have a satisfaction toward their job and score five indicates that employees have a satisfaction toward their job. In addition, organizational commitment was measured in reflective using 5 items, which developed from Vakola & Bouradas (2005). The example of the item includes "I believe that company's values and my values are similar". Alternative answers items were rated on a 5–point Likert scale. Score one indicates that employees have a low commitment toward the organization and score five indicates that employees have a high commitment toward the organization. The α reliability for this measure was above the conventional standards, i.e., 0.887.

### 3.3. Partial least square analysis

Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis through WarpPLS 5.0 is used to test the hypotheses. The analysis was applied because of all of the variables being studied are unobserved variables (Abdillah et al., 2016a; Anugerah et al., 2016b). Moreover, some of the variables were measured with formative indicators (Chin, 2010; Hair et al. 2012; Hair et al., 2014).

The application of PLS analysis consists of two steps. First, measurement model is assessed (outer model evaluation). For reflective indicators, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability are assessed. Furthermore, for formative indicators, "the assessment of the relevance of the indicators involves comparing the weights of the indicators to determine their relative contribution to forming the construct" (the indicator weight is significant or not) (Hair et al, 2014). Secondly, the structural model is assessed (inner model evaluation) (Anugerah et al., 2016b; Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2012; Hair et al., 2014).

## 4. Empirical results

### 4.1. Measurement model analysis

Evaluate measurement model for reflective indicators focuses on the reliability and validity of the measures used to represent each construct (Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2014). Lateral trust (LT), vertical trust (VT), institutional trust (IT), top management attitude to silence (TMS), supervisor attitude to silence (SS), communication opportunities (CO), and employee silence behavior (ES) and organizational commitment (OC) was measured with reflective indicators.

The column 2 of Table 1 (reliability test) shows that the composite reliability for each dimension (or variable) is above 0.70, which demonstrates that each dimension (or variable) has an internal consistency reliability (Hulland, 1999; Hair et al., 2012; Hair et al., 2014). Furthermore, Table 1 (discriminant validity test) shows that all the square roots of the AVE are greater than the respective correlation between dimensions (or construct). This explains that a

dimension (or variable) is more strongly related its own measures than with any other dimensions (or variable). In addition, the table 1 (convergent validity test) also shows that the AVE for each dimension (or variable) is above 0.50. This explains that more than 50 percent variance of the indicators for each dimension (or variable) could be accounted for (Chin, 2010). Overall, the results from the measurement model analysis for reflective indicators indicate that each dimension (or variable) exhibits satisfactory reliability and validity (Anugerah et al., 2016b; Chin, 1998; Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2012; Hair et al., 2014).

Evaluate outer model for the formative indicator is each indicator has significant value (Chin, 2010; Hair et al., 2014). The table 2 shows that each dimension (or indicator) has significant value. This result suggests that overall impression of available resources for each variable usage is primarily formed by each dimension (or indicator) (Chin, 2010).

### 4.2. Structural model analysis

This study aimed to investigate the impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction. The results of structural analysis models are shown in Table 3. The results (Panel A) revealed that organizational trust directly has a positive effect on organizational commitment ($\gamma = 0.683$, $p<0.01$). This supports $H_1$, which states that organizational trust directly has a positive effect on organizational commitment. The second hypothesis ($H_2$) is supported ($\beta= 0.464$, $p<0.01$) (see Table 3, Panel B). The data proved that organizational silence has a negative effect on organizational commitment. In addition, it was found that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.342$, $p<0.01$). This supports $H_3$, which states that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment.

The findings of the direct effects of organizational trust on organizational commitment show the positive effect as predicted in the hypotheses ($H_1$). This study also extends the analysis of organizational trust by demonstrating the indirect effect of organizational trust. The indirect effect may reflect the influence that organizational trust has on organizational silence and job satisfaction, which then affects organizational commitment. A significant negative effect of organizational trust on organizational silence was found ($\gamma = -0.791$, $p<0.01$). This supports $H_{1a}$, which states that organizational trust has a negative effect on organizational silence. A significant positive effect of organizational trust on job satisfaction was found ($\gamma = 0.132$, $p<0.01$). This also supports $H_{1b}$, which states that organizational trust has a positive effect on job satisfaction. In addition, it was found that organizational silence has a significant negative effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.746$, $p<0.01$). This supports $H_{1c}$, which states that organizational silence has a negative effect on job satisfaction.

**Table 1:** Reliability, Convergent Validity, and Correlation

|  | Composite reliability | AVE | Correlation | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  | LT | VT | IT | TMS | SS | CO | ES |
| LT | 0.932 | 0.516 | 0.718 | | | | | | |
| VT | 0.958 | 0.606 | 0.739* | 0.778 | | | | | |
| IT | 0.957 | 0.557 | 0.641* | 0.799* | 0.746 | | | | |
| TMS | 0.892 | 0.625 | -0.528* | -0.641* | -0.821* | 0.791 | | | |
| SS | 0.900 | 0.644 | -0.423* | -0.550* | -0.687* | 0.656* | 0.803 | | |
| CO | 0.889 | 0.617 | -0.452* | -0.723* | -0.787* | 0.738* | 0.659* | 0.785 | |
| ES | 0.927 | 0.646 | -0.229* | -0.544* | -0.616* | 0.611* | 0.531* | 0.685* | 0.804 |
| OC | 0.887 | 0.612 | 0.370* | 0.646* | 0.726* | -0.661* | -0.625* | -0.690* | -0.708* |

Note: Diagonal Elements are the Square Root of the AVE Statistics. Off-Diagonal Elements are the Correlation between the Latent Variable Calculated in the PLS*Significant at P < 0.01.

**Table 2:** Output Indicator Weight

| Variable | Dimension/ Indicator | Indicator weight-loading | Standard Errors | P Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | LT | 0.356 | 0.049 | <0.001 |
| Organizational trust | VT | 0.382 | 0.049 | <0.001 |
|  | IT | 0.367 | 0.049 | <0.001 |
| Organizational silence | TMS | 0.299 | 0.049 | <0.001 |

|                  |     |       |       |         |
|------------------|-----|-------|-------|---------|
|                  | SS  | 0.281 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
|                  | CO  | 0.307 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
|                  | ES  | 0.279 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
|                  | JS1 | 0.270 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
|                  | JS2 | 0.293 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
| Job Satisfaction | JS3 | 0.281 | 0.049 | <0.001  |
|                  | JS4 | 0.277 | 0.049 | <0.001  |

**Table 3:** PLS Results (Path Coefficient, P-Value, And $R^2$)

Panel A. Direct Effect Without Mediation

| Variable             | | | Path to Organizational Commitment |
|----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Organizational Trust | | | 0,683* |
| $R^2$                | | | 0,467 |

Panel B. Full Model

| Variable               | Path to Organizational Silence | Job Satisfaction | Organizational Commitment |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Organizational Trust   | -0.791*                        | 0.132*           | $0.058^{ns}$              |
| Organizational Silence |                                | -0.746*          | -0.464*                   |
| Job Satisfaction       |                                |                  | 0.342*                    |
| $R^2$                  | 0.434                          | 0.624            | 0.599                     |

* $P < 0.01$ ns (Not Significant)

**Table 4:** Indirect Effects for Paths with 3 Segments

| Indirect effects | Path coefficient | Standard errors | p-value |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Organizational trust → organizational commitment | 0.202 | 0.028 | p<0.01 |

Furthermore, the indirect effect significance ($H_{1d}$ and $H_{1e}$) was computed using the Sobel's test (Soper, 2017). This reveals the statistics of 8.168 (p < 0.01), indicating that the indirect effect of the organizational trust on organizational commitment through organizational silence is significant. This supports $H_{1d}$, which states Organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through organizational silence. A significant indirect effect of the organizational trust on organizational commitment through job satisfaction also was found (z=2.513, p < 0.05). This supports $H_{1e}$, which states that Organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through job satisfaction. The last hypothesis ($H_{1f}$) is accepted (β= 0.202, p<0.01) (see Table 4). The data proved that organizational trust has an indirect effect on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction. Finally, the results indicate that organizational silence and job satisfaction fully mediate the effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment (see Table 3).Discussion, Conclusion and Limitation. This study has made a unique and valuable contribution to our understanding of antecedent and consequences from organization silence at private sector higher education institutions in Indonesia. This model predicts the impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment through organizational silence and job satisfaction among academics. The result of $H_1$ revealed that individuals with strong organizational commitment caused of individuals trust in their organization. Their result is consistent with studies conducted by Chen et al. (2015), Fard & Karimi (2015), Martins et al. (2017), and Vanhala et al. (2016) who state the trust which shared between the parties entered into the relationship tend to build a strong individuals commitment toward organization.

The result of $H_2$ showed that organizational silence negatively affects organizational commitment. These results are in line with Vakola & Bouradas (2005), Dedahanov & Rhee (2015), and Fard & Karimi (2015) who found that organizational silence leads to produced negative feels toward organization such as low organizational commitment. The result of $H_3$ found a positive influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. These results are consistent with studies conducted by Gunlu et al., (2010), and Srivastava (2013). This result suggests that job satisfaction is predictors of organizational commitment. individuals who have a positive feeling towards their job cause high individuals commitment toward the organization. Conversely, individuals who have a negative emotion towards their job tend to not committed toward the organization.

$H_1$ has shown the positive influence of organizational trust on organizational commitment. Further, this study examined the indirect effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment. $H_{1a}$ showed that individuals with low trust in the organization tend to withhold ideas, information, and opinions about their organization. This study found that in situations of reduced trust, individuals tend to withhold their ideas, information, opinion, and concern about the organization. Conversely, in situations of increased trust, individuals tend to care about their organization. This result is supported by Dedahanov et al. (2015), Fard & Karimi (2015), Nikolaou et al. (2011) who state Individuals would assess competence, reliability, and benevolence of their leader, co-worker, and institution before they expose or withhold ideas, information, and opinions about their organizational. Furthermore, $H_{1b}$ proved that in a situation of increasing trust, individual tend to have a positive feeling towards their job. In contrast, when individuals have a low trust in the organization cause of individuals have a negative feeling toward their job. In addition, $H_{1c}$ also proved that the organization which has the condition wherein their members withhold their ideas, information, and opinions about their organization cause of individuals have a negative feeling towards their job. Conversely, the organization which has the condition where their members care about the organization cause their members have a positive feeling such as pleasure, pride, happiness, and delight towards their job.

Furthermore, $H_{1d}$ also successfully proved that organizational silence mediates the effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment. The result indicated that organization who have members with high trust toward their organization cause of the members have strong organizational commitment trough condition where their members more care to the organization. The hypothesis $H_{1e}$ is supported, which reveals that job satisfaction also mediates the effect of organizational trust on organizational commitment. These results indicate that the organization members with strong organizational commitment caused of the members trust in their organization through the members who have a positive feeling toward their job.

The study provides implications for managers at Private Higher Education Institutions of understanding antecedent and consequences of organizational silence. The findings provide insight into the critical role of the individual's trust of the organization in reducing condition of silence at the organization and increasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Managers and supervisors must maintain trusting relations between employees and their organization. Therefore, managers should do managerial practices which equitable in the organization such as develop their self-worth and self-identity through social relationships (Tlaiss &

Elamin, 2015). Finally, to maintain trust among individuals in an organization, managers could do communication-related training.

This study has several limitations. First, this study only uses sample was selected from the Private Higher Education Institutions. For this reason, the results could not be generalized in other sectors. Second, the data collection was restricted to Private Higher Education Institutions in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. Consequently, the results of this study might not be confirmed to the same sector in other countries with different national cultures. Third, this study only explored organizational trust as an antecedent of organizational silence. And then, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as the consequences of organizational silence. Finally, variables in this study were measured using self-report, meaning that the results of the study may be biased. The future study also is interesting to explore antecedents and consequences of organizational silence in another sector (i.e. manufacturing, banking etc.). Furthermore, for increasing the exploratory power of the research model, additional factors should be considered such as leadership style, organizational values (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005), stress, and turnover intention (Morrison & Milliken, 2000) to accurately reflect antecedents and consequences of organizational silence.

# References

[1] Abdillah, M.R., Anita, R., & Anugerah, R. (2016a). Dampak Iklim Organisasi terhadap Stres Kerja dan Kinerja Karyawan. Jurnal Manajemen, 20(1), 121-141.

[2] Abdillah, M.R., Anita, R., Anugerah, R. & Sari, R.N. (2016b). Authentic Leadership and Internal Whistleblowing Intention: Examining The Mediating Roles of Psychological Safety, Personal Identification, and Organizational Commitment. Proceeding 8th International Management and Accounting Conference (IMAC8), 473-482.

[3] Anugerah, R., Anita, R., Sari, R.N., and Zenita, R. (2016a). External locus of control and reduced audit quality behavior: The mediating effects of auditor performance and organizational commitment. Journal of Economics, Business and Management, 4(5), 353-357.

[4] Anugerah, R., Anita, R., Sari, R.N., Abdillah, M.R., & Iskandar, T.M. (2016b). The Analysis of Reduced Audit Quality Behavior: The Intervening Role of Turnover Intention. International Journal of Economics and Management, 10(S2), 341-353.

[5] Beer, M. and Eisenstat, R. (2000). The silent killers of strategy implementation and learning. Sloan Management Review, 41(4), 29-40.

[6] Chang, W.J., Liao, S.H., Lee, Y.J. and Lo, W.P. (2015). Organizational commitment, knowledge sharing and organizational citizenship behaviour: the case of the Taiwanese semiconductor industry. Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 13(3), 299-310.

[7] Chen, S.Y., Wu, W.C., Chang, C.S., Lin, C.T., Kung, J.Y., Weng, H.C., Lin, Y.T. & Lee, S.I. (2015). Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. BMC Health Services Research, 15, 1-17.

[8] Chin, W. W. (2010). How to Write Up and Report PLS Analyses. in Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W. W., Henseler, J. and Wang, H. (Eds.) Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications, Springer, Heidelberg, Dordrecht, London, New York, 655-690.

[9] Costigan, R.D., Ilter, S.E. & Berman, J.J. (1998). A multidimensional study of trust in organisations. Journal of Managerial Issues, 10(3), 303-17.

[10] Dedahanov, A.T. & Rhee, J. (2015). Examining the relationships among trust, silence and organizational commitment. Management Decision, 53(8), 1843-1857.

[11] Ellonen, R., Blomqvist, K. & Puumalainen, K. (2008). The role of trust in organisational innovativeness. European Journal of Innovation Management, 11(2), 160-181.

[12] 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(11), 219-227.

[13] Gaertner, S. (1999). Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment ın turnover models. Human Resource Management Review, 9(4), 479-493.

[14] Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M, & Perçin, M.Ş. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 22(5), 693-717.

[15] Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M, Ringle, C. M., and Mena, J. A., (2012). An assessment of the use of partial least squares structural equation modeling in marketing research. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40(1), 414-433.

[16] Hair, Joe, F., Marko, S., Lucas, H., and Volker, G., (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): an emerging tool in business research. European Business Review, 26 (2), 106-121.

[17] Jain, A.K. (2016). the mediating role of job satisfaction in the relationship of vertical trust and distributed leadership in health care context. Journal of Modelling in Management, 11(2), 722-738.

[18] Jernigan, I.E., Beggs, J.M. & Kohut, G.F. (2002). Dimensions of work satisfaction as predictors of commitment type. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 17(7), 564-79.

[19] Martins, D.M., Faria, A.C., Prearo, L.C., & Arruda, A.G.S. (2016). The level of influence of trust, commitment, cooperation, and power in the interorganizational relationships of Brazilian credit cooperatives. Revista de Administração, 52(1), 47-58.

[20] Mayer, R. C., Davis, J.H. & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20, 709–734.

[21] MacKinnon, D.P., Fairchild, A.J. & Fritz, M.S. (2007). Mediation Analysis. Annual Review of Psychology 58, 593-614.

[22] 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.

[23] Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, R. M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vacational Behavior, 14, 224-227.

[24] Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. and Steers, R.M. (1982). Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover. New York: Academic Press.

[25] Ng, T.W.H. (2015). The incremental validity of organizational commitment, organizational trust, and organizational identification. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 88(June), 154-163.

[26] Nikalaou, I., Vakola, M. & Bourantas, D. (2011). The role of silence on employee.

[27] Romle, A.R., Razak, R.C. & Shamsudin

[28] A.S. (2015). Mapping the relationships between quality management practices, human-oriented elements and organizational performance: A proposed framework, International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology 6 (3), 196.