

**How to Cite:**

Amraoui, S., Dridi, A., Kheireddine, D., Reghiss, I., & Hassiba, A. (2024). The effect of participative leadership in reducing the phenomenon of organisational silence in institutions: An exploratory investigation among employees at Biskra's Public Health Institution. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 18(12). 2649–2668. Retrieved from <https://ijeponline.org/index.php/journal/article/view/799>

# **The effect of participative leadership in reducing the phenomenon of organisational silence in institutions: An exploratory investigation among employees at Biskra's Public Health Institution**

**Soumia Amraoui**

The Laboratory of Entrepreneurship, Human Resources Management, and Sustainable Development, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, Blida 2 University, Algeria  
Email: [s.amraoui@univ-blida2.dz](mailto:s.amraoui@univ-blida2.dz)

**Ahlem Dridi**

Laboratory of Economic and Management Sciences, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, Biskra University Algeria  
Email: [ahlem.dridi@univ-biskra.dz](mailto:ahlem.dridi@univ-biskra.dz)

**Djemaa Kheireddine**

Laboratory of Finance, Banking, and Business Management, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, Biskra University, Algeria  
Email: [djemaa.kheireddine@univ-Biskra.dz](mailto:djemaa.kheireddine@univ-Biskra.dz)

**Imadeddine Reghiss**


LAVMF Laboratory, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning, Université of Constantine 3, Algeria  
Email: [Imadeddine.reghiss@univ-constantine3.dz](mailto:Imadeddine.reghiss@univ-constantine3.dz)

**Almi Hassiba**

Laboratory of Economic and Human Development in Algeria (DEHALG), Faculty of Economic Sciences, Commercial, and Management Sciences, Badji Mokhtar – Annaba University, Algeria  
Email: [hassiba.almi@univ-annaba.dz](mailto:hassiba.almi@univ-annaba.dz)

**Abstract**--This research assesses the impact of participative leadership in tackling organisational silence within institutions, focusing on gathering insights from employees at Biskra's Public

---

© 2024 by The Author(s).  ISSN: 1307-1637 International journal of economic perspectives is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

**Corresponding author:** Hassiba, A., Email: [hassiba.almi@univ-annaba.dz](mailto:hassiba.almi@univ-annaba.dz)

Submitted: 05 August 2024, Revised: 16 November 2024, Accepted: 16 December 2024

Health Institution. The research sample included 50 workers, and a descriptive methodology was used to elucidate and examine topics about the study subject. To accomplish this purpose, a questionnaire was used as the primary research instrument, supplemented by using SPSS.V22 for statistical data analysis. The study obtained several results, the most important of which is a moderate level of participative leadership, measured at an average of 3.272. Furthermore, it identified a heightened level of organisational silence among employees in the public health institutions of the local area under examination, with an average value of 3.533. In addition, participative leadership was instrumental in explaining 7.6% of the variations in organisational silence observed within the institutions studied.

**Keywords**---participative leadership, organisational silence, submissive silence, defensive silence, social silence.

## 1. Introduction

Participative leadership is considered one of the most influential modern leadership styles, as it enhances trust between leaders and subordinates. A participative leader values and respects their employees, boosting their self-confidence by involving them in decision-making. This positively impacts their performance and productivity at work, lifts their morale, and consequently contributes to achieving planned objectives.

Employees are the fundamental asset upon which institutions are constructed. Their actions, which are shaped by the dominant organisational atmosphere, differ. Specific individuals may show discontentment with erroneous practises and protocols inside the organisation, but others may choose to remain silent, refraining from complaining against their superiors or colleagues. The absence of communication often is due to weakness of organisational culture and a lack of trust among workers.

Organisational silence pertains to employees' inclination to refrain from discussing organisational issues or withholding their opinions and ideas due to concerns about potential negative consequences for their career progression. This silence leads to a gap between the employees and the institution, making organisational silence a notable hindrance to accomplishing institutional objectives. Therefore, institutions seek to mitigate this negative phenomenon through various measures, including adopting participative leadership as an effective style to improve negative employee behaviours. Considering the above, the study's main question is:

**How does Participative Leadership Influence the Mitigation of Organisational Silence from the Perspective of Employees at Biskra's Public Health Institution?**

From the main question, the following sub-questions emerge:

- What is the extent of Participative Leadership within the workforce at the Public Health Institution in Biskra?
- To what degree does organisational silence exist among these employees?
- How does Participative Leadership influence this institution's various forms of organisational silence?

The fundamental hypothesis of the research is as follows: "Participative leadership impacts organisational silence from the employees' perspective at the Public Health Institution in Biskra."

This leads to the following subsidiary hypotheses:

**H1:** Participative leadership impacts the phenomenon of Submissive silence among these employees.

**H2:** Participative leadership impacts the phenomenon of defensive silence among these employees.

**H3:** Participative leadership impacts the phenomenon of social silence among these employees.

**Objectives of the study:** This study seeks to accomplish the following objectives:

- To assess the degree of participative leadership among workers at the Public Health Institution in Biskra.
- To evaluate the extent of organisational silence among the personnel.
- The objective is to comprehend the influence of Participative leadership on various forms of organisational silence from the viewpoint of the individuals involved.

**Significance of Study:** This study aims to explain and comprehend sides of Participative leadership and organisational silence as seen by workers at the Public Health Institution in Biskra.

Additionally, it offers recommendations to these personnel, which could contribute in resolving the issue of organisational silence.

**Study Methodology:** A descriptive and analytical approach addresses the study's central question and validates or refutes the hypotheses, providing qualitative and quantitative insights into the phenomenon. Qualitative analysis clarifies the phenomenon's characteristics, while quantitative research provides a numerical description, showing its magnitude and correlation with other phenomena.

## 2. Literature review:

A recent research has extensively examined the correlation between various leadership styles and the occurrence of organisational silence. The adoption of participative leadership has emerged as a key element in mitigating the prevalence of silence inside institutions (Dankoski, Bickel, & Gusic, 2014). Combining participative leadership, genuine leadership, and solid corporate identification may combat organisational silence. This collaboration promotes productive reactions to address problems of silence (Monzani, Braun, & Dick, 2016). Highlight ethical leadership's significance in reducing employee quiet, particularly acquiescent silence, and strengthening commitment to change efforts (Bormann & Rowold, 2016). Research supports that ethical leadership is crucial

in diminishing employee quiet and maintaining a commitment to change. Köse and Güçlü (2017) expand upon this discourse by examining the impact of school principals' leadership styles on organisational silence and learning environments within the educational sector.

Several previous studies have addressed the variables of this study, including:

**(Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017):** Focused on participative leadership's role in reducing organisational silence in a cement company, using surveys for data collection.

Objective: To examine the impact of Participative leadership on mitigating organisational silence inside the General Company for Southern Cement.

Approach: A survey was administered to a total of 90 workers.

Results: The presence of leadership, especially participative leadership, may either reduce or worsen organisational quiet. The proposal recommends engaging workers in the process of developing and implementing initiatives to appreciate their ideas and mitigate administrative issues.

**(Al-Subaie, 2019):** An empirical investigation was undertaken to examine the impact of ethical leadership on organisational silence in elementary schools in Kuwait. Surveys were used as the means of gathering data.

Purpose: To investigate ethical leadership's impact on organisational silence among the primary school workforce in Kuwait's Capital Educational District.

Approach: A survey was administered to 170 workers throughout the academic year of 2019-2020.

Results: The level of trust in leaders has a detrimental effect on workers' tendency to remain silent, affecting the overall culture of silence inside the organisation.

**(Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021):** Examined the correlation between transformative leadership and organisational quiet in Palestinian universities in Gaza, using surveys as the means of data acquisition.

Purpose: To examine the correlation between transformative leadership and organisational quiet in Palestinian universities in Gaza (Al-Azhar et al.).

Procedure: The survey was sent to 771 workers, resulting in 209 completed replies.

Findings: The observed universities indicate that there is a negative correlation between transformative leadership and organisational quiet. This implies that improving academic leadership positions may help decrease this issue.

**(Mahdi, 2023)** Explored the impact of toxic leadership behaviours on organisational silence in service directorates in Sohag, Egypt, using surveys for data collection.

Objective: To study the impact of toxic leadership behaviours on organisational silence in service directorates in Sohag, Egypt.

Method: The survey was distributed to employees of 16 directorates, excluding those in auxiliary services, analysing 307 responses.

Findings: Toxic leadership dimensions significantly affect organisational silence, recommending the promotion of work ethics and awareness of employees' rights and duties.

Current Study's Position Relative to Previous Studies: The present study shares similarities with previous ones in its descriptive and analytical approach, surveys,

and focus on participative leadership. However, it differs in its sample (employees of the Public Health Institution in Biskra) and its specific focus on participative leadership and its impact on organisational silence, with a detailed study model incorporating three dimensions of silence (submissive, defensive, and social).

**Similarities:**

**Methodology:** Like previous studies, this research adopts a descriptive and analytical approach, utilizing surveys analysed via SPSS software.

**Focus:** Similar to (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017), this study focuses on participative leadership.

**Differences:**

**Subject Samples:** Vary across studies, with (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017) focusing on a cement company, (Al-Subaie, 2019) on primary schools in Kuwait, (Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021) on Palestinian universities, and (Mahdi, 2023) on service directorates in Sohag. Our study targets employees at the Public Health Institution in Biskra.

**Model Construction:** This study uniquely focuses on participative leadership as the independent variable and organisational silence, including its three dimensions (submissive, defensive, social), as the dependent variable. Other studies have varied in their focus, such as ethical leadership, transformational leadership, and toxic leadership, alongside organisational silence and its different dimensions.

### **3. The Theoretical Framework of the Study:**

#### **3.1. Participative Leadership:**

Shared or participative leadership is a modern leadership style that emerged in the late 1990s, focusing on involving individuals in decision-making and delegating certain authorities to them. This approach enables them to perform their tasks efficiently and effectively (Al-Sheyyab, 2023, p. 38).

##### **3.1.1. Definition of Participative Leadership:**

Historically, participative leadership has been practised since ancient times. In the era of Islam, Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) implemented this style of leadership with his companions, as consultation (Shura) is a fundamental pillar of leadership in Islam, as stated in the Holy Quran (Surah Al-Imran, p.159). The concept of Participative leadership has been linked with industrial democracy by Rockefeller, described as "a process where management and workers jointly plan industrial operations, thereby preventing disputes between employers and employees and providing opportunities for workers who exhibit judicious governance, transparency, prompt responsiveness, and efficiency in participating in decision-making, thus fostering a sense of responsibility among them."(Alhamdany, 2021, p. 114). Participative leadership is "involving workers in the decision-making process, discussing problems, and developing solutions."(Ghediri & Boussalem, 2023, p. 166)

Furthermore, it is characterized as "a style emanating from the democratic leadership model, based on respecting individual personalities and their involvement in decision-making and work management through delegating certain leadership tasks" (Habi & Quajja, 2021, p. 963), which aligns with the responsibilities granted to them, ultimately leading to the achievement of both institutional and subordinate goals simultaneously (Kodifa & Hamami, 2023, p. 5).

Participative leadership is a leadership style characterised by collaboration and reciprocal influence, where team members jointly strive towards achieving a shared aim. (Mayer, Sivatheerthan, Mütze-Niewöhner, & Nitsch, 2023, p. 93). This leadership style is linked to empowering leadership and interdependence (Fausing, Joensson, Lewandowski, & Bligh, 2015, p. 272). The research done by Han et al. (2021) found that Participative leadership, which focuses on building relationships, has a positive impact on team performance via the enhancement of team psychological capital. In contrast, a task-oriented participative leadership style impacted negatively on team performance, and team psychological capital does not act as a mediator in this regard (Han, Yoon, Choi, & Hong, 2021, p. 594). In addition, Cakiroglu et al. (2020) proposed that military organisations may adopt the participative leadership model inside their research and planning teams (Cakiroglu, Caetano, & Costa, 2020, p. 303). In addition, Ishikawa (2012) highlighted the importance of collaborative leadership in R&D teams. (Ishikawa, 2012, p. 266).

From these definitions, we can present a comprehensive definition of participative leadership as that leadership style which relies on involving workers in the decision-making process through delegating certain authorities to achieve the outlined objectives.

### **3.1.2. The Importance of Participative Leadership:**

Participative leadership holds great importance for the following reasons (Ghediri & Boussalem, 2023, pp. 167-168)

- It contributes to the decision-making process, improves the quality of decisions, and makes them more acceptable and relatable to organisational employees (Al-Amiri & Al-Yahmadi, 2023, p. 8).
- It achieves desired goals with minimal cost.
- It enhances the morale of employees and improves their performance level.
- It creates a positive work environment.
- It fosters employee initiative and creativity (Al Tall & AL-Azzam, 2023, p. 69).
- It empowers employees and boosts their self-confidence.
- It improves human relations between superiors and subordinates.
- It aids in enhancing productivity and devising effective strategic plans.
- It encourages subordinates to self-develop and provides opportunities for professional growth and career advancement.

### 3.1.3. Dimensions of Participative Leadership:

The following are the dimensions of Participative leadership (Ghediri & Boussalem, 2023, p. 37):

**A- Human Relations:** Participative leadership provides a psychological atmosphere and suitable climate that motivates subordinates to exert their utmost effort and energy to achieve the highest performance levels. It also balances subordinates' interests and desires with the organisation's interests. Participative leaders are tolerant and open in their interactions with employees, treating them with respect and appreciation and focusing on interpersonal interactions and socialisation.

**B- Delegation of Authority:** This involves the leader transferring the decision-making authority to subordinates. Delegation is part of the participative decision process, where subordinates are granted authority for a specific purpose. It aims to utilise the capabilities of subordinates and enhance opportunities for experienced individuals to consult with them, seek their suggestions, and consider their ideas before making decisions. This allows them the opportunity to discuss issues related to problem-solving before finalising decisions. The Participative leader shares duties with subordinates by delegating a part of them and involving them in the stages of preparation, decision-making, and execution.

**C- Sharing Information and Decision-Making:** Participative leaders emphasise involving subordinates in sharing information and making decisions. The prevailing culture in the organisation is collaborative and participative, based on delegating some tasks and responsibilities to develop employees and ensuring good communication between leaders and subordinates.

## 3.2. Organisational Silence:

### 3.2.1. Definition of Organisational Silence:

Organisational silence is "the tendency of subordinates in organisations to avoid providing information and suggestions to their superiors or reporting problems, fearing negative reactions or unsatisfactory outcomes that may ensue." (Al-Dhafeeri & Al-Saidiya, 2020, p. 383). It can also be defined as "the behaviour consciously practised by employees, where they conceal their views, thoughts, and knowledge about work-related issues, thereby not sharing this knowledge with their colleagues and managers." (Al-Subaie, 2019, p. 404).

Additionally, organisational silence is understood as "the inclination of employees not to share their knowledge, ideas, suggestions, and experiences with management on matters concerning the development of the work environment, for various reasons they believe have negative repercussions" (Al-Romeedy & Mohamed, 2021, p. 8) and (Brechan & Dylan, 2023, p. 240).

Organisational silence is the deliberate act of workers inside an organisation choosing not to share their thoughts, facts, or concerns. The issue described has been identified as an obstacle to implementing and advancing organisational

transformation (Morrison & Milliken, 2000, p. 708). Information hoarding refers to the intentional behaviour of workers withholding their information and suggestions about administrative matters, potentially enhancing the organisation (Yalçın, Baykal, & Türkmen, 2021, p. 4). Organisational silence has been associated with impeding organisational transformation and suppressing actions to enhance organisational performance (Zubaidah & Sambasivan, 2019, p. 2). Furthermore, it is linked to a culture of apprehension inside the company, where individuals may withhold information owing to anticipated risks or consequences (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005, p. 443). Furthermore, organisational silence pertains to the conscious choice made by employees to refrain from sharing their knowledge and opinions on company affairs (Akin & Ulusoy, 2016, p. 3).

Organisational silence has attracted significant interest in several fields, including healthcare, education, and corporate management. Prior studies have investigated the impact of burnout on the well-being of employees, specifically focusing on academics (Akin & Ulusoy, 2016, p. 4). Furthermore, studies have examined the impact of organisational silence on employee conduct, particularly concerning disengagement and inefficient work output. (Yalçın, Baykal, & Türkmen, 2021, p. 5). The study done by Sun and Hong-sheng (2018) examined the correlation between organisational silence and organisational identity, as well as its impact on employee silence.

Organisational silence is a multifaceted concept encompassing the intentional suppression of knowledge, the apprehension of adverse outcomes, and its impact on the organisation's dynamics and workers' welfare. Understanding and addressing organisational silence is crucial for promoting open communication, fostering a positive organisational environment, and facilitating meaningful organisational change.

### **3.2.2. Causes of Organisational Silence:**

The causes of organisational silence may be categorized into two main factors: organisational-administrative and individual-personal reasons (Al-Salibi, 2019, pp. 17-20).

**A- Organisational-Administrative Factors:** Some of the most notable reasons include:

**Lack of solid backing from top-level executives:** Employee confidence in top management significantly diminishes their apprehension about discussing work-related matters (Mahdi, 2023, p. 11). Conversely, a deficiency in trust towards higher-level executives amplifies sensations of ambiguity.

**Continuous negative feedback from supervisors:** When an employee's suggestion is met with rejection and negative feedback by a supervisor, organisational silence becomes more prevalent within the organisation.

**Unspoken set of beliefs:** Managers often keep implicit regarding matters concerning employees.

**Deteriorating organisational climate:** An uncomfortable organisational climate leads to poor communication among employees, misunderstandings, loss of interest in teamwork, and thus prevailing organisational silence.

**B- Individual-Personal Reasons:** Among these are:

**Lack of trust:** The trust deficit between the leader and the subordinate results in organisational silence, mostly caused by the subordinates' restricted involvement in decision-making, which arises from the leaders' fear of getting unfavourable criticism. The perception among lower-ranking individuals that expressing dissenting views against the organisation's instructions may result in retribution leads to a state of quiet to avoid confrontation (Sadfi & khathiri, 2021, p. 409).

**Fear of adverse reactions:** The subordinates fear receiving negative feedback from superiors and colleagues.

**Isolation:** An individual's psychological and physical distancing from the necessary or desired network of relationships with colleagues leads to the employee's silence about their suggestions.

**Lack of experience:** Inexperienced employees often feel that their position does not allow them to voice their opinions, fearing that their views will be rejected or ignored.

**Conflict of goals and interests:** Each party's desire to gain at the expense of the other leads them to refrain from providing information and suggestions.

**3.2.3. Dimensions of Organisational Silence:** The following are the dimensions of organisational silence (Nian , Jalal , & Nikar , 2020, p. 310)

**A- Submissive Silence:** Submissive silence is characterized by extreme passivity, driven by a culture of submission (Harouz & Bloom, 2021, p. 167). It is the first form of silence, where individuals withhold ideas, information, or opinions about organisational issues, often out of a desire for disengagement or resignation (Hosni, 2021, p. 981). This kind of silence is equivalent to workers who are inherently disengaged and resistant to initiating change. These employees exhibit disengagement with the organisation, demonstrate acceptance of the current conditions, and have a diminished willingness to attempt change, which often results in a lack of collaboration among workers.

**B- Defensive Silence:** They are referred to be workers who deliberately withhold ideas, facts, and opinions pertaining to work as a means of safeguarding themselves from potential adverse personal repercussions that may arise from expressing their views. It is a strategic and precautionary measure used to safeguard personal interests or prevent public disagreement with others (Naroura & Tee , 2020, p. 503). Defensive quiet, in contrast to submissive silence, is characterised by a proactive mindset that takes into account future personal advantages (Hussein , Hammad, & Hazza, 2023, p. 124), subsequently, a deliberate choice is made to refrain from sharing ideas and facts as the most effective and distinct approach.

**C- Social Silence:** This is a deliberate, intentional, and targeted behaviour focusing on others by withholding work-related information, ideas, and opinions, motivated by altruism and cooperation (Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021, p. 178). Social silence also occurs in cases of protecting a colleague at work or the organisation itself.

Positive social silence refers to the intentional act of refraining from sharing work-related information for the greater good of others, including the organisation. This

atypical and forward-thinking behaviour generally centres on others, stemming from a genuine care for their well-being rather than a fear of bad repercussions for oneself. It entails the non-disclosure of information to safeguard its secrecy and prevent unauthorised access by undesired third parties. Another rationale for avoiding disclosing information arises when an employee is in an inappropriate role to engage in discussions about such information.

### **3.3. The Relationship Between Participative Leadership and Organisational Silence:**

The organisational policy of a leader directly impacts the organisational climate and individual attitudes toward work. Thus, leadership directly influences organisational silence to varying degrees. Organisational silence consists of three essential aspects: personal employee relationships, corporate relationships, and organisational culture. From an individual perspective, when an employee perceives the executive leadership negatively, it can lead to anxiety or withdrawn or introverted employee behaviour, enhancing job awareness and self-protection, which results in defensive silence. Additionally, a leader's care and attention towards employees reflect significant effects, influencing the extent of employee satisfaction and motivation towards work, which may cause submissive silence. On the aspect of organisational culture, a leader's self-interest can promote a selfish culture, preventing an employee from sharing information with the leader or colleagues and causing social silence.

During the job design process, a leader focuses on the hierarchical sequence of knowledge transfer, which involves the upward flow of information from workers to top management. This information is then used to effectively address and resolve organisational challenges. Hence, the first phase in the design process entails the top-level executives comprehending the essence of organisational silence and its detriments as seen by the workers. It is crucial to tackle workers' apprehension about expressing their opinions and engaging in proposing ideas. Leaders must inspire and encourage staff to openly share their thoughts, so addressing the issue of organisational silence and its resulting repercussions (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017, p. 152).

## **4. Methodological Framework of the Study:**

### **4.1. Research Community and Sample:**

The study population comprises employees of the Public Health Institution in Biskra, totalling 50 individuals. We distributed 50 questionnaires, and 33 were returned and valid for statistical analysis.

### **4.2. Research Tool:**

After reviewing numerous studies related to the subject, we designed a questionnaire to achieve the desired objectives of this research. The questionnaire is divided into two sections:

**The first section** pertains to general data about the research sample and consists of four paragraphs.

**The second section** is divided into two parts. The first is dedicated to participative leadership and includes 11 statements. On the other hand, the second part concerns organisational silence and its various dimensions, including 21 statements. A Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 was adopted for responses, where a score closer to 5 indicates a more substantial agreement with the statement.

#### 4.3. Characteristics of the Research Sample:

The various personal characteristics of the sample members are elucidated in the following table:

Table1. Distribution of Research Sample Members According to Their Data

Personal and Professional Variables		Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	Male	14	42.4%
	Female	19	57.6%
<b>Age</b>	Under 30	5	15.2%
	30 to under 40	12	36.4%
	40 to under 50	10	30.3%
	50 and over	6	18.2%
<b>Educational Level</b>	Secondary or less	6	18.2%
	Bachelor's	5	15.2%
	Master's	17	51.5%
	PhD	3	9.1%
	Other certification	2	6.1%
<b>Years of Experience</b>	Five years or less	11	33.3%
	6-10 years	4	12.1%
	11-15 years	8	24.2%
	16 years and more	10	30.3%
<b>Total</b>		33	100%

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers based on SPSS.V22

From the above table, we observe that the percentage of females in the sample is higher than that of males, with females constituting 57.6% and males 42.4%. This difference is generally observed in public health institutions in Biskra, where females are more prevalent. Consequently, the majority of employees in these institutions are female, explaining why the most significant number of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra are females.

Regarding age, the largest group of respondents is between 30 and under 40 years, comprising 36.4%, the most active and vibrant age group. This is followed by the age group of 40 to under 50 years at 30.3% and 18.2% for those aged 50 years and over. The smallest percentage, 15.2%, is for those under 30 years. This indicates that the most significant portion of the research sample is young, characterized by vitality and enthusiasm in their work.

Regarding educational level, the largest category among the respondents is those with a Master's degree at 51.5%, indicating that most of the research sample has a high educational level. 18.2% have secondary education or less, 15.2% have a Bachelor's degree, 9.1% have a Ph.D., and a small percentage, 6.1%, have other certifications. This suggests that the public health institutions in Biskra place importance on the educational level of their employees, as demonstrated by the most significant proportion of the research sample having a Master's degree.

Regarding years of experience, the most significant number of respondents, 33.3%, have five years of experience or less. This is followed by those with 16 years or more of experience, making up 30.3%, indicating that these institutions value and retain experienced workers. 24.2% have 11 to 15 years of experience, and the least represented group, with 12.1%, has 6 to 10 years of experience.

#### 4.4. Reliability and Validity of the Research Tool

**Reliability of the Research Tool:** The study instrument's dependability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which determines the acceptable level of a measurement tool at 0.60 or higher. The results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 2. Results of Reliability and Validity Coefficients

Axis	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient	Validity Coefficient
<b>Participative Leadership</b>	11	0.900	0.948
<b>Organisational Silence</b>	21	0.911	0.954
<b>Overall Questionnaire</b>	32	0.911	0.954

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers using SPSS.V22

This table shows that the research tool's internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) reached a value of 0.911, which is high and suitable for research purposes. The values for the research variables were also high and appropriate for this research, with Cronbach's alpha for the participative leadership dimension at 0.900 and 0.911 for the organisational silence dimension. This indicates that the questionnaire is reliable and would yield the same results if used or repeated under similar conditions.

**Validity of the Research Tool:** The validity coefficient was calculated by taking the square root of Cronbach's alpha coefficient, (Table N. (02)). The overall validity coefficient for the research tool reached 0.954, indicating high validity and suitability for the objectives of this research. This is supported by the high validity coefficients for the research dimensions, with the validity coefficient for the participative leadership dimension at 0.948 and 0.954 for the organisational silence dimension. Hence, all the questionnaire items are valid for what they were intended to measure.

## 5. Results and Discussion

### 5.1. Analysis of the Questionnaire's Dimensions:

Analysis of the Participative Leadership Dimension:

To understand the respondents' attitudes towards participative leadership, the statements measuring this dimension were analysed to answer the following question: "What is the level of participative leadership among employees of the studied institutions in Biskra?" The results are detailed in the following table:

Table 3. Analysis Results of Respondents' Attitudes Towards Participative Leadership

Axis	Mean	Standard Deviation	Level
Participative Leadership	3.272	0.879	Medium

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers using SPSS.V22

From the table, we note that the level of participative leadership among employees of the public health institutions in Biskra is of medium significance as perceived by the research sample. The mean score for responses in this dimension is 3.272, with a standard deviation of 0.879. This average falls within the third level of the five-point Likert scale (2.60 -3.39), indicating that opinions lean towards a medium level.

Despite the importance of participative leadership in achieving better results through exchanging information and knowledge that improves work quality and services provided, the studied institutions still need to adopt the participative leadership style. The relationships among some individuals are characterized by limitation and lack of collaboration, with leadership primarily held by the chief or manager. The rest of the employees perform their duties according to their leader's dictates, resulting in limited participation in decision-making processes and in proposing ideas that could effectively solve problems and improve work. Nevertheless, the participative leadership process is present to a moderate extent in the institutions.

### Analysis of the Organisational Silence Dimension:

To understand the respondents' attitudes towards organisational silence, the statements measuring each aspect of this dimension were analysed to answer the question: "What is the level of organisational silence among employees of the studied institutions in Biskra?" The results are shown in the following table:

Table 4. Analysis Results of Respondents' Attitudes Towards Organisational Silence

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Relative Importance</b>	<b>Level</b>
<b>Submissive Silence</b>	3.043	0.898	03	Medium
<b>Defensive Silence</b>	3.515	0.990	02	High
<b>Social Silence</b>	4.043	0.894	01	High
<b>Organisational Silence</b>	3.533	0.743	/	High

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers using SPSS.V22

From the table, we observe that the level of organisational silence among employees of public health institutions in Biskra is high, based on the relative importance given by the research sample. The mean score for this dimension is 3.533 with a standard deviation of 0.743, which falls within the fourth level of the five-point Likert scale (3.40-4.19), indicating that opinions lean towards a high level. The sample members exhibit an increased tendency towards organisational silence behaviour, suggesting a reluctance to disclose ideas and proposals in any form, despite some wanting to express their thoughts and suggestions beneficial to the institution.

Social Silence ranks first in relative importance as given by the sample members, with a mean score of 4.043 and a standard deviation of 0.894, falling within the fourth level of the Likert scale (3.40-4.19). This indicates a high level of social silence, where members prefer silence in many situations and refrain from disclosing information to protect its confidentiality or because they are in an unsuitable position to discuss such details.

Defensive Silence comes second in relative importance, with a mean score of 3.515 and a standard deviation of 0.990, also within the high range of the Likert scale. This suggests that the sample members adopt defensive silence to protect themselves from threats that may arise from expressing their ideas, fearing the consequences and potential problems.

Submissive Silence is third in relative importance, with a mean score of 3.043 and a standard deviation of 0.898, indicating a medium level of submissive silence. This reflects a moderate acceptance of submissive silence among the sample members due to a lack of interest or connection with the institution, acceptance of circumstances as they are, and a reduced desire to exert effort for change compared to their colleagues.

## **5.2. Hypothesis Testing and Interpretation**

To validate the model for testing the hypothesis of a statistically significant impact of participative leadership on addressing organisational silence from the perspective of employees in the studied institutions in Biskra, analysis of variance for regression was used as shown in the following table:

Table 5. Regression Variance Analysis Results to Test the Main Hypothesis

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squares	F Calculated	Significance Level of F
<b>Regression</b>	1.877	1	1.877	2.879	0.007
<b>Error</b>	22.850	31	0.737		
<b>Total</b>	24.727	32			

Statistically significant at the significance level (0.05)

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers using SPSS.V22

From the results in the table, the model's validity for testing the central hypothesis is confirmed, with the calculated F-value of 2.879 and a probability value of 0.007, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. Based on this, we can test the main and sub-hypotheses using simple linear regression. The results can be clarified in the following table:

Table 6. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results for the Impact of Participative Leadership on Organisational Silence

Independent Variable Dimensions	(B)	Beta	(T)	Significance Level	Correlation Coefficient	Determination Coefficient
<b>Submissive Silence</b>	0.882	0.152	0.728	0.000	0.152	0.023
<b>Defensive Silence</b>	0.817	0.402	5.987	0.001	0.402	0.162
<b>Social Silence</b>	0.889	0.089	0.249	0.000	0.089	0.008
<b>Participative Leadership</b>	0.858	0.276	2.547	0.007	0.276	0.076

Statistically significant at the significance level (0.05)

**Source:** Prepared by the researchers using SPSS.V22

From this table, the following is evident:

There is a statistically significant impact at the 0.05 level of participative leadership on organisational silence in public health institutions in Biskra. This is supported by a calculated T-value of 2.547 at a significance level of 0.007, less than 0.05. There is an acceptable correlation between the variables at 27.6%, with participative leadership explaining 7.6% of the variance in organisational silence. Other factors not included in the model account for the remainder, representing a relatively acceptable explanatory power.

Participative leadership has a statistically significant impact on reducing submissive silence, as indicated by a calculated T-value of 0.728 at a significance level of 0.000, less than 0.05. The correlation between the variables is modest at 15.2%, with participative leadership explaining 2.3% of the variance in submissive silence, representing a relatively modest explanatory power.

There is a statistically significant impact of participative leadership on addressing defensive silence, as indicated by a calculated T-value of 5.987 at a significance level of 0.001, less than 0.05. The correlation between the variables is moderate at 40.2%, with participative leadership explaining 16.2% of the variance in defensive silence, representing a relatively acceptable explanatory power.

Participative leadership has a statistically significant impact on addressing social silence, as indicated by a calculated T-value of 0.249 at a significance level of 0.000, less than 0.05. The correlation between the variables is modest at 8.9%, with participative leadership explaining 8% of the variance in social silence, representing a relatively modest explanatory power.

These results suggest that participative leadership impacts addressing organisational silence in public health institutions in Biskra, but it is less extensive than required. The results indicate a lack of adequate means and suitable conditions for participative leadership to address organisational silence effectively. The limited impact is due to a need for sufficient awareness among employees about the significant role of participative leadership in addressing organisational silence. While participative leadership has the most significant impact on addressing defensive silence, it also impacts submissive and social silence, albeit to a lesser extent. In conclusion, participative leadership is present in public health institutions in Biskra and contributes to addressing organisational silence, but more is needed and extensive.

### **5.3. Results of the Study and Their Interpretation:**

The results of the study can be summarized as follows:

#### **Comparison with Previous Studies:**

This study aligns with the findings of (Al-Salibi, 2019), (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017), (Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021), and (Mahdi, 2023) in terms of identifying the impact of various leadership styles on reducing organisational silence in the studied institutions. However, our study differs regarding the independent variable, participative leadership, where it found a medium level of participative leadership compared to the (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017) findings of a low level and (Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021) conclusion of a high level of transformational leadership. Regarding the dependent variable, organisational silence, our study found a high level. In contrast, (Al-Enezi & Al-Atwi, 2017) concluded that a medium level, and (Salama & Al-Sufi, 2021) found a low level.

#### **Unique Findings of Our Study:**

Our study revealed a medium level of participative leadership from the perspective of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra. Despite the importance of participative leadership in achieving better outcomes through exchanging information and knowledge that improves work quality and services, these institutions need to adopt participative leadership more extensively. Limitations and a lack of collaboration characterize relationships among some individuals. Leaders or managers oversee operations, and employees carry out their work as directed by their leaders. This leads to limited involvement in decision-making and idea generation, even though participative leadership is present to a moderate extent.

The study found a high level of organisational silence in its three dimensions (submissive, defensive, and social silence). Social silence ranked highest, indicating that respondents extensively adopt this behaviour, preferring silence in many situations to protect confidentiality or because they are in an unsuitable position to discuss such information. Defensive silence ranked second, reflecting a high level of behaviour adopted to defend against threats when expressing ideas and fear of resultant consequences. Submissive silence ranked last, indicating a moderate level of behaviour adopted due to a lack of interest or connection with the institution and acceptance of circumstances as they are, with a reduced desire to exert effort for change.

In conclusion, the public health institutions in Biskra exhibit participative leadership that addresses organisational silence but needs to be more extensive and effective.

## **6. Conclusion:**

Participative leadership is considered one of the tools contributing to addressing organisational silence in institutions, and it has an impact, albeit not widely practised within the institutions studied in Biskra. Nevertheless, we observed a noticeable and acceptable impact of participative leadership on one of the studied dimensions: defensive silence. This implies an adequate contribution of participative leadership to addressing organisational silence from the perspective of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra.

Through our field study in these institutions, we have found the following:  
According to the research scale, participants' perceptions of the level of participative leadership from the perspective of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra tended toward a medium level.  
According to the research scale, participants' perceptions of the level of organisational silence from the perspective of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra tended toward a high level.  
The existence of participative leadership's impact on reducing organisational silence from the perspective of employees in the public health institutions in Biskra, with participative leadership affecting submissive silence, defensive silence, and social silence.

Based on our findings, we can provide several recommendations:  
Raise awareness of the importance of participative leadership in the institutions studied to reduce the phenomenon of organisational silence.  
Adopt policies that involve employees in decision-making processes to bridge the gap between employees and the institution.  
Strengthen relationships between supervisors and employees to promote participative leadership and create an open dialogue for exchanging ideas between leaders and subordinates without fear of consequences. This will enhance the effectiveness of participative leadership in addressing organisational silence.

## 7. Bibliography List

- Akin, U., & Ulusoy, T. (2016). The relationship between organisational silence and burnout among academicians: research on universities in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v5n2p46>.
- Al Tall, H., & AL-Azzam, S. (2023). "The impact of participative leadership on the performance of Asir region municipality employees during the Covid-19 pandemic". *HSS*, vol. 20, no. 2.
- Al-Amiri, B. H., & Al-Yahmadi, H. (2023). The reality of participative leadership and its relationship to the effectiveness of decision-making among post-basic education school principals in Muscat Governorate from the teachers' point of view. *Educational Sciences*, 31(1), 1-20.
- Al-Dhafeeri, S. B., & Al-Saidiya, D. B. (2020). Organisational silence and its relationship to organisational justice among employees in schools in the Sultanate of Oman. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, vol. 21, 373-401.
- Al-Enezi, A. K., & Al-Atwi, M. H. (2017). The role of participative leadership in reducing organisational silence: an applied study in the General Company for Southern Cement. *Al-Qadisiyah Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, vol. 19, 144-160.
- Alhamdany, W. A. (2021). The interaction between participative leadership practices and perceived behavioral integrity and their impact on fighting deviant work behavior: an applied study on a sample of administrative leaders in private commercial banks in Sulaimani City in Iraq. *Journal of Economic, Administrative and Legal Sciences*, 5(18). <https://doi.org/10.26389/ajsrp.r070221>, 133-109.
- Al-Romeedy, B., & Mohamed, S. (2021). The impact of organisational health on organisational silence within tourism education institutions. *Journal of the College of Tourism and Hotels*, Volume 5, Issue 2.
- Al-Salibi, R. S. (2019). The role of organisational silence in the creative behavior of members of the Marine Police Service, *Majester's thesis*. Gaza, Department of Leadership and Management, Palastine: Al-Aqsa University -.
- Al-Sheyab, S. (2023). The Extent of School Principals' Practice of Participative Leadership from the Teachers' Perspective in Al-Jizah District. *Al-Balqa Journal for Research and Studies*, Volume 25, Special Issue.
- Al-Subaie, T. M. (2019). Ethical leadership and its impact on organisational silence among workers in primary schools in Kuwait, the Capital Educational District as an example. *Journal of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Hurghada, South Valley University*, 2(4), 394-422.
- Bormann, k., & Rowold, J. (2016). Ethical leadership's potential and boundaries in organisational change: a moderated mediation model of employee silence. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung*, 30(3-4), 225-245.
- Brechan, M. J., & Dylan, M. H. (2023). Analysis of the reality of the ethical climate and its role in reducing organisational silence - an analytical study of the opinions of heads of scientific departments in a sample of private university colleges in the city of Erbil/Kurdistan Region of Iraq. *Scientific Journal of Cihan University - Sulaymaniyah*, Volume 7, Issue 1.
- Cakiroglu, S. S., Caetano, A., & Costa, P. (2020). How do mid-senior multinational officers perceive shared leadership for military teams? A

- qualitative study. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 26(5/6), 301-318.
- Dankoski, M. E., Bickel, J., & Gusic, M. E. (2014). Discussing the undiscussable with the powerful. *Academic Medicine*, 89(12), 1610-1613.
- Fausing, M. S., Joensson, T., Lewandowski, J., & Bligh, M. C. (2015). Antecedents of shared leadership: empowering leadership and interdependence. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 36(3), 271-291.
- Ghediri, D., & Boussalem, A. (2023). The Impact Of Participative Leadership And Employee Empowerment On Organisational Cynicism In Light Of The Mediating Role Of Civic Virtue Using The (sem-pls) Method - A Case Study Of The Faculty Of Letters And Languages At Jijel University -. *Journal of Business Administration and Economic Studies*.
- Habi, S., & Quajja, R. (2021). Participative leadership in light of the running stages of the Algerian economic establishment "Socio-economic vision. " *Al Mieyar*.
- Han, J., Yoon, J., Choi, W., & Hong, G. (2021). The effects of shared leadership on team performance. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 42(4), 593-605.
- Harouz, F. A., & Bloom, A. (2021). Organisational silence: according to a socio-organisational perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences, Volume 15, Issue 2*.
- Hosni, M. S. (2021). The mediating role of organisational commitment in the relationship between the dimensions of organisational silence and organisational citizenship in public institutions - a field study on government pharmaceutical sector companies in Cairo Governorate. *Journal of Financial and Commercial Research, Volume 22, Issue 3*.
- Hussein , H. M., Hammad, A., & Hazza, S. D. (2023). Hussein Hashem Muhammad Ali, M., Adel Hammad, A., & Samir Hazza, D. Organisational silence and its impact on the performance of employees in tourism companies in Iraq. *Journal of the College of Tourism and Hotels. Mansoura University*, 13(13), 107-176.
- Ishikawa, J. (2012). Transformational leadership and gatekeeping leadership: the norm for maintaining consensus and shared leadership in team performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 29(2), 265-283.
- Kodifa, M., & Hamami, F. (2023). Participative leadership and investment in human capital. *The Journal of "El Hiwar El Thakafi*.
- Köse, E. K., & Güçlü, N. (2017). Examining the relationship between leadership styles of school principals, organisational silence, and organisational learning. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*.
- Mahdi, M. (2023). Toxic leadership behaviors and their impact on organisational silence behavior - a field study. *Journal of Administrative Research, Volume 41, Issue 2*.
- Mayer, C., Sivatheerthan, T., Mütze-Niewöhner, S., & Nitsch, V. (2023). Sharing leadership behaviors in virtual teams: effects of shared leadership behaviors on team member satisfaction and productivity. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 29(1/2), 90-112.
- Monzani, L., Braun, S., & Dick, R. V. (2016). It takes two to tango: the interactive effect of authentic leadership and organisational identification on employee silence intentions. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung*, 30(3-4), 246-266.

- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organisational silence: a barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725.
- Naroura, A., & Tee, A. (2020). The impact of organisational silence on the dimensions of organisational citizenship behavior in an economic institution: a field study at the National Social Security Fund Agency for Wage Workers in the Valley (CNAS). *Collections of knowledge*, vol. 6, 497-513.
- Nian, K. R., Jalal , A. M., & Nikar , A. M. (2020). The role of organisational trust in reducing the manifestations of organisational silence Analytical study of the opinions of a sample of teachers and technicians at the Sulaymaniyah Technical Institute. *SJCUS Vol 4- Issue 1*.
- Sadfi, D., & khathiri, M. (2021). The impact of job security on organisational silence in Algerian public institutions - a case study for the University of Khemis Miliana employees. *revue administration et développement pour les recherches et les études*.
- Salama, A. A., & Al-Sufi, A. S. (2021). Transformational leadership and its relationship to organisational silence behavior in Palestinian universities in the Gaza Strip. *Journal of Economic and Financial Research*, Volume 8, Issue 1.
- Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: an empirical investigation. *Employee Relations*, 27(5), 441-458.
- Yalçın, B., Baykal, Ü., & Türkmen, E. (2021). Why do nurses choose to stay silent?: A qualitative study. *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 28(1).
- Zubaidah , M. A., & Sambasivan, M. (2019). A review on counterproductive work behavior (cwb) and even coping strategy model amongst flight attendants. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(10).