

## "Unheard Voice: Navigating Challenges and Fostering Inclusion for New Talent"

<sup>1</sup>Mahek Jabeen Patel, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Kanak Wadhvani, <sup>3</sup>Nurin Ahmed Majdood

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Corresponding Author, Ramdeobaba University Nagpur

<sup>2</sup>Supervisor, Co-author 1, Ramdeobaba University Nagpur

<sup>3</sup>Research Scholar, Co-author 2, Ramdeobaba University Nagpur

### Abstract

When companies onboard new employees and interns, they introduce novel viewpoints, expertise, and ideas that can improve workflows and team interactions. Although they could offer valuable contributions, these new arrivals frequently feel conflicted between voicing their thoughts and staying silent. Employee voice, which entails speaking out on key matters, and silence, which signifies holding back views, might appear as contradictory behaviours. Nevertheless, employees holding valuable information or ideas continually face the dilemma of whether to speak up or stay silent. Over the past few years, there has been a notable increase in studies focused on identifying the elements that affect employee voice behavior, encompassing personal, contextual, and voice-specific factors. This expanding collection of studies has investigated the effects of voice and silence on employees, workgroups, and organizations. This paper offers initial findings and a framework for our continuing research on employee voice behaviour. Future publications will provide a comprehensive analysis of the research outcomes, offering insights into the complexities of voice and silence in organizational settings.

**Keywords:** New Joiners, Interns Employee Voice, Employee Silence, Organizational Behavior, Membership Negotiation, Psychological Safety, Proactive Behaviour, Organizational Support, Co-worker Support, Early Career Employees.

---

### Introduction

New joiners begin establishing the foundation for their professional development and career expectations in their first employment opportunity after college (Smith, 2018). An overall understanding of the working world starts to develop. While entering the workforce, recently graduated individuals face changeable work environments with an increasing number of project work and temporary contracts. This reflects the importance of their early career experiences in the workplace and impacts the young professionals' perception of their membership. New joiners entering the workforce as early career newcomers have an inclination to desire unified, encouraging, and transparent communication, as well as input from others and a readiness to share their knowledge (Myers and Sadaghiani, 2010). These characteristics have been seen. As a challenge to management, including how to make sure that employees receive the feedback they require and have opportunities for professional growth or work-life balance (Nolan, 2015).

New joiners frequently hesitate to share information that might be seen as harmful or threatening by people in positions of authority within an organization (Roberts & O'Reilly, 1974; Ryan & Oestreich, 1991). New joiner's morale and trust may be harmed, organizational decision-making and error-correction may be compromised, and employees' reluctance to speak up may result in silence or information withholding (Argyris & Schon, 1986; Beer & Eisenstat, 2000; Janis, 1982; Morrison & Millin, 2000; Tamuz, 2001)

However, as the aforementioned quote suggests, staying silent might make sense from the standpoint of the new joiners who worries that their manager will take adverse action in response to concerns raised higher up and might even go so far as to take actions that threaten the employee ability to continue working for the company. Someone

in a position of authority should be notified if they suspect a problem. It's not always easy to voice concerns when you witness something at work, though, especially in many workplaces. While going about their daily business and engaging with clients and co-workers, employees encounter a variety of things, including brewing concerns, inefficiencies, improper practices, strategic issues, and opportunities for improvement.

However, they may not discuss these insights with those in their organization who have the authority to act upon them. They don't always speak; they could decide to keep quiet instead. In a new work environment, new hires are constantly shaping their membership through membership negotiations (Scott and Myers, 2010). In addition to adapting to interaction norms and organizational standards, newcomers also need to examine their own expectations and values. This study aimed to clarify the kinds of concerns that workers are reluctant to bring up and to pinpoint the reasons behind new hires' constant decision to keep quiet rather than address their concerns.

## **Review of Literature**

### **NEW JOINERS**

In basic terms, the term "New Joiners" might be drawbacks to being considered "new" by an organization. Krackhardt (1996) has claimed that the traditional organizational-level concept of "liability of newness" (Stinchcombe, 1965) can also apply to individuals. Since they usually lack prior experience and haven't proven to be valuable to the company, new hires' positions, reputations, and status are more ambiguous. Colleagues may also believe that recent hires are inexperienced with the customs and procedures of the company and are therefore less inclined to ask them for guidance and information (Borgatti & Cross, 2003; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). According to early laboratory research, "new" members of a group typically contribute fewer creative ideas and are viewed as less creative by their peers (Nash & Wolfe, 1957; Ziller, Gebinger, & Jansen, 1961).

On the other hand, the term "new employee" describes a status or designation given to those who have newly joined a company. It exists for the same reason as other statuses undertake: to enhance the members of the organization. Being considered "new" by an organization can be beneficial. Human resource managers could designate specific individuals as "new" and provide them with extra orientation, training, or mentorship. Supervisors may give 'new' subordinates more attention than others, offering advice and criticism that they might not otherwise provide to other employees (Fisher, 1985).

Moreover, employees may be more understanding of people they view as "new" to the company (Louis, Posner, & Powell, 1983) or more inclined to overlook the errors of "new" hires (Greenberg, 1996). Newcomers' self-initiated activities, such as proactive behavior, play a significant role in their adjustment and organizational socialization.

Young professional newcomers' experiences of communication processes in membership negotiation in their first workplace after graduation. It identified three communication processes during membership negotiation: developing reciprocity, seeking and perceiving acceptance, and becoming an active member. The study emphasized the importance of achieving acceptance and engaging in reciprocal communication for newcomers to experience membership in the workplace. The long-term data collection in the study may have affected participants' motivation and the quality of their descriptions, but it also had positive consequences for the newcomers' transition. Social support and information from peers and managers were found to be crucial in helping newcomers become members of their workplace and develop job competency. Reciprocal self-disclosure and repeated, supportive, and open communication were valued by newcomers. (Sari Rajamäki, Membership negotiation in the first workplace – Newcomers' experiences, 2021)

The level of organizational support and co-worker support positively influences newcomers' engagement in proactive behaviour, which in turn leads to higher levels of socialization. The proposed influence of organizational support on socialization was not supported, suggesting that other factors, such as proactive behaviour, may have a stronger impact. Successful socialization requires resources to overcome the stress and challenges of role transition, and perceived support can help manage anxiety and depression (James, Newcomers' organizational socialization: the role of co-worker support, organizational support and proactive behaviour, 2020)

New administrators fail to address the confusion generated by conflicting demands during entry, leading to bad beginnings and failed transitions. It emphasizes the importance of hitting the ground learning instead of running, by building relationships with stakeholders and developing a process for learning rather than focusing solely on tasks. The authors propose an approach called Entry Plan, which involves writing a plan, conducting interviews and site visits, and working jointly with stakeholders to make sense of information before making changes. This approach promotes learning about the new job situation and challenges organizations to rethink their operating assumptions. New joiners in an organization face initial barriers that can be overcome with support from colleagues. Work environment understanding takes time for new employees. Support from colleagues can help new employees feel at ease. Education level, salary, exposure, and cultural aspects can contribute to workplace conflicts. (affiliations, Starting Confused: How Leaders Start When They Don't Know Where to Start, 2005)

This is attributed to factors such as lack of regular connect with managers, irregular performance feedback, and the dearth of instant recognition for work done. Remote working during the pandemic has posed challenges in forming social connections and integrating new joiners into the organization. The decrease in the level of belongingness among new hires who joined virtually in 2020 could lead to dissatisfaction and disengagement at work, posing a risk for employee retention. Recommendations to address the belongingness gap include having structured daily informal connects, assigning buddies to new joiners, providing regular feedback and recognition, creating opportunities for social interactions, and training people managers to effectively manage remote working employees. (Gokul Santhanam D. K., 2020)

(Walanchalee Wattanacharoensil, 2012) Suggested to make employee training and development a priority, improve communication and coordination between handling agents and airlines, and enhance competencies related to customer service and problem-solving

(Sivapragasam Panneerselvam, Employee experience: the new employee value proposition, 2022) Indicate that Employee experience (EX) is an emerging concept in the employer-employee relationship, consisting of work, workplace culture, empowering technologies, flexible HR policies/practices, and inclusive leadership. Positive EX leads to employee engagement, which in turn creates a "positivity spiral" of culture, engagement, and organizational bottom-line impact. EX is considered the new value proposition, highlighting its importance in talent management and human resource management research.

The positive significant effect of cultural environment on employee performance, while there was no effect of physical environment and technological environment on employee performance (Harlianto, 2008)

(James, 2020) Suggested Newcomers' self-initiated activities, such as proactive behaviour, play a significant role in their adjustment and organizational socialization. The extent of. Support from co-workers and the organization has a positive impact on newcomers' participation. proactive conduct which raises socialization levels. the suggested impact. of organizational support on socialization was not supported suggesting that other factors such as proactive conduct could have a greater effect. Resources are necessary for socialization to be successful. Perceived support can assist in managing the stress and difficulties associated with changing roles both sadness and anxiety. The results underscore the significance of co-worker support. support from the organization to encourage proactive behaviour from newcomers. A lot of new administrators neglect to clear up the confusion. caused by competing demands during entry resulting in unsuccessful beginnings. alterations. It highlights how important it is to start learning on the ground rather than rushing. building relationships with stakeholders and developing a process for learning rather than. concentrating only on tasks. The authors propose an approach called Entry Plan which involves.

The authors propose an approach called Entry Plan, which involves writing a plan, conducting interviews and site visits, and working jointly with stakeholders to make sense of information before making changes. This approach promotes learning about the new job situation and challenges organizations to rethink their operating assumptions (affiliations, 2005). Also highlighted the benefits of an Entry Plan, including enabling new leaders to use the confusion that comes with starting a new job as a resource for personal and organizational learning. It emphasizes the potential for success right from the start by experiencing and leveraging healthy confusion

The concept of employee silence has been neglected in organizational research, but it is a complex phenomenon that goes beyond the absence of voice and reflects characteristic thoughts, feelings, and actions. Silence can communicate and is accompanied by behavioral, affective, and cognitive components. It is important to study the nature, incidence, and impact of employee silence, including why some victims of organizational injustice maintain their silence while others break theirs. The context within which silence occurs affects its meaning, and choosing to be silent can be a way of conveying something important. Organizational inaction and the deaf ear syndrome discourage employees from expressing their discontent, leading to costs and negative outcomes (Craig C. Pinder, 2001)

Employees often do not feel comfortable speaking to their bosses about organizational problems or issues that concern them. The study found that most employees had been in situations where they were concerned about an issue but did not raise it to a supervisor. Silence among employees spanned a range of organizational issues, with some employees indicating that they did not feel comfortable speaking to those above them about any issues or concerns. The fear of being viewed or labelled negatively was the most frequently mentioned reason for remaining silent. The perceived consequences of voicing concerns contribute to employee silence, as employees fear damaging valued relationships. Speaking up can have social and relational implications that take away employees' ability to have influence within an organizational setting (Frances J. Milliken, 2003)

Implicit voice theories are taken-for-granted beliefs about when and why speaking up at work is risky or inappropriate. These implicit voice theories can act as barriers to organizational learning by blocking the sharing of valuable knowledge, even when managers do not actively stifle voice. Enabling individuals to speak up to those in power is challenging due to the presumed risk-reward asymmetry that favours silence. The benefits of speaking up are primarily collective (organizational), while individuals bear the costs. Managers have the discretion to proactively manage implicit voice theories by acknowledging them, stating theories that contradict them, and continuously working to dispel them through modelling, inviting, and rewarding speaking up. The research findings suggest that implicit voice theories can be measured with survey scales that show evidence of reliability and validity. These theories are distinct from individual differences and contextual factors. Implicit voice theories have incremental validity in predicting workplace silence, even when controlling for other individual and contextual explanations (Detert, 2001)

The decision to engage in voice or remain silent can have significant implications for organizations and individuals within them, affecting performance, problem-solving, and the ability to take advantage of new ideas. Organization leaders need to foster conditions that encourage and give voice while removing obstacles like the fear of rejection or seen unfavourably. The research (Morrison 2014) offers a thorough comprehension of the elements and motivational techniques that influence whether or not workers use upward voice or keep quiet as well as the effects of employee voice on the organization and the individual quietness. Future research should concentrate on expanding and deepening our understanding according to the author comprehension of the nature causes and effects of voice and silence in the workplace. The study emphasizes how crucial it is to comprehend both the individual and the organization consequences of speaking up and remaining silent as well as the elements and circumstances that inhibit workers sound. (Morrison, 2014)

Even when individual factors are taken into account openness and employee voice are consistently correlated variations in personality job satisfaction and demographics. This connection is mediated by perceptions of psychological safety among subordinates emphasizing the role of leaders in evaluation the dangers of raising an issue. Voice behaviour is most strongly influenced by leadership behaviours of the most productive workers (Burris, 2007)

Employee information withholding is referred to as organizational silence phenomenon at the collective level that may impede organizational growth and change settings with pluralism. Employees may feel that way due to strong organizational forces. speaking up about issues and problems is futile or dangerous resulting in silence that acts as a vital impediment to development and change. putting in place mechanisms that support employee input requires understanding the complex dynamics within organizational systems that maintain and reinforce silence.

Top management's adherence to assumptions that foster silence can make it difficult for organizations to respond appropriately to the diversity of values, beliefs, and characteristics in the workforce. The implicit belief structure of top management, which views employees as self-interested and dissent as undesirable, can lead to negative reactions to input from subordinates and a lack of feedback seeking. This lack of employee voice can diminish the quality of decision-making and change initiatives. (Milliken, 2000 )

The conceptual article on organizational silence, employee quiet became a recognized issue in the literature on organizational behaviour (Morrison & Milliken's, 2000). The study concentrated on the variables that frequently lead to climates of silence in organizations, which occur when there is a general unwillingness to speak up about important topics of concern. It also examined the origins and effects of quiet at the collective level. Shortly afterward, a model of quiet at the individual level of analysis was developed by Pinder & Harlos (2001). They said that silence in the face of inequality is common in organizations and defined employee quiet as the withholding of any sincere expression about a seen or experienced injustice from those capable of effecting change or reparation. Building on Pinder and Harlos's definition, more research has changing the emphasis to include silence about all important concerns rather than just injustice (Milliken et al. 2003, Tangirala & Ramanujam 2008a).

Trust in the employer is the most important factor in evaluating voice systems for all employees. Male and female employee groups have different evaluations of voice opportunities based on attributes such as generational cohort and job tenure. Line managers play a significant role in encouraging or inhibiting employee voice. Some managers are able to use blockages as a form of proactive and productive resistance, while others resort to raising their voice informally through covert "underground channels". Lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees often experience separation and isolation in the workplace due to their sexual orientation, which can affect their voice and silence. LGBT employee networks can help mitigate this isolation and provide voice in the organization, but their value in providing voice for all sexual minority employees is questioned (Adrian Wilkinson Ying Xu, 2018)

Communication failure, including the failure to speak up about potential safety problems, is a significant issue in healthcare. Martinez et al. present preliminary psychometrics for a new measure of speaking up climate, focusing on perceptions and enablers of speaking up about traditional patient safety concerns and professionalism-related safety concerns. The study highlights residents' overall reluctance to speak up, particularly regarding professionalism issues. The field would benefit from additional conceptual work on the definition and dimensionality of speaking up climate, as well as greater attention to the patient-family side of speaking up. The concept of speaking up climate may differ for safety concerns and professionalism-related concerns within the same clinical setting. Speaking up about safety and professionalism can be seen as dimensions of patient safety climate, reflecting staff perceptions of the importance and prioritization of safety (Ginsburg1, 2015 )

On the surface, expressing and withholding behaviors might appear to be polar opposites because silence implies not speaking while voice implies speaking up on important issues and problems in organizations. Based on employee motives, we differentiate three types of silence (Acquiescent Silence, Defensive Silence, and ProSocial Silence) and three parallel types of voice (Acquiescent Voice, Defensive Voice, and ProSocial Voice) where withholding important information is not simply the absence of voice by Van Dyne et al. (2003, as cited in Ruck, p.119)

The studies concludes that employee silence and voice should be viewed as separate, multidimensional constructs, rather than polar opposites. It presents a conceptual framework that differentiates three types of silence (Acquiescent Silence, Defensive Silence, and ProSocial Silence) and three parallel types of voice (Acquiescent Voice, Defensive Voice, and ProSocial Voice) based on employee motives. The paper suggests that silence and voice have differential consequences for employees in work organizations. It proposes that silence is more ambiguous than voice, leading to misattributions of employee motives and incongruent consequences. The paper highlights the need for further research in this area to explore the behavioral cues and consequences of silence and voice in the workplace. It also emphasizes the importance of managers being aware of the potential misattributions and incongruent outcomes associated with employee silence. (Linn Van Dyne, 2003)

**EMPLOYEE VOICE**

Voice is referred to as "the discretionary or formal expression of ideas, opinions, suggestions, or alternative approaches directed to a specific target inside or outside of the organization with the intent to change an objectionable state of affairs and to improve the current functioning of organization, group, or individual" (Bashshur and Oc, 2015, page 1531). Instead of becoming a dispute among coworkers, organizational voice is a constructive behavior for the organization's development (Dyne and Lepine, 1998). The voluntary voicing of opinions to impact organizational actions is referred to as "organizational voice" (Bowen and Blackmon, 2003, p. 1394). Intimacy activities like lending a hand are not the same as voice, which is typically associated with situational performance and organizational civic behavior. Actions that foster intimacy, preserve, and advance a relationship.

Employee voice is best understood as a complex and uneven set of meanings and purposes shaped by external regulation and internal management choice. The degree to which voice practices are embedded in an organization is more important than the extent of any particular individual or collective schemes for employee voice. The passing of the EU Information and Consultation Directive and the growing legal regulation will impact the nature, meaning, and purpose of employee voice. There is also more support for trade union and representative forms of employee voice. The research collected from 18 organizations reflects differences in size, structure, ownership, representative systems, and sectors of economic activity. The meanings ascribed to employee voice techniques differ among organizations and respondents (Tony Dundon, 2004)

The paper conducted a multidisciplinary review of academic research on employee voice to identify common ground in its conceptualization. The review focused on the Human Resource Management/Employment Relations and Organizational Behaviour disciplines' conceptualization of employee voice. The paper identified where these disciplines diverged in their concept and study of employee voice and mapped their similarities and differences based on motive, content, mechanism, target, and management of voice. The paper proposed a conceptual model that addresses the blind spots in each discipline and suggests incorporating formal and informal employee voice in future studies for better integration of voice research (Paula K. Mowbray1, 2015)

Voice is pervasive in organizations. Unlike silence, voice has attracted more academic scrutiny. The management literature contains two major conceptualizations of voice. The first approach uses the term voice to describe speaking up behaviour such as when employees proactively make suggestions for change (Farrell and Rusbult, 1992; Frese et al., 1999; LePine and Van Dyne, 1998; Rusbult et al., 1988; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Withey and Cooper, 1989; Zhou and George, 2001). The second uses the term voice to describe the presence of due process procedures that enhance justice judgments and facilitate employee participation in decision making (Bies and Shapiro, 1988; Folger, 1977; Lind et al., 1990). Although both definitions of voice have merit and address important managerial issues, we focus in this paper on the first conceptualization (voice as an employee behaviour rather than an organizational process) since our interest is in comparing and contrasting silence and voice as two important employee behaviours.

In reviewing the literature on voice as employee behaviour, we make two primary observations that suggest the importance of developing a more finegrained conceptualization of voice. First, the literature contains a variety of terms to describe employee voice behaviours. Perhaps best known is the voice work that is part of the EVLN (exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect) framework (Farrell, 1983; Hirschman, 1970; Rusbult et al., 1988; Withey and Cooper, 1989). Additionally, there is a growing amount of research that focuses specifically on voice (proactive and constructively intended speaking up behaviour) outside of the EVLN framework (Avery and Quinones, 2002; LePine and Van Dyne, 1998; Van Dyne et al., 1995; Van Dyne and LePine, 1998; Zhou and George, 2001)

The study explores contextual factors that facilitate or hinder the expression of electronic voice (e-voice) in a digitally organized alternative organization, Premium. Contextual facilitators of e-voice expression include a collective belief in the value of diverse voices, cautious online and complementary face-to-face communication. Contextual barriers to e-voice expression include less formalized structures, power and knowledge asymmetries, and information overload. Despite the organization's intention to create an inclusive and participatory digital

space, tensions arise in the expression of e-voice. The study contributes to employee voice theorizing by outlining contextual factors specifically relevant to e-voice practices (Vanessa Bernauer, 2022)

In addition to this research that uses the specific voice label, there are a number of other voice-like conceptualizations in the literature that emphasize speaking up and making suggestions. Civic Virtue, a form of Organizational Citizenship, includes suggesting modifications in policies and speaking up about issues for the benefit of the organization (Graham, 1991; Organ, 1988; Robinson, 1996; Robinson and Morrison, 1995). Another similar construct is Advocacy Participation which Van Dyne et al. (1994) defined as constructive and proactive voice such as expressing high standards, challenging others, and making suggestions for change. Consistent with this positive, change-oriented focus, George and Brief (1992), Zhou and George (2001) and Frese et al. (1999) focused on Constructive Suggestions (actively proposing ways to improve individual, group, or organizational functioning). Championing, Taking Charge, and Issue Selling are also other relevant prosocial behaviours involving speaking up that is intended to benefit the larger collective (Dutton and Ashford, 1993; Howell and Higgins, 1990; Morrison and Phelps, 1999). Finally, Parker (1993) used the term Reformist Dissent to describe proactive expression of disagreement that occurs within the parameters of organizational rules and norms.

(wilkinson, 2011)The issue highlighted the importance of employee voice for various organizational outcomes, such as justice climate, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and diversity promotion. They provide a rationale for HR professionals to support employee voice policies and projects. There are competing visions and expectations of employee voice, with different motives underlying a desire for collective voice versus individual voice. Managers tend to be interested in employee voice if there is a perceived payoff, such as avoiding issues or playing a more positive role. The literature on employee voice comes from different camps, but there are overlaps in practice. Management-driven forms of involvement, like quality circles, meet the desire of workers to be involved in matters that directly relate to them. Voice needs to be about more than just efficiency and adding value to business. It should also be seen as a fundamental democratic right for workers to have a degree of control over managerial decision-making, and as a means to develop skills and values that contribute to broader society.

Employee voice (EV) encompasses various domains, topics, and channels, including direct and indirect, formal and informal, and individual and collective channels. Different disciplines have their own conceptualizations of EV, leading to research silos and competing literatures. Integrative approaches are needed to understand how EV shapes organizations and affects individual and organizational outcomes (E Della Torre, 2022)Employee voice has been the subject of extensive research across various disciplines, but there is a lack of a systematic literature review on this topic. The paper conducts a systematic review in an effort to close this gap. of 67 studies on worker voice that were released between 2000 and 2021. These articles were. gathered from seven renowned management databases such as Springer and Science Direct, Wiley JSTOR Taylor and Francis SAGE Emerald Insight and Link the main purpose of the review is to evaluate the methodologies and find themes in the employee voice literature. utilized in books. Additionally the review looks at the kinds of research techniques used concentrating on sectoral focus statistical methods and research design(Sheikh Sajid Mohammad, 2023)

He contributed to the understanding of employee voice within the workplace by investigating three types of arrangements: trade union representation, non-union employee representation, and management-led arrangements for direct voice (Amossé, 2016)

A trustworthy measurement tool for employee voice intention was created and verified by the study. comprising perceived feasibility and perceived desirability as its two dimensions. The empirical. Analysis revealed that employee voice intention is positively impacted by voice efficacy. Voice behaviour is strongly predicted by employee voice intention. Employee intentions are also voiced acts as a mediator between voice efficacy and voice behaviour. The research adds to the understanding of employee voice intention and its implications for organizations providing insightful information about the elements affecting employee voice intention and a trustworthy source scale of measurement to evaluate it. The findings have implications for organizations seeking to promote a culture of voice and encourage employee participation in decision-making processes (al, 2023)

**EMPLOYEE VOICE BEHAVIOUR**

On the other side, voice behavior is a challenge, and as such, it may cause relationships to deteriorate. Despite the fact that they were started with good intentions. Snitching is a preventive behavior that is not the same as organizational voice behavior because the former seeks to obstruct continuous practice, while the latter is beneficial. Organizational voice differs from organizational opposition in that the former involves informing the appropriate departments about issues pertaining to morality and conscientiousness. Organizational voice, on the other hand, expresses ideas about how to improve the way things are done now. Complaint behavior is another idea that needs to be separated from organizational voice since it expresses dissatisfaction with the status quo without requiring recommendations for improvement. Since these roles are already what are anticipated of employees, voice behavior differs from the roles that are stated in their job descriptions (LePine and Dyne, 1998). The first social scientist to examine voice as a response to job unhappiness was Hirschman (1970). He saw voice and interruptions from workers as signs of a worker's commitment to their position. He claims that when faced with such circumstances, loyal employees vocally communicate their unhappiness with their organizations; however, disloyal personnel depart from their organizations (Brinsfield et al., 2009). The benefits of developing channels for workers to express their opinions to employers and other employees were noted by Freeman and Medoff (1984).

Management openness has a significant positive impact on employees' self-esteem based on the organization. Organizational self-esteem plays a mediating role between management openness and voice behaviour. Employee prosocial motivation is based on organizational self-esteem. Prosocial motivation moderates the relationship between self-esteem and voice behavior. The stronger the prosocial motivation of the employees, the weaker the relationship between self-esteem and voice behaviour based on the organization. (Yue Zhu, 2019)

(Linn Van Dyne, 2003) He concluded that employee silence and voice should be viewed as separate, multidimensional constructs, rather than polar opposites. It presents a conceptual framework that differentiates three types of silence (Acquiescent Silence, Defensive Silence, and ProSocial Silence) and three parallel types of voice (Acquiescent Voice, Defensive Voice, and ProSocial Voice) based on employee motives. The paper suggests that silence and voice have differential consequences for employees in work organizations. It suggests that quiet is more ambiguous than voice resulting in inconsistent and incorrect employee motivation attributions. ramifications. The study emphasizes the need for additional investigation into this field. behavioural indicators and repercussions of speaking and remaining silent at work. Moreover, it highlights the significance of managers understanding potential inconsistencies and misattributions. consequences of silent employees. The decision to engage in voice or remain silent can have significant implications for organizations and individuals within them, affecting performance, problem-solving, and the ability to take advantage of new ideas. Organization leaders need to foster conditions that motivate and enable voice while breaking down inhibitors, such as the fear of being dismissed or viewed negatively. (Morrison, 2014) This paper offers a thorough understanding of the elements and methods of motivation that influence whether workers use upward voice. or keep quiet as well as the consequences of employee voice on both an individual and organizational level. quietness. Future research should concentrate on expanding and deepening our understanding according to the author. knowledge of the nature of voice and silence in the workplace as well as its causes and effects.

The paper highlights the importance of understanding the individual and organizational implications of voice and silence, as well as the factors and conditions that stifle employee voice (Morrison, 2014)

Openness is consistently related to employee voice, even after controlling for individual differences in personality, satisfaction, and job demography. This relationship is mediated by subordinate perceptions of psychological safety, highlighting the role of leaders in assessing the risks of speaking up. Leadership behaviour have the strongest impact on the voice behaviour of the best-performing employees. (Burriss, 2007)

Employee voice is a complex phenomenon to predict. The study identified three psychological antecedents (psychological safety, felt obligation for constructive change, and organization-based self-esteem) that uniquely and differentially predict supervisory reports of promotive and prohibitive voice behavior. Felt obligation was found to be most strongly related to subsequent promotive voice, while psychological safety was most strongly

related to subsequent prohibitive voice. Organization-based self-esteem was reciprocally related to promotive voice. Felt obligation strengthened the positive effect of psychological safety on both forms of voice, while organization-based self-esteem weakened this effect for promotive voice. The study highlights the need for further research to understand the factors that facilitate or inhibit employee voice expression (Liang, 2012)

In line with Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) original conceptualization of voice, we define promotive voice as employees' expression of new ideas or suggestions for improving the overall functioning of their work unit or organization. Because promotive voice proposes ways of changing the status quo, it is challenging. However, because it is accompanied with innovative solutions and suggestions for improvement, such voice is "promotive" in the sense that it is focused on a future ideal state or what could be [Van Dyne and LePine's (1998)].

In contrast, prohibitive voice describes employees' expressions of concern about work practices, incidents, or employee behaviour that are harmful to their organization. Prohibitive voice serves an important function for organizational health, primarily because such alarming messages place previously undetected problems on the collective agenda to be resolved or prevent problematic initiatives from taking place. In certain organizational settings, prohibitive voice is potentially more impactful than promotive voice because the process of developing innovative ideas and solutions may require substantial time and effort—a luxury that organizations operating in "high-velocity" environments may not be able to afford. In comparison, prohibitive voice calls for stopping harm, thereby preventing the negative effects of "process losses" in a timely manner [Van Dyne and LePine's (1998)].

Employee voice is a complex phenomenon to predict. The study identified three psychological antecedents (psychological safety, felt obligation for constructive change, and organization-based self-esteem) that uniquely and differentially predict supervisory reports of promotive and prohibitive voice behavior. Felt obligation was found to be most strongly related to subsequent promotive voice, while psychological safety was most strongly related to subsequent prohibitive voice. Organization-based self-esteem was reciprocally related to promotive voice. Felt obligation strengthened the positive effect of psychological safety on both forms of voice, while organization-based self-esteem weakened this effect for promotive voice. The study highlights the need for further research to understand the factors that facilitate or inhibit employee voice expression. (Liang, 2012)

Promotive voice, which refers to employees actively suggesting improvements and innovations, can contribute to supervisor-rated employee promotability. Engaging in promotive voice strengthens supervisors' balanced psychological contract with employees, leading to higher ratings of employee promotability. The positive impact of promotive voice on supervisor-rated employee promotability is stronger when the quality of leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship between employees and supervisors is higher. (Chenwei Li, 2022) The concept of promotive and prohibitive ethical voice, which elicit different emotions in co-worker. Promotive ethical voice leads to moral elevation, while prohibitive ethical voice can lead to mixed emotions, including feelings of threat (Anjier Chen 1, 2022)

The study found that prosocial forms of safety citizenship behavior (SCB), specifically safety stewardship, were influenced by affective dimensions of organizational belongingness, such as affective commitment. On the other hand, proactive forms of SCB, specifically safety voice, were more strongly linked to the internalization of safety promotion instances, such as psychological ownership. The findings suggest that promoting a broader safety citizenship orientation among the workforce can be supported by enhancing affective commitment and psychological ownership towards safety management. Conceptual implications result from the study. highlighting the significance of taking into account for both academic research and managerial practice. various SCB dimensions and the factors that underlie them to promote workplace safety. The study investigates the connection between formal voice (Matteo Curcuruto a, 2018) mechanisms and prosocial voices among Korean and Japanese portfolio career workers (PCWs). The study focuses on the mediating function of managers leadership activities related to issues this connection. The results imply that formal voice mechanisms have a favourable impact. The relationship between PCWs prosocial voice and managers issue-related leadership is mediated. actions. Lean team members are positively impacted by top management commitment (TMC) prosocial voice behaviour which boosts productivity and business performance job satisfaction employee capacity and occupational health and safety (OHS). The six. aspects of TMC (involvement, empowerment, encouragement, support, communication and

observation) are essential for encouraging prosocial voice behaviour in lean teams. The study was conducted in two ready-made garment (RMG) factories in Bangladesh, indicating the need for cross-sector and large-scale international quantitative research. This research provides insights into how TMC and Lean problem-solving teams can mobilize employee voice, which is crucial in Lean implementation. (Mohammad Abdul Latif, 2021)

The study found a positive significant effect of cultural environment on employee performance, while there was no effect of physical environment and technological environment on employee performance. The research framework focuses on the effect of employee experience (cultural environments, physical environments, and technological environments) on employee performance (Jefta Harlianto, 2023)

### **Research Gap**

Understanding of employee silence and voice has significantly expanded in recent years, as a result of growing research interest in these phenomena. Yet many questions and issues remain. In this final section, I identify by these literature study that the following questions are need to be addressed. Therefore the objectives of my research are as follows.

1. To ascertain whether the Administrative Authorities' working culture is satisfactory for new employees or not.
2. The aim is to determine the level of satisfaction among employees.
3. Identify how new joiners employee voice impacts organizational performance.
4. Interns and first time employee's communication work best when it's a two-Way Street identify.
5. How does silence impact turnover and job performance?
6. To comprehend and enhance employee sentiment, and suggest measures to boost employee sentiment.
7. How do voice and silence depend on how you get along with your co-workers?
8. Identify the seriousness or urgency of the issues affect unheard voice of Interns and first time employee's.
9. To streamline the factors that affects the growth of new Interns and first time employee's.
10. Identify the factors influencing the unheard voice of new joiners.

These are not just questions that have been insufficiently addressed in existing work, but also questions that I believe to have the most potential for expanding our understanding of unheard voice and silence of new joiners in meaningful ways and for providing guidance to managers who wish to ensure that voice is not being stifled or ignored in their organizations. This review highlights the strong theoretical basis. importance of existing literature compellingly arguing for swift action to address the emphasized problems. In this paper a thorough, qualitative research plan is outlined a crucial step in examining the lived experiences of vulnerable populations to comprehend their difficulties moving from theoretical to empirical understanding evidence the research seeks to understand the mechanisms that underlie voice suppression. exclusion. These results will ultimately enable project teams to foster inclusivity psychologically secure settings in the sector allowing for significant project changes. This paper presents preliminary findings and a framework for our ongoing research on employee voice behaviour. Future publications will provide a comprehensive analysis of the research outcomes, offering insights into the complexities of voice and silence in organizational settings.

### **References**

- [1] Adrian Wilkinson Ying Xu, P. J. (2018). Voices unheard: employee voice in the new century. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* , 711-724 .

- [2] affiliations, B. C. (2005). Starting Confused: How Leaders Start when They Don't Know where to Start. *Sage Journal* , Vol 86.
- [3] affiliations, B. C. (2005). Starting Confused: How Leaders Start When They Don't Know Where to Start. *PDK Article* , VOI 86.
- [4] al, W. e. (2023). Research on Employee Voice Intention: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validation Among Enterprises in China. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management* , 2137-2156.
- [5] Amossé, T. (2016). Employee Expression and Representation at Work: Voice or Exit? *Comparative Workplace Employment Relations*, 61-103.
- [6] Anjier Chen 1, L. K. (2022). Promotive and prohibitive ethical voice: Coworker emotions and support for the voice. *National library of Medicine* .
- [7] Burris, J. R. (2007). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal*, Volume 50 NO. 4.
- [8] Chenwei Li, C. W.-Y. (2022). A Psychological Contract Perspective of Employee Promotive Voice and Promotability. *Academy of management* .
- [9] Craig C. Pinder, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 331-369.
- [10] Detert, J. R. (2001). Implicit Voice Theories: Taken-for-Granted Rules of Self-Censorship at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 461-488.
- [11] E Della Torre, A. G. (2022). Employee Voice: Meanings, Approaches, and Research Directions. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.
- [12] Frances J. Milliken, E. W. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Employee Silence: Issues that Employees Don't Communicate Upward and Why\*. *Journal Management of studies*, 1453-1476.
- [13] Ginsburg1, L. (2015 ). Speaking up' climate: a new domain of culture to measure and explore. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 661-663.
- [14] Gokul Santhanam, D. K. (2020). Plug And Play New Joiners During Pandemic Times: Creating A Sense of Belongingness. *JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL NEGATIVE RESULTS*.
- [15] Harlianto, J. (2008). Promote Employee Experience for Higher Employee Performance. *International journal of profesional business review* .
- [16] James, R. (2020). Newcomers' organizational socialization: the role of co-worker support, organizational support and proactive behaviour. *Journal Business Studies* .
- [17] James, R. (2020). Newcomers' organizational socialization: the role of co-worker support, organizational support and proactive behaviour. *Journal of Business Studies*.
- [18] Jefta Harlianto, r. (2023). Promote Employee Experience for Higher Employee Performance. *International Journal of professional business review* , Vol 8 No. 3.
- [19] Liang, J. F.-L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 71-92.
- [20] Linn Van Dyne, S. A. (2003). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. *Journal management of studies*, 1359-1392.
- [21] Matteo Curcuruto a, M. A. (2018). Prosocial and proactive "safety citizenship behaviour" (SCB): The mediating role of affective commitment and psychological ownership. *Elsevier*, Volume 104 Pages 29-38.
- [22] Milliken, E. W. (2000 ). Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. *Academy of Management*, 706-725.
- [23] Mohammad Abdul Latif, J. V. (2021). Top management commitment and lean team members' prosocial voice behaviour. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma* , 1289-1309.
- [24] Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee Voice and Silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 173-197.
- [25] Paula K. Mowbray1, A. J. (2015). An Integrative Review of Employee Voice: Identifying a Common Conceptualization and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 382-400.
- [26] Sari Rajamäki, L. M. (2021). Membership negotiation in the first workplace – Newcomers' experiences. *Journal of Communication Management*.
- [27] Sheikh Sajid Mohammad, N. A. (2023). Employee Voice: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sage pub* .

- [28] Sivapragasam Panneerselvam, K. B. (2022). Employee experience: the new employee value proposition. *Strategic HR Review*, 1475-4398.
- [29] Tony Dundon, A. W. (2004). The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1149-1170.
- [30] Vanessa Bernauer, A. K. (2022). E-voice in the digitalised workplace. Insights from an alternative organisation. *Human Resource Management Journal* .
- [31] Walanchalee Wattanacharoensil, C. Y. (2012). Thailand's Human Resource Competencies in Airline Service Quality: Voices from the Airline Industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism* , 280-302.
- [32] wilkinson, a. (2011). New times for employee voice. *Human resource management* .
- [33] Yue Zhu, C.-I. Z. (2019). Management Openness and Employee Voice Behavior: An Integrated Perspective of Decision-Making Calculation and Prosocial Motivation. *DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education and Human Science*.
- [34] Adrian Wilkinson Ying Xu, P. J. (2018). Voices unheard: employee voice in the new century. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* , 711-724 .
- [35] affiliations, B. C. (2005). Starting Confused: How Leaders Start when They Don't Know where to Start. *Sage Journal* , Vol 86.
- [36] affiliations, B. C. (2005). Starting Confused: How Leaders Start When They Don't Know Where to Start. *PDK Article* , Vol 86.
- [37] al, W. e. (2023). Research on Employee Voice Intention: Conceptualization, Scale Development, and Validaton Among Enterprises in China. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management* , 2137-2156.
- [38] Amossé, T. (2016). Employee Expression and Representation at Work: Voice or Exit? *Comparative Workplace Employment Relations*, 61-103.
- [39] Anjier Chen 1, L. K. (2022). Promotive and prohibitive ethical voice: Coworker emotions and support for the voice. *National library of Medicine* .
- [40] Burris, J. R. (2007). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal*, Volume 50 NO. 4.
- [41] Chenwei Li, C. W.-Y. (2022). A Psychological Contract Perspective of Employee Promotive Voice and Promotability. *Academy of management* .
- [42] Craig C. Pinder, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 331-369.
- [43] Detert, J. R. (2001). Implicit Voice Theories: Taken-for-Granted Rules of Self-Censorship at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 461-488.
- [44] E Della Torre, A. G. (2022). Employee Voice: Meanings, Approaches, and Research Directions. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.
- [45] Frances J. Milliken, E. W. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Employee Silence: Issues that Employees Don't Communicate Upward and Why\*. *Journal Management of studies*, 1453-1476.
- [46] Ginsburg1, L. (2015 ). Speaking up' climate: a new domain of culture to measure and explore. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 661-663.
- [47] Gokul Santhanam, D. K. (2020). Plug And Play New Joiners During Pandemic Times: Creating A Sense of Belongingness. *JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL NEGATIVE RESULTS*.
- [48] Harlianto, J. (2008). Promote Employee Experience for Higher Employee Performance. *International journal of professional business review* .
- [49] James, R. (2020). Newcomers' organizational socialization: the role of co-worker support, organizational support and proactive behaviour. *Journal Business Studies* .
- [50] James, R. (2020). Newcomers' organizational socialization: the role of co-worker support, organizational support and proactive behaviour. *Journal of Business Studies*.
- [51] Jefta Harlianto, r. (2023). Promote Employee Experience for Higher Employee Performance. *International Journal of professional business review* , Vol 8 No. 3.
- [52] Liang, J. F.-L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 71-92.

- [53] Linn Van Dyne, S. A. (2003). Conceptualizing Employee Silence and Employee Voice as Multidimensional Constructs. *Journal management of studies*, 1359-1392.
- [54] Matteo Curcuruto a, M. A. (2018). Prosocial and proactive “safety citizenship behaviour” (SCB): The mediating role of affective commitment and psychological ownership. *Elsevier*, Volume 104 Pages 29-38.
- [55] Milliken, E. W. (2000 ). Organizational Silence: A Barrier to Change and Development in a Pluralistic World. *Academy of Management*, 706-725.
- [56] Mohammad Abdul Latif, J. V. (2021). Top management commitment and lean team members’ prosocial voice behaviour. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma* , 1289-1309.
- [57] Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee Voice and Silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 173-197.
- [58] Paula K. Mowbray<sup>1</sup>, A. J. (2015). An Integrative Review of Employee Voice: Identifying a Common Conceptualization and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 382-400.
- [59] Sari Rajamäki, L. M. (2021). Membership negotiation in the first workplace – Newcomers' experiences. *Journal of Communication Management*.
- [60] Sheikh Sajid Mohammad, N. A. (2023). Employee Voice: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sage pub* .
- [61] Sivapragasam Panneerselvam, K. B. (2022). Employee experience: the new employee value proposition. *Strategic HR Review*, 1475-4398.
- [62] Tony Dundon, A. W. (2004). The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1149-1170.
- [63] Vanessa Bernauer, A. K. (2022). E-voice in the digitalised workplace. Insights from an alternative organisation. *Human Resource Management Journal* .
- [64] Walanchalee Wattanacharoensil, C. Y. (2012). Thailand's Human Resource Competencies in Airline Service Quality: Voices from the Airline Industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism* , 280-302.
- [65] wilkinson, a. (2011). New times for employee voice. *Human resource management* .
- [66] Yue Zhu, C.-I. Z. (2019). Management Openness and Employee Voice Behavior: An Integrated Perspective of Decision-Making Calculation and Prosocial Motivation. *DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education and Human Science*.