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ABSTRACT
When the employees as a strategic asset are silent, management must feel great risk. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational silence and employees' performance of the Social Security Organization in Kermanshah. The research is descriptive survey. The population consisted of management staff of the Social Security Organization of Kermanshah Province (about 924 people) and a sample of 5% margin of error based on the sample of 271 people is estimated. Tools for data collection are inventory, Diane von organizational silence (2003) and a questionnaire with 15 questions that assess employees' performance (2005) with 39 items. Confirmatory factor analysis were used to confirm the validity of content and in terms of appearance, experts and professors, the results imply endorsement questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to verify the validity and reliability in the 0.88 and 0.93 respectively to the components of organizational and the employees' performance. Data analysis software SPSS and LISREL and Spearman correlation coefficients and were used to analyze. The results showed that there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational silence (the submissive silence, silence, silence altruistic defense) and employees' performance. So that there is an inverse negative relationship between the obedient silence and performance silence and there is no significant correlation between defensive silence and altruistic silence.
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INTRODUCTION
Today, many organizations see the staff refused to provide opinion and comments about organizational problems, and the organizations created a climate that is often, employees do not value their opinion and makes the staff to stop talking. This phenomenon is known as organizational phenomenon studied silence is that by identifying the factors affecting organizational silence can be effective steps to eliminate obstacles to comment harvested employees. Efficiency and development of any organization depends largely on the correct application of manpower. As companies and organizations grow older therefore also be added to the problems of this great force. Managers in relation to various issues trying to continually monitor their employees. Some managers insist on the issue of employee satisfaction can be increased through reward and encourage doing. It is their belief that employees are their subordinates and must accept their orders. Although due to financial distress that employees remain, more attention and willingness to work on economic issues, do not be disillusioned job and will be organized withdrawal which in turn leads to phenomena such as organizational silence (Zarei Matin et al., 2011). People in organizations often have ideas, comments and intelligence to offer constructive ways to improve the work of their organizations. The functions, expressing the concept as sound organization. Some people offer these ideas and others are reluctant to offer ideas, opinions and information that Morrison and Miliken believe that silence is not called organizational silence (Danaifar et al., 2011). For an organization with efficient management of human resources and formidable choice but to pay attention to training, strength, creativity, morale and motivation, personality and so the hypothesis is not rejected. To achieve these goals, the first step is to properly evaluate and assess staff performance fall,
and after identifying the strengths and weaknesses of employees in the above fields, to eliminate weaknesses and strengths, an action should be taken. In other words, the assessment should seek to improve and develop human resources. Performance management, strategic human resource management is one of the special issues and instruments for improving the performance of employees and organizations to account. If performance management is designed and implemented with the requirements and prerequisites in the organization can be part of your organization identify problems and solve them in order to provide scientific solutions, Performance management is a holistic view of the performance of individuals and organizations with specific mechanisms between individual performance and organizational synergies are created (Habibi and Zabet, 2011). In this context, we can say that the silence of organizational and employee performance to the organization and its objectives In order to find issues are very important. In the first study to examine the relationship between organizational silence and paid staff performance, and then developing hypotheses is considered. The study, analysis and research model will be introduced in the next section. The results of the analysis will be discussed and recommendations for management and personnel are provided in the final section.

Review of the Literature

For over 50 years, researchers have focused on the concepts of silence and sound. Employees often have ideas, information and opinions about constructive ways to improve their work and organization. Sometimes the staff tells ideas, information and sometimes they are silent. Apparently, the two are polar opposites because silence implies not to speak, but to speak of the important issues in organizations representing sound (Diane Vaughan, 2003). The sound is any attempt to change other than escape from objectionable, whether individual or collective management through recourse to a higher authority with the aim of forcing him to change management or through a variety of actions and protests, including the steps to follow public opinion (Pinder and Harloz, 2001). The sound can be expressed as ideas, information and opinion is defined as silence (Brayns et al., 2009). On the other hand, Lynp and Diane von voice protest a manufacturer aimed at improving their focus on behavior, not just criticism. Wow D and Cooper showed that the volume of each type of activity in order to improve the situation in the workplace. They described sound organization as a voluntary expression of views to influence organizational measures. While speaking staff behavior (noise) is studied in many ways. For example, organizational learning, organizational opposition, change efforts, information sharing, communications, organizational citizenship behavior and organizational justice (Argyris, 1993). Diane Wang and colleagues noted that differences in the reasons or motivation of employees to represent the interests of the different types of silence are silence. While the traditional concept of passive silence refers to all forms of sedentary behavior is not indicative of silence and silence is not merely opposed to sound. But, according to Pinder and Harloz, silence can be active, conscious, conceptual and systematic. Finally, the results show that silence Brayns field staff and a comprehensive multi-dimensional and can be measured with a valid and important relationship with other phenomena of organizational behavior (Scott, 1993).

Silence of Staff

In 2001, the silence of staff in organizational science literature to examine the organizational silence as Morrison and was Milikn; Pinder, based on research and Harloz silence personnel as any lack of expression issues, cognitive, emotional, behavioral or organizational conditions defined. The study was conducted at the level of individual analysis. While Brayns Field and colleagues claimed that their silence can be at the team and organizational levels as well. They stated that silence can start at the individual level and team level is where most people are not willing to talk. Pinder and Harloz also know the sound of silence that has its own form of communication, and includes a set of knowledge, emotions or intentions of protest or approval. The phenomenon of silence employees can have different meanings according to its basic motivation. Their silence was introduced in two variants. Passive silence and satisfaction silence that the first type is intentional and the second type is based on the consent and agreement. According to research by Diane Vaughan et al., silence and sound can show that silence is opposite of expressing the ideas (sound). They show that the silence of staff is not necessarily the lack of sound (Fors et al., 1999). They developed the third dimension of the staff's silence that the social
motivations are the base of satisfaction and passive motivations. Diane Vaughan et al, believe that social silence means not expressing the ideas, information or comments in order to obtain benefits for others or the organization based on cooperation. As a result, they emphasized on three distinct motivations for silence, submission, fear and cooperation.

Voice of Staff
According to previous studies, behaviors associated with sound were studied and accordingly, voice of staff with a form of expression of ideas or answers has been associated with different positions. The staff's voice is defined as job satisfaction. Diane Vaughan and Lypyn considered the staff's voice as the behavior based on expressing the constructive objection for improvement not just for criticize. Furthermore, Diane Wang and colleagues insisted on speaking voice as behavior because employees offer suggestions for change, while the sound can be the ways to improve the fair and facilitate employee participation in decision making (Fors et al., 1999).

Since the launch of model fidelity sound and my Hirsch, sound and silence on survey research organization that has a major impact on issues such as identity, power, justice, culture and dialogue deal. For more than 40 years, the study of sound and silence with patterns and developed landscapes; the two of them are briefly mentioned. On the one hand, normative and functionalist view that the sound and silence and self-expression expression totally opposite knows the issues. Site rule, conditions or sound or silence the result of their culture and way the staff to comply with them. The social constructionist view that the sound and silence opposition in the first place. But while sound and silence are of strategic communications. My Hirsch believes organizational silence of senior management in the organization and the forces that reinforce silence. Managers fear the negative feedback and implicit set of beliefs about their employees and managerial practices and policies specific to certain structures leads; and this in turn leads to the development of a silent environment with a sense of community is strengthened staff. In addition to the silence, relevant research, a number of other shows. For example Harloz injustice culture, concepts of unfair employment relationship between the staff in a note. Some areas of the organization make sure injustice. While focused on the environment are likely to keep people from breaking the silence to improve their position and means that the culture of injustice, the culture of silence causes. Researchers silence, group and organizational measures to remind us that it prevents the presentation of information, ideas and opinions (Morrison and Milikn, 2000).

Pinder and Harloz believe these concepts in accordance with a management point of view, functionalism and normative organization. Administrators, law, environment or culture of silence to make sure that employees must follow. Some silent culture with different management strategies such as joint consultation, partnership projects, proposals and studies achieved their attitude. The strength leaves no place for individual choice and agency.

As a result, the limits of sound and silence, and the staff cannot resist them (Diane, 2003). Changing and competitive world of today, to speak of silence is especially valuable for organizations to dialogue and indeed should be considered unnecessary and unhelpful. On the other hand, employees often tend not to transfer information that can negatively or organizational hierarchy to be considered a threat to senior officials (Avery and Roberts, 1974). Silence can be effective if employees fear negative reaction to an injection molded director commented that they would be impossible to weaken the ability of employees to work in the organization through react. Organizational silence on mass phenomenon very minor activity or expression in response to important issues or issues facing an organization or industry due to negative reactions refers (Milikn, 2000). In fact, if more people prefer silence on organizational matters, silence, silence as a collective behavior that the organization will be called (Dayton, 2001). Organizational silence an inefficient process that could play all organizational efforts and can be in various forms such as collective silence in the sessions, low levels of participation in the proposals, and found low levels (Nikmaram, 2012). However, in a changing world, organizations need employees who have expressed their ideas, organizations that adopt employees who cannot express them, for both employees and managers are motivated and high performance in an environment without silence. How to break the culture of silence and create an environment to encourage free expression of ideas is considered
employees of the major challenges facing managers is obvious that a silent environment can contribute to organizational outcomes and vice versa (Heavenly et al., 1391). Basic definitions of loyalty and silence the hypothesis that the lack of expression issues, not wrong because it has its own form of communication, including a set of knowledge, emotions or intentions of protest or confirmed. Morrison and Milikn pointed to the effect of silence as they are; one reason could be that the silence of the issues is that psychologists have studied it with silence effect. Research shows that people tend to move through the negative information are not recognized as an employee (AvhanCinar et al., 2013). In organizations, this is evidence that employees are reluctant to pass on information, particularly related to issues not superiors. In other words, low and high-level hierarchical relationship between silence effects increases (Milikn et al., 2003).

Research has shown that silence is very harmful for the organization's staff and often results in increased levels of discontent among workers and the absence of work and layoffs and possibly other undesirable behaviors are evident. In addition, communication is key to the success of an organization (AvhanCinar et al., 2013).

The silence of staff, communications destroyed and therefore reduced overall organizational performance. Other results can be innovation, weak project, morality and defective products is low in organizations silence over time means that some staff do not care about the quality of their work. It is thought that silence would only harm staff organization; but the fact is that the damage to both the organization and personnel (Bagheri et al., 2012). Richard mentioned the factors of silence as follows:

1. Fear
2. Limited understanding of moral responsibility
3. Shyness
4. Lack of opportunities
5. Some friends

Motives of Organizational Silence

As mentioned above, people in organizations often have ideas, comments and information to offer constructive ways to improve their work and organization. The functions, expressing the concept of organizational onomatopoeia. Some of these ideas and others to offer ideas, opinions and information kept silent and their silence. Express ideas (Enterprise Voice) or withhold the presentation of (organizational silence) may be behavioral, two activities seem contradictory, because silent while Ava needs unaddressed needs expressed problems in the organization; but the reality is that silence, not necessarily at odds with sound organizational phenomenon. In fact, the difference between silence and sound, not to speak of people's motivation in refusing to provide information, ideas and opinions to them. In this context, there are three types of motivation associated with silence and sound:

1. The preventive treatment based on the submission and approval on anything
2. The self-protective behavior based on fear
3. The altruistic motivation because of an interest in others and create opportunities for collaboration with them.

These three types of motivation in employees (self-protective motives, besides preventive motivation, altruistic motivation) leads to three types of silence or voice (submissive silence or voice, defensive silence or voice and altruistic silence or voice) that the motivations are taken from passive and non-passive behavior of the two types of behavior (active) that are shown in Figure 1 (Diane et al., 2003).

So silent is not always indicative of passive behavior.

Silence can be active, conscious, intentional and systematic. This is important because it reveals the nature of the complex and multidimensional silence. In fact, some forms of silence are strategic and actively. Consciously, purposefully and intentionally, such as when employees refrain from providing confidential information to others. Deliberate silence and passive (based on the submission and consent to any circumstances) is the deliberate silence but for proactive is different (Van, 2003). These three types of motivation in organizational silence and sound, along with examples of specific types shown in Table 1.
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Dimensions of Silence

According to the three dimensions of silence in Figure and Table 1, explaining any aspect of this concept is discussed.

Submitive Silence

When more people, more personal behavior silent-think often referred to disconnect active person. The silence of this type of behavior is submissive silence and to refrain from providing ideas, information or opinions based on submission and consent refers to any condition; so submissive silence, showing the withdrawal of the more passive to active (Pinder and Harlou, 2001). The behavioral characteristics of persons with the following silent participation can be low, negligence, carelessness, neglect and decline to be named. Pinder and Harlou consider this dimension of silence as a factor in conflict with sound that a form of consent or the passive acceptance of the status quo. People with this then silence surrenders the current situation and have no desire to try to talk to, no participation or attempt to change the status quo (Diane, 2003).

Table 1 shows examples of submissive silence that followed sedentary behavior is intentional. For example, an employee may not express their ideas for change. Speaking on the grounds that is useless and is unlikely to make a difference in the case. In addition, an employee may evaluate information and express their opinions through their own ability to influence the situation is not expressed at low levels. In both cases, silence is a result of resignation. If employees believe that they can make a difference in status, they remain silent and probably your ideas or proposals have not expressed proactively. For example, an employee could comment during an administrative session because of an unwillingness to refuse participation.

Finally, the abiding silence deliberately passive behavior and lack of expression also includes data through resignation and the belief that meaningful change beyond the capabilities of the group (Diane, 2003).

Defensive Silence

Pinder and Harlou reform passive silence to describe the deliberate omission on the basis of personal fear of the consequences of speaking adopted, and this is consistent with the result of Morrison and Milinik's research that emphasizes on the personal sense of fear as a key driver of organizational silence and the opportunity to speak in terms of work.

According to Pinder et al., defensive silence is defined as the lack of expression of ideas, information or opinions in the form of self-protection and by fear (Edmonson, 1999). Defensive silence is deliberate and proactive behavior in order to protect themselves against external threats.

On the contrary, obedient silence, silence proactive defense that includes awareness and consideration of options and with a conscious decision not to express ideas, information and opinions as the best personal strategy is followed. The proposed framework, as a defense silence to avoid confusion with multiple meanings passive silence (such as compliance or agreement) is used. In silence defensive and submissive silence, the distinction between the two, according to Pinder and Harlou drawn. While the evidence submitted is disabled submissive silence, the silence is different. Fearing the consequences of speaking and recommendations for change to occur. Defensive silences like a condition that people of bad news because of disorganized individuals or deny avoid negative consequences for the individual informant (Avery and Koinonz, 2002).

Table 1 shows specific examples of defensive silence; these include lack of information and expression through fear because they express ideas in terms of personal risk retail outlets. Another example, the removal of the facts related to issues that need to be modified to protect himself. This can be motivated by fear of responsibility is safety. Likewise, defensive silence can hide personal mistakes as a form of self-protection.

Altruistic Silence

Silence altruistic expression of ideas, information or opinions related to work organization in order to transfer the benefits to others through altruism or cooperation. Such as corporate citizenship, deliberate and proactive and focus mostly on philanthropic silence others (Kordgard, 1997).
As well as organizational citizenship behavior, silence altruistic behavior is optional and cannot be compelled by the same silence as a defense based on knowledge of the options and make informed decisions for lack of ideas, information and ideas. In contrast, defensive silence, silence to show respect to other forms of altruistic rather than fear of negative personal consequences that occur due to say. Kordgard and colleagues reviewed the literature on organizational citizenship behavior, organizational citizenship behavior have identified seven dimensions of their total silence chivalry and justice have a direct relation with organizational citizenship behavior, and a lack of social protests defined the tolerance of the inevitable problems and imposed without displeasure that this form of silent tolerance (Oregon, 1998). And since that is altruistic, people-centered; So no complaints (silence) show a shift from direct personal interests with the explicit aim of others and show patience against others (Kowalski, 1996). Table 1 shows specific examples of the type of friendly silence. For example, an employee can keep cooperating and others with relevant information to the benefit. Similarly, altruistic silence can be the lack of expression of information. For confidential and will not be put to public debate. An employee can have opinions about a decision is imminent and may not be in a position appropriate to discuss these ideas with others. A final example is the preservation of confidential and private information. The failure to provide information to non-members members, failure to provide personal information about others and non-disclosure of secrets in each of these examples, an employee in a proactive and deliberate to decide which ideas, information or opinions given by concern for organized and motivated to obtain benefits not tell it (Diane, 2003).

Organizational Performance
Overall corporate performance indicators divided into two categories, subjective and objective. Subjective measures of organizational performance indicators involves judgments based on the organization's productivity groups are formed. One of these indicators can be customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction, noted the success of new products and other objective indicators of organizational performance, the index is said to be very real and measurable are based on objective data. Including objective indicators of organizational performance, can be indicators such as return on assets and profitability, return on equity, return on investment and earnings per share range (Doaei et al., 2011).

Functional Factors
Generally, functional factors include behavioral factors and process agents (Jalali, 1998).

Behavioral Factors
-Compliance with administrative discipline: the time and do things in a timely manner.
-Be good behavior effectively with clients: a good deal of effort to resolve problems, intimate relationships.
-The seriousness of the job: fast execution of orders, keep track of assignments.
-Taking a leave: Efforts to increase job skills, different skills, participate in training courses.
-Flexibility: Accepting mistakes, more than the refrain about your thoughts on accepting other tips.
-Trustworthy: Fluency in job and doing it without supervision, proper attention and accuracy, compassion carrying out the work, responsibility, care of equipment.
-Spontaneity: Detection of needs and appropriate solutions to address them and having the motivation to work and create something constructive, proactive in the implementation of business activities.

Process Factors
-Factors related to the working conditions: Provide supplies, equipment, job security and liability insurance.
-Factors related to the honor and prestige: Respect by managers, intimate relationships, encouragement among people, discrimination and injustice.
-Factors related to educational needs and providing upgrade situation: holding refresher courses, provision of research and scientific and functional researches, strengthen information.
-Factors related to the participation of: Participation in decision-making, discussion of the issues associated with them.
-Factors related to the management competent and qualified.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Methods
This can be seen in terms of purpose; and since the reviews and learn more about the relationships between variables in the survey's descriptive and correlational study examined the relationship between the variables studied.

The population used in this study consisted of 924 employees of the Management of Social Security is in Kermanshah province. In this study, sampling was done randomly available. Sample size was based on a sample and taking into account the 95% and 5% error, sample size was approximately 271 people, which is based on the experiences of researchers, 15% higher than the sample questionnaire was distributed to end 271 full questionnaire. In this study, a questionnaire was used to collect data that on the whole five-item Likert of 1 means strongly disagree and 5 means strongly agree is used; And a questionnaire to assess staff performance based on the model of the three options (beyond the expected 3 points, 2 points as expected and needs to improve 1 point) Stephen Kandi. To ensure the validity of a few experts, university professors and carried out the intended reforms and Chart 1 and Chart 2 inferential analysis equation modeling "using structural software LISREL shows". Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the validity. SSPS software using Cronbach's alpha coefficient obtained for organizational silence questionnaire 88/0 and 93/0 Cronbach's alpha coefficient obtained for the questionnaire is employees' performance. Cronbach's alpha values obtained for dimensions and variables in Table 2 on the questionnaire.

Figure 1: The measured dimensions of organizational silence on the standard first-order estimate
Table 2: Cronbach's alpha values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0/922</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Submissive silence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Defensive silence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/786</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Altruistic silence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/935</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Employees' Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/878</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Organizational silence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis Method
In this study, the data obtained using the methods of descriptive and inferential statistics were analyzed. The descriptive analysis of the frequency distribution, central tendency, dispersion charts "using SPSS software and inferential statistical technique equation modeling analysis" "using LISREL structural software is used".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results
All of the respondents indicated that most respondents (53.5%) were male. The highest average age at 50.2 per cent between 30 and 40 years. The average was 76.8 degrees, which indicates that the majority of people with postgraduate university studies; in addition, information about work experience shows that most people have between 10 and 15 years of service to be healthy.

The Main Hypothesis Testing
The main hypothesis of the study results is shown in Table 3. The correlation coefficient between employee performance and organizational silence -0.128, average organizational silence is 3.07 (almost equal to the average) and the average of Performance is 1.85. Thus, H0 is rejected and H1 confirmed.
Table 3: The main hypothesis of the study results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis confirmed</td>
<td>0/05</td>
<td>-0/128</td>
<td>1/85</td>
<td>3/07</td>
<td>Organizational silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The First Sub-Hypothesis Test

Test results are shown in Table 4 is the first sub-hypothesis. Scores address the situation obedient silence 2/71 SD 0/94. The correlation coefficient between submissive silences is 0.178 employee performance - resulting in significant level is 0.05; thus, H0 is rejected and H1 is confirmed.

Table 4: The results of the first sub-hypothesis test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis confirmed</td>
<td>0/05</td>
<td>-0/178</td>
<td>0/94</td>
<td>2/71</td>
<td>Submissive silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Second Sub-Hypothesis Test

The test results are shown in Table 5, second sub-hypothesis. The average scores of the respondents to the defensive silence is 2.60 with standard deviation 0.98. The correlation coefficient between silence defensive staff performance is 0.115, the significance level of 0.05 showed that is not significant. So H0 and H1 were rejected.

Table 5: The results of the second sub-hypothesis test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 is rejected</td>
<td>0/05</td>
<td>-0/115</td>
<td>0/98</td>
<td>2/60</td>
<td>Defensive silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Third Hypothesis Testing

The third hypothesis has been demonstrated by test results in Table 6. Scores of respondents to silence humanitarian situation were 3.90 with a standard deviation 0.84. The correlation coefficient between altruistic silence by performance 05/0 026/0 showed that the level is not significant. So H0 and H1 were be rejected.

Table 6: Results of the third sub-hypothesis test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 is rejected</td>
<td>0/05</td>
<td>0/026</td>
<td>0/84</td>
<td>3/90</td>
<td>Altruistic silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Argument and Conclusion

The main hypothesis of the study results show the correlation between employees' performance and organizational silence -0.128 and the average organizational silence is 3.07 (almost equal to the average) and an average of Performance is 1.85. This means that a reduction of one unit variable organizational silence, the Performance increases 0.128. Spearman correlation test results showed that there is an indirect negative relationship between organizational silence and the employees' performance, the significance level is 0.05; therefore it can be claimed with 95% confidence that the management staff of the Social Security Organization of Kermanshah organizational silence lower employee performance increases. The results suggest that there is negative and significant relationship the obedient silence and
performance via the Spearman correlation. The interpretation of the results obtained considering that the correlation coefficient is 0.178 to say that the submissive silence and performance are inversely. This means much greater impact on performance levels fall silent obedient employees and increase employee performance, which increases the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the activities of the organization. And there is no significant relationship between silence and defensive performance; so we can say about the interpretation of the obtained results. Given that the value of the Spearman correlation coefficient 115 / -0 obtained show that this relationship is not significant at the level 0.05; and defensive means that silence had nothing to do with employee performance by increasing or decreasing the defensive silence, performance will not increase or decrease; so the lack of expression of ideas, information and ideas for self-protection and fear have no effect on performance. And the results showed no significant relationship between silence philanthropic and employee performance; so on the interpretation of the results obtained and given that the value of the Spearman correlation coefficient obtained relationship is not significant; and altruistic means that silence is not any communication with employees' performance by increasing or decreasing the altruistic silence, performance will not increase or decrease. The results were compared with similar studies which continue to be part of them.

According to the results offered the following suggestions:
- Administrators can with proper planning, the use of shared reason the doors open, conditions of participation to express ideas, opinions and provide information.
- Administrators can formed working groups and expert teams and not individual decisions to create conditions that employees fear negative results, the expression of ideas, opinions and information on their own, do not refuse.
- Managers can plan, organize, direct and coordinate activities, control, ability and willingness to assume responsibility, accountability, efficient use of staff in ways to reduce climate of silence enhances their performance.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research
- Since the current research in the field of social sciences and humanities research is conducted may influence some variables beyond the control of the investigator is not far-fetched results. It is possible that factors other than submissive silence, silence, silence altruistic defense and also have an impact on performance, but this study only examines the factors examined. Since this study was conducted of the management of the Social Security Organization of Kermanshah. Therefore, it is recommended that this issue be examined in other organizations and the results of the comparison results are given.
- Studying the silence of other factors that can affect organizational and employee performance.
- Using a larger sample size in order to increase confidence in the results.
- The relationship between sound organizational and employees' performance.
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