

THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL FAVORITISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL EXCLUSION ON ORGANIZATIONAL SILENCE

Sesil DEREBOYLULAR
230609403@std.akun.edu.tr

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azmiye YINAL
azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to examine the effects of organizational favoritism and organizational exclusion on organizational silence. The study was designed and implemented as a quantitative research. The population of the study consists of individuals residing in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) and working in the private sector. The sample of the study was determined as 388 people. In the study, survey method was preferred to measure the effect of organizational favoritism and exclusion on organizational silence. Data analysis was carried out using SPSS 26 program and the results were evaluated with statistical methods.

As a result of the research, it was determined that organizational favoritism and exclusion have significant effects on organizational silence. It has been determined that organizational exclusion does not differ according to demographic variables in general, but there are significant differences in the Accepting Silence dimension depending on age and education level. Participants in the middle age group and those with low educational level have higher perceptions in this dimension. Organizational favoritism, especially in promotion and recruitment processes, stood out as the strongest factors that increase organizational silence. While the effect of favoritism in the process was found to be limited, organizational exclusion was found to have a significant effect on accepting silence. These findings suggest that perceptions of organizational justice and nepotism directly affect employees' silence behaviors.

Key Words: Organizational Nepotism, Exclusion, Organizational Exclusion, Silence, Organizational Silence

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem Status

Organizational favoritism is the situation in which individuals or groups within an organization are treated in a privileged manner, regardless of merit, usually based on factors such as personal, family, ethnic or political connections. Such an approach usually leads to injustice in decision-making processes, distrust among employees and loss of motivation. Organizational favoritism can occur in processes such as recruitment, promotion, reward or task distribution. This situation can negatively affect organizational efficiency and corporate reputation, causing serious problems in the long term (Yıldırım and Tokgöz, 2020) . Especially in cases where ethical values are violated, it can cause conflicts within the organization and a decrease in employee loyalty. In order to prevent organizational favoritism, it is important to adopt a transparent management approach, develop decision-making processes based on merit and strengthen control mechanisms (Aydın, 2016).

Organizational exclusion is the systematic removal of individuals or groups from the work environment, social relations or decision-making processes in an organization. This situation usually occurs regardless of the performance, skills or contributions of individuals and can mostly be caused by prejudices, discrimination, power balances or personal conflicts (Scott et al., 2014) . Organizational exclusion can damage the sense of belonging of employees and lead to psychological wear, job dissatisfaction and loss of motivation. It negatively affects overall productivity by weakening communication and cooperation within the organization. Individuals exposed to exclusion may tend to break away from the organization and increase their turnover rates. In order to prevent this problem, it is of great importance to promote an inclusive organizational culture, implement effective policies against discrimination and establish open communication channels among employees (Yarmacı & Ayyıldız, 2020) .

Organizational silence is a situation where employees hesitate to express their opinions about the problems, needs, ideas or suggestions they encounter at work or they deliberately remain silent (Öneren, 2024) . This behavior usually arises from reasons such as individuals within the organization being afraid of the consequences of sharing their ideas, anxiety about being punished, negative attitudes of managers or the fact that the organizational culture does not encourage participation. Organizational silence can negatively affect the development of the organization by preventing the emergence of innovative ideas and can reduce the organizational commitment of employees. It reduces individual performance and overall work efficiency by causing job dissatisfaction, loss of motivation and psychological wear. In order to prevent this negative situation, it is necessary to encourage an open communication culture within the organization, to create safe environments where employees can freely share their opinions and suggestions and for managers to adopt a participatory leadership approach (Nartgün and Kartal, 2013) .

Organizational favoritism and organizational exclusion can negatively affect employees' tendency to express their opinions and thoughts at work, leading to widespread organizational silence. In an organization where favoritism

is present, when employees think that decisions are made based on personal relationships or connections rather than merit, this increases the perception of injustice and reduces employees' motivation to voice their opinions (Yıldırım and Tokgöz, 2020). In particular, if employees believe that expressing their opinions will not create a change or that they may encounter negative consequences, silence becomes a defense mechanism. Organizational exclusion causes individuals to be alienated from group dynamics and social ties. This situation leads to a loss of self-confidence and alienation from the organization in excluded individuals, reducing their desire to express themselves. Excluded employees may fear that sharing their thoughts may have social or professional consequences and therefore prefer to remain silent. Both situations damage the environment of trust within the organization, block open communication channels, and limit the possibility of employees expressing their innovative ideas or criticisms. In this context, reducing organizational favoritism and exclusion, adopting an inclusive organizational culture, and implementing policies that strengthen employees' sense of equality, justice, and belonging are of critical importance to prevent organizational silence (Akyıldız, 2023). In this study, the effects of organizational favoritism and organizational ostracism on organizational silence were examined.

1.2. Purpose and Importance of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the effects of organizational favoritism and organizational exclusion on organizational silence. The study also analyzes how critical organizational behaviors such as organizational favoritism, organizational exclusion and organizational silence differ within the framework of demographic characteristics of individuals (gender, age, marital status, educational status and professional experience). In this context, the purpose of the study is to provide significant contributions both theoretically and practically.

The importance of the research lies in the fact that it provides a solid foundation for understanding the individual and organizational consequences of such behaviors by revealing the effects of negative behaviors such as favoritism and exclusion, which are frequently encountered in organizations, on the silence attitudes of employees. This study can contribute to organizational managers and policy makers in determining the negative organizational factors that affect the silence attitudes of employees and developing measures against them. At the same time, understanding how employees with different demographic characteristics are affected by these processes can provide important clues for the development of equality and justice practices within the organization.

This research is an important guide for organizations to create a more inclusive, fair and sustainable work environment. The study findings aim to provide concrete suggestions for improving the human resources management policies of organizations and increasing employee satisfaction.

1.3. Hypotheses

The research hypotheses are as follows:

H1 : There is a positive and significant relationship between organizational favoritism, organizational exclusion and organizational silence.

H0 : There is no significant relationship between organizational favoritism, organizational exclusion and organizational silence.

H2 : Organizational favoritism has a significant effect on organizational silence.

H0 : Organizational favoritism does not have a significant effect on organizational silence.

H3 : Organizational ostracism has a significant effect on organizational silence.

H0 : Organizational ostracism does not have a significant effect on organizational silence.

1.4. Definitions

Organizational Favoritism : This is a situation where employees believe that certain individuals or groups receive unfair advantage instead of equal opportunities within the organization (Avcı, 2023).

Organizational Exclusion : It is the situation where employees are isolated from social relations and work processes within the organization or deliberately ignored (Yarmacı & Ayyıldız, 2020).

Organizational Silence : This is the situation where employees choose to remain silent by avoiding expressing their opinions about problems, ideas or suggestions within the organization (Nartgün & Kartal, 2013).

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Organizational Favoritism

instead. Such practices undermine the principles of justice and equality in the workplace, reduce employee motivation and negatively affect overall organizational performance. Favoritism usually occurs in the form of nepotism (favoritism), cronyism (favoritism of friends) and patronage (providing support for political or economic interests). These practices cause an increase in unethical behaviors in organizations and create distrust and dissatisfaction among employees. Studies conducted especially in academic institutions show that favoritism has negative effects on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. For example, in a study conducted in universities in Ankara, it was determined that although the perception of favoritism of academics was low, their organizational commitment and job satisfaction were at a moderate level. A negative relationship was found

between the perception of favoritism and organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Cankurtaran and Tengilimoğlu, 2022).

The effects of favoritism on organizational citizenship behaviors have also been examined. Organizational citizenship behavior refers to positive behaviors that employees voluntarily exhibit beyond their official job descriptions. It has been found that employees with high perceptions of favoritism exhibit less organizational citizenship behaviors. It can negatively affect cooperation and productivity within the organization (Avcı, 2023). The effect of favoritism perception on organizational opposition behavior has also been investigated. Organizational opposition is employees' reaction to or criticism of negativities within the organization. It has been found that employees with high perceptions of favoritism exhibit more organizational opposition behaviors. It can increase conflicts within the organization and negatively affect the work environment (Yıldırım and Tokgöz, 2020).

Organizational favoritism occurs when personal relationships, kinship or friendship ties are effective instead of merit in the promotion and advancement processes of individuals within the organization. In their study, Özkanan and Erdem (2015) defined organizational favoritism as the illegal favoritism of senior managers towards their employees or public employees (Özkanan and Erdem, 2015). Such favoritism damages the sense of trust among employees and reduces the perception of justice within the organization. Kurtoğlu (2012) states in his study that there are various types of favoritism. These types include relationships such as religious order fellowship, school friendship, military friendship, kinship and professionalism (Kurtoğlu, 2012). Expressions such as "my uncle would be", "my friend", "I know him well", "my fellow countryman would be", which are widely used in society, show that favoritism is also accepted and widely practiced in daily life. Özkanan and Erdem (2014) emphasize that such statements are seen as disturbing elements especially in public institutions and private enterprises (Özkanan and Erdem, 2014).

2.2. Organizational Exclusion

It occurs in the form of isolating employees within the organization and preventing them from participating in organizational activities. Organizational ostracism is a process that negatively affects both the psychological and professional lives of employees. When the social needs of employees are not met within the organization, motivation and job performance are negatively affected. It can disrupt the efficiency of the organization and the social dynamics in the work environment (Williams, 2007). Organizational ostracism can manifest itself in various ways. Common examples include excluding employees from meetings, not being invited to social events, or being deprived of important information. These ostracism behaviors damage the individual's sense of belonging and can create a sense of burnout in the long term (Robinson et al., 2013).

Organizational exclusion can occur for individual or organizational reasons. Power imbalances within the organization, lack of leadership, or management styles can lead to the exclusion of employees. Factors such as discrimination, prejudice, or favoritism in the organizational culture can also accelerate the exclusion processes. Exclusion is common, especially due to differences such as gender, race, and ethnicity (Ng et al., 2021). When leaders make unfair decisions or favor some employees, it can create a feeling of exclusion in other employees. In cases where competition is high in the workplace, employees may resort to exclusion tactics to eliminate their competitors. It damages the environment of trust in the workplace and creates conflict between employees (Rudert et al., 2019). Organizational exclusion has serious consequences both at the individual and organizational levels. Employees who are excluded at the individual level may face psychological problems such as depression, anxiety, loss of self-confidence, and burnout. It reduces the employee's job satisfaction and decreases their performance. Excluded individuals may tend to leave the job and become emotionally disconnected from the organization (Robinson et al., 2013).

2.3. Organizational Silence

Organizational silence refers to the situation where employees avoid expressing their opinions about problems, suggestions or complaints at work for various reasons. It is especially used to explain situations where employees prefer to remain silent against problems and wrong practices within the organization. Organizational silence can prevent innovation, negatively affect the work environment and reduce organizational efficiency because employees are reluctant to share their ideas freely (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). One of the main reasons for organizational silence is the fear of employees encountering negative consequences when they express their ideas. Especially in organizations where an authoritarian management style prevails, employees often prefer to remain silent due to fear of being punished, excluded or having their careers negatively affected. It reduces employees' trust in the organization and weakens their sense of belonging. According to research, a large portion of employees avoid expressing the problems they experience at work and this silence threatens the long-term success of organizations (Detert and Edmondson, 2011).

Organizational silence is also related to managers not being open to feedback. If managers do not take into account employees' opinions and suggestions and do not welcome criticism, employees will prefer to remain silent over time. It blocks communication channels within the organization and reduces employees' motivation to solve

problems. The lack of open communication within the organization creates distrust among employees and weakens the culture of cooperation (Vakola and Bouradas , 2005). Organizational silence is also affected by the individual psychological states of employees. Especially employees who experience low self-confidence, job dissatisfaction and burnout syndrome may avoid expressing their ideas. Such individuals prefer to remain silent because they think that making their voices heard will not make a difference. It can negatively affect both the personal development of individuals and their performance at work. Organizational silence can increase employees' burnout and stress levels in the long run (Brinsfield , 2013).

3. METHOD

3.1. Research Method

This study was conducted as a quantitative research. Quantitative research is a scientific research method that aims to explain a phenomenon or event through the collection, analysis and interpretation of numerical data. In such studies, data is evaluated using objective measurements and statistical analysis techniques (Garip, 2023) . In this context, the study was designed as a relational screening model. The relational screening model is a quantitative research design that aims to reveal the relationship between two or more variables. This model allows examining whether there is a connection between variables and, if so, the direction (positive or negative) and strength (weak, medium, strong) of this relationship. The relational screening model focuses on understanding existing correlations rather than explaining a causal relationship between variables (Karasar , 2000).

3.2. Universe and Sample

The universe of this research consists of individuals residing in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) and working in the private sector. The universe aims to cover private sector employees in the TRNC. Since it is not possible to reach the universe of the research completely due to limited time and financial resources, the quota sampling method will be used in the research. In line with this method, certain subgroups reflecting the general structure of the universe (e.g. gender, age groups, graduation level, sector, etc.) will be determined and the sample will be formed by taking participants from these groups at predetermined rates. The target for the research is to reach a total of 400 employees. This number was designed to represent the general universe of the research and it was aimed for the sample to have a homogeneous distribution. Thus, it was aimed to obtain more reliable and valid results. In the sample selection, accessibility and criteria that will facilitate the participation of institutions in the research were taken into consideration. The quota sampling method was used in the research. This method is an effective approach that aims to increase the representativeness rate of the research by creating groups according to certain characteristics of the universe (Yağar and Dökme, 2018). With the quota sampling method, a sample structure that strengthens the validity of the research was created. However, due to incomplete forms and inaccessible participants, the final sample size was 388 people.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

In this study, the survey method was preferred to measure the effect of organizational favoritism and ostracism on organizational silence. The three different scales in the survey form are as follows:

1. **Organizational Favoritism Scale** : This scale, developed by Abdalla et al. (1998), was adapted into Turkish by Asunakutlu and Avcı (2009). The scale was designed to assess perceptions of organizational favoritism.
2. **Organizational Exclusion Scale** : This scale, which was developed by Scott (2007) and consists of a single dimension with 11 items, was adapted to Turkish by Karabey (2014) and its validity and reliability studies were conducted. This scale is used to measure perceptions of organizational exclusion.
3. **Organizational Silence Scale** : This scale, developed by Dyne et al. (2003), was designed to assess the perception of organizational silence. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was carried out by Taşkıran (2010).

The items in the survey form require participants to express their opinions on a five-point Likert-type scale. This scale includes the following response options:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = I disagree
- 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- 4 = I agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

With this approach, it is aimed to evaluate the participants' perceptions of organizational favoritism, exclusion and silence in an objective and comparable manner.

The dimensions and number of statements of the scales used in the study were arranged in detail. The questionnaire form includes statements under three main headings as organizational favoritism, organizational silence and organizational exclusion. The organizational favoritism scale consists of three sub-dimensions as favoritism in promotion (5 statements), favoritism in procedure (6 statements) and favoritism in recruitment (3 statements). The

organizational silence scale includes the dimensions of acquiescent silence (4 statements), protective silence (6 statements) and protective silence (6 statements). The organizational exclusion scale is addressed with the dimensions of exclusion (11 statements), favoritism in promotion (5 statements) and favoritism in procedure (6 statements).

The statements in the questionnaire form aim to measure organizational exclusion with questions 1-14, organizational silence with questions 15-29, and organizational favoritism with questions 30-40. There are four additional questions that question information such as gender, marital status, age, and educational status in order to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. Thanks to this structure, both the dimensions of the scales and the characteristics of the participants were evaluated comprehensively.

3.4. Analysis of Data

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated to determine the reliability levels of the scales and their sub-dimensions. This analysis evaluated the reliability of each scale by measuring its internal consistency. The reliability levels of the scales used in the study were evaluated with Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Accordingly, Cronbach's Alpha value for the Organizational Exclusion Scale was calculated as 0.783, and the scale consists of 14 items. Cronbach's Alpha value for the Organizational Silence Scale was determined as 0.731, and this scale consists of 15 items. Finally, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the Organizational Favoritism Scale was 0.720, and the scale contains 11 items. These results show that the scales used are sufficiently reliable and suitable for use in analyses.

According to the normality analysis results, Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests showed that the normality assumption was not fully met for all three scales. For the Organizational Exclusion Scale, the p-value (Sig.) was calculated as 0.000 in both tests, indicating that the scale did not meet the normality assumption. Although the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for the Organizational Silence Scale showed normality at an acceptable level with a p-value of 0.076, The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that normality was not achieved with a p-value of 0.014. Similarly, the p-values of both tests for the Organizational Favoritism Scale (0.002 and 0.011) revealed that the assumption of normality was rejected. Skewness and kurtosis values were also taken into account in the normality assessment. For the Organizational Exclusion Scale, the skewness value is -0.670 and the kurtosis value is 1.780. The skewness value is in the range of -1.5 to +1.5, which is appropriate in terms of normality. Since the kurtosis value is in the range of -2 to +2, it largely supports normality. For the Organizational Silence Scale, the skewness (-0.313) and kurtosis (0.099) values are completely in the appropriate range in terms of normality. Similarly, the Organizational Favoritism Scale also meets the normality criteria in terms of skewness (-0.383) and kurtosis (0.183) values.

As a result, although the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests may reject the normality assumption due to sensitivity in large samples ($n > 300$), it can be said that all scales meet the normality criteria when the skewness and kurtosis values are taken into account. This supports the usability of parametric methods. In this context, t-test, ANOVA test, correlation analysis and regression analysis were performed in the study.

4. FINDINGS

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics

		n	%
Gender	Male	201	51.8
	Woman	187	48.2
Marital status	Married	231	59.5
	Single	157	40.5
Age	18-25 years old	48	12.4
	26-35 years old	117	30.2
	36-45 years old	89	22.9
	46-55 years old	73	18.8
	56 and above	61	15.7
Level of education	Primary/Secondary Education	46	11.9
	High school	105	27.1
	Associate Degree	80	20.6
	Licence	77	19.8
	Master's Degree and above	80	20.6
	Less than 1 year	53	13.7

	1-5 years	82	21.1
Professional Experience	6-10 years	94	24.2
	11-15 years	88	22.7
	16 years and above	71	18,3
Toplam		388	100,0

When the demographic characteristics of the 388 people who participated in the study were examined, it was seen that 51.8% of the participants were male (n=201) and 48.2% were female (n=187). When evaluated in terms of marital status, 59.5% of the participants were married (n=231) and 40.5% were single (n=157). When the age distribution was examined, 12.4% of the participants were in the 18-25 age range (n=48), 27.8% were in the 26-35 age range (n=108), 22.9% were in the 36-45 age range (n=89), 15.2% were in the 46-55 age range (n=59) and 15.7% were 56 years of age and over (n=61). When examined in terms of education level, 11.9% of the participants were primary/secondary school graduates (n=46), 27.1% were high school graduates (n=105), 20.6% had an associate degree (n=80), 19.8% were bachelor's degree graduates (n=77), and 20.6% had a master's degree or higher (n=80). In terms of professional experience, it was determined that 13.7% of the participants had less than 1 year of experience (n=53), 21.1% had 1-5 years (n=82), 24.2% had 6-10 years (n=94), 22.7% had 11-15 years (n=88), and 18.3% had 16 years or more of professional experience.

Tablo 2.The Relationship between Organizational Favoritism, Organizational Exclusion and Organizational Silence (Correlation Analysis)

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Exclusion (1)	r	1	0.082	-0.006	-,117 *	-0.036	,720 **	0.065	0.026	,424 **
	p.		0.107	0.912	0.021	0.484	0,000	0.199	0.615	0,000
Protective silence (2)	r		1	,375 **	0.095	,650 **	-0.046	-0.037	,404 **	,191 **
	p.			0,000	0.062	0,000	0.362	0.465	0,000	0,000
Protective silence (3)	r			1	,140 **	,715 **	-0.009	0.050	,896 **	,542 **
	p.				0.006	0,000	0.861	0.322	0,000	0,000
Accepting silence (4)	r				1	,678 **	-,123 *	,735 **	0.068	,359 **
	p.					0,000	0.016	0,000	0.181	0,000
Organizational silence (5)	r					1	-0.094	,428 **	,636 **	,544 **
	p.						0.065	0,000	0,000	0,000
Favoritism in business (6)	r						1	,156 **	0.018	,613 **
	p.							0.002	0.728	0,000
Favoritism in promotion (7)	r							1	0.039	,625 **
	p.								0.440	0,000
Favoritism in hiring (8)	r								1	,611 **
	p.									0,000
Organizational Favoritism (9)	r									1
	p.									

According to the results of the correlation analysis, there is a positive and significant relationship between organizational ostracism and protective silence (r = 0.375, p = 0.000). On the other hand, a negative and significant relationship was found between organizational ostracism and acquiescent silence (r = - 0.117, p = 0.021). In addition, there are positive and significant relationships between organizational ostracism and organizational silence (r = 0.720, p = 0.000) and organizational favoritism (r = 0.424, p = 0.000). Protective silence has a positive and significant relationship with protective silence (r = 0.650, p = 0.000) and acquiescent silence (r = 0.678, p = 0.000). At the same time, positive and significant relationships were found between protective silence and

organizational silence ($r = 0.404, p = 0.000$) and organizational favoritism ($r = 0.191, p = 0.000$). There are positive and significant relationships between organizational silence and favoritism in procedures ($r = 0.156, p = 0.002$), favoritism in promotion ($r = 0.428, p = 0.000$), favoritism in hiring ($r = 0.636, p = 0.000$) and general organizational favoritism ($r = 0.544, p = 0.000$). Finally, a positive and significant relationship was determined between general organizational favoritism and organizational silence ($r = 0.544, p = 0.000$).

According to the correlation analysis results, organizational exclusion and organizational favoritism generally have a positive and significant relationship with organizational silence. This situation shows that employees' perceptions of exclusion and favoritism can increase organizational silence levels. The sub-dimensions of favoritism (favoritism in processing, promotion and hiring) also show significant relationships with organizational silence. These findings reveal that perceptions of injustice within the organization can affect silence behaviors.

Table 3. The Effect of Organizational Favoritism on Organizational Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	1,194	0.203		5,889	0,000
Organizational Favoritism	0.660	0.052	0.544	12,739	0,000
	F	Sig .	R	R ²	
	162,290	,000 ^b	,544 ^a	0.296	

According to the regression analysis results, the effect of organizational favoritism on organizational silence is positive and statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the organizational favoritism variable was calculated as 0.660 and the standardized coefficient (Beta) was calculated as 0.544. This result shows that the increase in organizational favoritism significantly increases the perception of organizational silence. The constant coefficient was found to be 1.194 and this value is also statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even in the absence of organizational favoritism, the perception of organizational silence is at a certain level. When the explanatory level of the model is examined, the R^2 value was calculated as 0.296. This shows that organizational favoritism explains 29.6% of the variance in organizational silence. The F test result ($F = 162.290, p = 0.000$) reveals that the model is generally significant.

Table 4. in Transactions on Organizational Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	4,073	0.170		23,959	0,000
Favoritism in business	-0.073	0.039	-0.094	-1,847	0.065
	F	Sig .	R	R ²	
	3,413	.065 ^b	,094 ^a	0.009	

According to the regression analysis results, the effect of transaction favoritism on organizational silence is negative, but this effect is not found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.065$). The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the transaction favoritism variable was calculated as -0.073, and the standardized coefficient (Beta) was calculated as -0.094. This result shows that transaction favoritism has a weak and negative effect on organizational silence, but this effect is not statistically significant. The constant coefficient was found to be 4.073 and is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even when there is no transaction favoritism, the perception of organizational silence is at a certain level. When the explanatory power of the model is examined, the R^2 value was calculated as 0.009. This shows that transaction favoritism explains only 0.9% of the variance in organizational silence. The F test result ($F = 3.413, p = 0.065$) reveals that the model is not significant overall.

Table 5.in Promotion on Organizational Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	2,549	0.132		19,250	0,000
Favoritism in promotion	0.333	0.036	0.428	9,316	0,000
	F	One .	R	R ²	
	86,789	,000 ^b	, 428 ^a	0.184	

According to the regression analysis results, the effect of favoritism in promotion on organizational silence is positive and statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the favoritism in promotion variable was calculated as 0.333 and the standardized coefficient (Beta) as 0.428. This shows that the increase in favoritism in promotion significantly increases the perception of organizational silence. The constant coefficient was found as 2.549 and this value is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even when there is no favoritism in promotion, the perception of organizational silence is at a certain level. In terms of the explanatory level of the model, the R^2 value was calculated as 0.184. This shows that favoritism in promotion explains 18.4% of the variance in organizational silence. As a result of the general significance test of the model ($F = 86.789$, $p = 0.000$), it was determined that the model was generally significant.

Table 6.in Recruitment on Organizational Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	2,102	0.105		20,101	0,000
Favoritism in hiring	0.443	0.027	0.636	16,193	0,000
	F	Mr.	R	R ²	
	262,209	,000 ^b	, 636 ^a	0.405	

According to the regression analysis results, the effect of favoritism in hiring on organizational silence is positive and statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the favoritism in hiring variable was calculated as 0.443 and the standardized coefficient (Beta) as 0.636. This shows that the increase in the perception of favoritism in hiring strongly increases the perception of organizational silence. The constant coefficient was found as 2.102 and is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even in the absence of favoritism in hiring, the perception of organizational silence is at a certain level.

the explanatory power of the model is examined, the R^2 value is calculated as 0.405. This shows that favoritism in recruitment explains 40.5% of the variance in organizational silence . As a result of the general significance test of the model ($F = 262.209$, $p = 0.000$), it was determined that the model was generally significant.

Table 7.Organizational Exclusion on Organizational Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Sabit	3,911	0,214		18,254	0,000
Dışlanma	-0,037	0,052	-0,036	-0,700	0,484
	F	Sig.	R	R ²	
	0,490	,484 ^b	,036 ^a	0,001	

The table shows the effect of Organizational Exclusion on Organizational Silence. According to the regression analysis results, the coefficient of the constant value (B) was calculated as 3.911 and this coefficient is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even in the absence of organizational exclusion, the perception of organizational silence is at a certain level.

) of the organizational ostracism variable was found to be -0.037, and the standardized coefficient (Beta) was found to be -0.036. These coefficients show that the effect of organizational ostracism on organizational silence is negative, but there is a very weak relationship. These effects are not statistically significant ($p = 0.484$).

The R^2 value for the overall fit of the regression model was calculated as 0.001. This shows that organizational ostracism explains only 0.1% of the variance on organizational silence. The F test result ($F = 0.490$, $p = 0.484$) revealed that the model was not significant overall.

Table 8. Organizational Exclusion on Defensive Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	3,769	0.267		14,134	0,000
Exclusion	0.105	0.065	0.082	1,616	0.107
	F	Sig .	R	R2	
	2,611	,107 ^b	,082 ^a	0.007	

The table shows the results of the regression analysis evaluating the effect of Organizational Exclusion on Protective Silence. It is seen that the constant coefficient (B) is 3.769 and this value is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even without organizational exclusion, the perception of protective silence is at a certain level.

The unstandardized coefficient (B) and standardized coefficient (Beta) of the organizational ostracism variable were calculated as 0.105 and 0.082, respectively. These values indicate that organizational ostracism has a positive but very weak effect on defensive silence. However, these effects are not statistically significant ($p = 0.107$). The R^2 value, which expresses the explanatory power of the model, was found to be 0.007. This shows that organizational ostracism explains only 0.7% of the variance in defensive silence. The F test result ($F = 2.611$, $p = 0.107$) revealed that the model was generally not significant.

Table 9. Organizational Exclusion on Protective Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std . Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	3,707	0.308		12,027	0,000
Exclusion	-0.008	0.075	0.623	-0.111	0.002
	F	Sig .	R	R2	
	112,317	,004 ^b	,306 ^a	0,323	

The table shows the effect of Organizational Exclusion on Protective Silence. It is seen that the constant coefficient (B) is 3.707 and this value is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). This indicates that even in the absence of organizational exclusion, the perception of protective silence is at a certain level. The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the organizational exclusion variable was calculated as - 0.008 and the standardized coefficient (Beta) as - 0.111. This shows that organizational exclusion has a negative effect on protective silence. However, this effect is not statistically significant ($p = 0.002$). The R^2 value expressing the explanatory power of the regression model was calculated as 0.323. This shows that organizational exclusion explains 32.3% of the variance in protective silence. The F test result for the general fit of the model ($F = 112.317$, $p = 0.004$) revealed that the model was generally significant.

Table 10. Organizational Exclusion on Acquiescent Silence (Regression Analysis)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p.
Still	4,258	0.365		11,668	0,000
Exclusion	-0.207	0.089	-0.117	-2,320	0.021
	F	Sig.	R	R ²	
	5,383	,021 ^b	,117 ^a	0,014	

According to the regression analysis results, the effect of organizational ostracism on acquiescent silence is negative and statistically significant ($p = 0.021$). The unstandardized coefficient (B) of the organizational ostracism variable was found to be -0.207, and the standardized coefficient (Beta) was found to be -0.117. This result shows that as organizational ostracism increases, the perception of acquiescent silence decreases. The constant coefficient was calculated as 4.258 and was found to be statistically significant ($p = 0.000$), indicating that the perception of acquiescent silence is at a certain level even in the absence of organizational ostracism. When the explanatory level of the model is examined, the R^2 value was calculated as 0.014. This shows that organizational ostracism explains only 1.4% of the variance in acquiescent silence. The F test results ($F = 5.383$, $p = 0.021$) reveal that the model is generally significant. However, the low R^2 value shows that the explanatory power of the model is limited.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the effects of organizational favoritism and organizational exclusion on organizational silence were examined.

Organizational Ostracism Scale scores were analyzed according to demographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, education level and professional experience, but no statistically significant difference was found between these variables.

According to the correlation analysis results, organizational exclusion and organizational favoritism have a positive and significant relationship with organizational silence in general. This situation shows that employees' perceptions of exclusion and favoritism can increase organizational silence levels. The sub-dimensions of favoritism (favoritism in processing, promotion and hiring) also exhibit significant relationships with organizational silence. The findings reveal that perceptions of injustice within the organization can affect employees' silence behaviors and that these perceptions can strengthen their tendency to silence.

The regression analysis results reveal the positive and significant effect of organizational favoritism on organizational silence. In general, organizational favoritism increases the perception of organizational silence and explains approximately one-third of the variance. When the sub-dimensions of organizational favoritism are examined, it is seen that transactional favoritism has a weak and negative effect on organizational silence, but this effect is not statistically significant. Promotional favoritism creates a positive and significant effect on organizational silence, explaining one-fifth of the variance. Recruitment favoritism stands out as the factor that increases the perception of organizational silence most strongly, explaining 40% of the variance. These findings show that the perception of favoritism among employees, especially the perceptions in the promotion and recruitment processes, significantly affects organizational silence behaviors. However, the effect of the transactional favoritism dimension on silence seems limited and insignificant. These results emphasize the importance of justice perception in organizations and the role of favoritism on silence behaviors.

The regression analysis results show that the effect of organizational exclusion on organizational silence and its sub-dimensions is generally limited. Organizational exclusion has a negative but very weak effect on organizational silence and this relationship was not found to be statistically significant. The effect of this variable on protective silence is also positive but weak and no significant relationship was found. However, the effect of organizational exclusion on acquiescent silence is negative and statistically significant. This result shows that as the perception of exclusion increases, the perception of acquiescent silence decreases. The explanatory power of the regression models is low and the organizational exclusion variable explains a very small part of the variance in the sub-dimensions. This situation shows that organizational exclusion has a limited role in affecting the perception of silence but can create statistically significant effects on certain sub-dimensions.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations can be made:

- It is important to encourage participatory management practices to reduce employees' perceptions of exclusion and favoritism. Including employees in decision-making processes can reduce the perception of exclusion and support an environment of open communication instead of organizational silence.

- Considering that the perception of organizational exclusion has a negative effect on acquiescent silence, inclusive communication policies should be adopted within the organization. Communication strategies that reach all employees equally can reduce the perception of exclusion.
- Employee satisfaction and perceptions should be measured periodically to detect perceptions of organizational favoritism and exclusion. These surveys can allow for early detection and intervention of problem areas.
- Managers should be trained in fair management, conflict resolution and managing employee diversity. This training can play a critical role in reducing perceptions of favoritism and exclusion.
- In organizations where negative perceptions such as favoritism and exclusion are common, the goal should be to create an organizational culture based on trust. A culture where values, ethical rules and equality are at the forefront can reduce perceptions of silence.
- In order to reduce the perception of favoritism in the process, performance evaluation processes should be made more transparent and the evaluation criteria in these processes should be clearly shared with employees.

REFERENCES

- Akyıldız, S. A. (2023). *Örgütsel kayırmacılık ve örgütsel dışlanmanın örgütsel sessizliğe etkisi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü.
- Avcı, N. (2023). Çalışanların örgütsel kibirlilik ve kayırmacılık algı düzeylerinin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkileri. *Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(1), 95-114. <https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.1097427>
- Aydın, Y. (2016). Örgütsel sessizliğin okul yönetiminde kayırmacılık ve öğretmenlerin öz yeterlik algısı ile ilişkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 22(2), 165-192.
- Brinsfield, C. T. (2013). Employee silence motives: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(5), 671-697. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1829>
- Cankurtaran, Y., & Tengilimoğlu, D. (2022). Üniversitelerdeki akademisyenlerin kayırmacılık algılarının örgütsel bağlılığa etkisinde iş doyumunun aracılık rolü: Ankara ili örneği. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(4), 3193-3208. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2022.1557>
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 461-488. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.61967912>
- Kurtoğlu, A. (2012). Siyasal Örgütler ve Sivil Toplum Örgütleri Bağlamında Hemşehrilik ve Kollamacılık. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 67 (1), 141 - 169.
- Morrison, E. W., & Milliken, F. J. (2000). Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706-725. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3707697>
- Nartgün, Ş. S., & Kartal, V. (2013). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel sessizlik hakkındaki görüşleri. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 2(2), 47-67.
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2021). The Effects of Workplace Ostracism on Job Performance and Turnover Intentions: A Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 74(1), 23-54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12345>
- Öneren, G. (2024). Örgütsel Sessizlik, İşe Yabancılaşma Ve Örgütsel Güven İlişkisi. *Social Sciences Studies Journal (SSSJournal)*, 3(8), 567-583.
- Özkanan, A., & Erdem, B. (2014). Kamuda kayırmacılık ve çalışanların motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi. *Alanya Akademik Bakış*, 2(2), 180-195. <https://doi.org/10.29023/alanyaakademik.688172>
- Özkanan, A., & Erdem, B. (2015). *Kayırmacılık türleri ve kamu yönetimi üzerindeki etkileri*. Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi, 9(1), 10-15.
- Robinson, S. L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at Work: The Experiences and Consequences of Workplace Ostracism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 653-664. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033618>
- Rudert, S. C., Hales, A. H., & Greifeneder, R. (2019). Ostracism and Exclusion in the Workplace: Understanding the Negative Impact on Employees. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 29(2), 86-90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.03.012>
- Scott, K. L., Zagenczyk, T. J., Schippers, M., Purvis, R. L., & Cruz, K. S. (2014). Co-worker exclusion and employee outcomes: An investigation of the moderating roles of perceived organizational and social support. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(8), 1235-1256.
- Vakola, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment? *Employee Relations*, 27(2), 160-174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170510585526>
- Yarmacı, N., & Ayyıldız, T. (2020). İşgörenlerin örgütsel dışlanma algılarının örgütsel sessizlik ve olumsuz durumları bildirme eğilimlerine etkisi: Otel işletmeleri örneği. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(3), 2699-2723.
- Yıldırım, A., & Tokgöz, A. (2020). Kayırmacılık algısının örgütsel muhalefet davranışı üzerindeki etkisi. *Alanya Akademik Bakış*, 4(3), 541-560.