COLLECTIVITY AND AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT A PRIVATE COMPANY EMPLOYEES IN INDONESIA: DIFFIDENT SILENCE AS MODERATOR


ABSTRACT

Background: The competitive environment of the business world requires applying for the best talent to maintain the continuity of the organization. This situation has led to more and more headhunters looking for talent and has an impact on the high turnover rate. Therefore, research on organizational commitment, especially affective commitment, is still useful to prevent the loss of personnel. The purpose of this study was to discuss diffident silence as a moderator of the influence of collectivity on the affective commitment of employees.

Method: The participants were 104 employees (female, n = 21; male, n = 83) of 304 employees from a private company in Indonesia. The data was collected using a questionnaire in both direct and indirect ways, from February 7 until March 7, 2022. The sampling technique used was convenience non-probability sampling. We set the time for data collection, and after the dateline, we examined how many questionnaires returned. The data was analyzed using gradual regression analysis, and the predictions were gradually made by including predictors in the regression.

Result: The result shows that diffident silence can play a role as a moderator in the effect of collectivity on affective commitment. It implies that diffident silence not only poses a danger to the company but also strengthens the effect of collectivity on affective commitment. Employees who performed high-diffident silence showed a higher influence of collectivity on affective commitment. Employees with diffident silence usually avoid labels (negative labels) from others. Labels will make them uncomfortable and embarrassed, and this situation will reduce attachment to the organization.

Conclusion: This was explained as to why employees with diffident silence will build up their affective commitment.
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RESUMO

Histórico: o ambiente competitivo do mundo dos negócios requer a solicitação dos melhores talentos para manter a continuidade da organização. Esta situação levou a cada vez mais pessoas à procura de talentos e tem um impacto na elevada taxa de rotatividade. Portanto, a pesquisa sobre o comprometimento organizacional, especialmente o comprometimento afetivo, ainda é útil para evitar a perda de pessoal. O objetivo deste estudo foi discutir o silêncio como moderador da influência da coletividade no comprometimento afetivo dos funcionários.

Método: Os participantes eram 104 empregados (feminino, n = 21; masculino, n = 83) de 304 empregados de uma empresa privada na Indonésia. Os dados foram coletados por meio de questionário, tanto de forma direta quanto indireta, de 7 de fevereiro a 7 de março de 2022. A técnica de amostragem utilizada foi amostragem por conveniência e sem probabilidade. Definimos o tempo para a coleta de dados e, após a linha de data, examinamos quantos questionários foram retornados. Os dados foram analisados pela análise de regressão gradual, e as previsões foram gradualmente feitas incluindo preditores na regressão.

Resultado: O resultado mostra que o silêncio difícele pode desempenhar um papel de moderador no efeito da coletividade no compromisso afetivo. Implica que o silêncio difícele não só representa um perigo para a empresa, mas também fortalece o efeito da coletividade no compromisso afetivo. Funcionários que realizavam silêncio de alta dificuldade mostraram maior influência da coletividade no comprometimento afetivo. Funcionários com silêncio diferente geralmente evitam rótulos (rótulos negativos) dos outros. Os rótulos os deixarão desconfortáveis e constrangidos, e essa situação reduzirá o apego à organização.

Conclusão: Explicou-se por que os funcionários com silêncio difícil vão construir o seu compromisso afetivo.

Palavras-chave: compromisso afetivo, coletividade, silêncio difícil, moderador, empresa privada, funcionários.

1 INTRODUÇÃO

Organizational commitment was one of the studies in industrial and organizational psychology, academically or in practice. There were some issues that underlined why organizational commitment was an issue that needed special attention by managers. First is the tough business competition. Second is the developing pattern of ‘headhunters’ seeking competent workers. Third, a high turnover of employees. The turnover of employees in an organization or company could have consequences related to reducing the efficiency of the company. Such as the cost of recruitment, selection, and training or onboarding programs that introduce the work culture in the organization. Rahmani suggests that the low organizational commitment of the employees will lead to a high intention to leave among them. Ignoring employees’ intention to leave will allow high
turnover to occur (Rahmani, 2014). This will result in the emergence of an understanding among researchers of industrial and organizational psychology that organizational commitment is a significant factor that must be considered for organizational managers to obtain sufficient information on how to strengthen organizational commitment.

The studies related to affective commitment mention the important role of affective commitment in the performance of employees of PT. Pelindo IV (PT. Indonesian Harbor IV) directly or indirectly (Iravan et al., 2013); organizational performance and quality of life of employees (Kashefi et al., 2013); organizational effectiveness and productivity (Abbott et al., 2005); employee loyalty to an organization (Chen et al., 2009); and a negative effect on turnover intention (Yukongdi & Shrestha, 2020).

Based on the phenomena related to *intention to leave* and previous studies of affective commitment, it is obvious that studies of factors influencing affective commitment are still required. Moreover, affective commitment can be used as an aspect to bind employees with their organization so as to have a positive effect on other employees and the organization. Based on this, the researcher intends to explore more deeply what determinants may result in affective commitment. Similar to other human behaviors, affective commitment has two major domains of determinants, including personal (intrinsic) and environmental (extrinsic). This study will examine some variables assumed to play a role in affective commitment. The variables to be explored include collectivity and employee silence.

As a group of humans, the organization will develop based on the values of its organizational actors. In relation to a group of humans in a certain means (an organization), in its development, the experts of social psychology suggest that in interaction with their environment, humans will take actions to manipulate the environment with the purpose of being able to adapt. The way humans manage their environment in the hope that they can adapt is carried out based on culture, reflecting the internalization of values by a group of people in a certain area. One of the studies on culture and behavior was widely referred to by other researchers in the research conducted by Hofstede in the early 1980s (Hofstede, 2009). In his research, Hofstede explains that the national or regional culture of a region can influence the behavior of individuals as part of the population. The research that Hofstede conducted was mostly in the capital city of the nation. The cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede are composed of
individualism-collectivism, masculine-feminine, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation.

Indonesia is one of the countries with a strong domination of collectivity (Hofstede, 2009). As a result, a study of collectivity needs to be conducted. Collectivity is a state of society where all its members are integrated into a group and protect each other. In countries with a high level of collectivity (Asian countries), employees of a company will be concerned about the other company employees. Different from Asian countries, western countries are mostly individual ones. Individualism has a value orientation toward oneself, where employees tend to place an emphasis on freedom, achievement, and making themselves the most meaningful social unit. In simple words, employees who develop a collective culture have a strong affective commitment (Triandis, 1989). Another study conducted in three countries, i.e., China, Romania, and Germany, reveals that collectivity can predict organizational commitment, and the strongest prediction is on affective commitment (Felfe et al., 2008).

By understanding the description of collectivity, it can be understood that when employees of a company are concerned with each other and maintain harmony within the company, it is understandable if the employees are then subjectively bound. When related to the understanding of affective commitment, it explains that the reason employees are attached to the organization is the harmony among employees in the organization. Therefore, it can be understood that the existence of collectivity in an organization can form affective commitment. As a result, the existence of collectivity as a triggering factor stemming from outside the employees is expected to affect employees’ behaviors, especially regarding affection and attachment in an organization.

The other interesting phenomenon at the present time, particularly in industrial and organizational psychology, related to the reason why employees remain in the organization was the willingness to convey thoughts, suggestions, ideas, and opinions when dealing with events that promote or hinder the organization or company. Many employees only keep quiet when they see their colleagues’ mistakes. Another phenomenon was that when asked for input on the progress of the organization, employees seemed reluctant to convey their input. This phenomenon is known as employee silence. Wulandari describes employee silence as a behavior undertaken by employees where they choose not to share information and opinions that may be useful and can prevent the organization from having difficulties (Wulandari, 2013). Employees
feel that silence is a good way of finishing the job. Based on the research conducted by Wulandari, there are several reasons for the emergence of employee silence behavior. The first reason is to avoid conflicts with colleagues by not reporting mistakes made by colleagues, as it may cause relationships between employees to be less harmonious. Second, employees are afraid that the opinions to be conveyed will have no impact. Third, employees are afraid of personal gossip that will be accepted if they reveal current problems to other colleagues or managers.

Milliken, Morrison, and Hwelin (2003) suggested that silence is a method that is frequently undertaken by employees if the problem occurring in the organization is an issue with negative risk (Milliken et al., 2003). Employees choose not to express their ideas with the purpose of improving the organization due to worries about ethical violations and irregularities, as well as information that is harmful to colleagues if disclosed. Different from Dyne, Ang, and Botero (2003), Brinsfield (2009) suggests that there are five dimensions of employee silence, including acquiescent silence, defensive silence, relational silence, deviant silence, and diffident silence. First is acquiescent silence, where employees choose not to disclose ideas, opinions, and complaints that occur within the organization based on resignation because they feel unable to make changes to the organizational conditions. Second is defensive silence, where employees choose not to disclose ideas, opinions, and complaints that occur within the organization as a form of self-protection. The third is relational silence, which is when employees choose not to express ideas, opinions, and complaints about problems in the organization as a way of protecting their colleagues and organization. Fourth is deviant silence, that is, employees choose not to disclose the forms of irregularities that occur in the organization intended to harm other colleagues and the organization. Fifth is diffident silence, which is a silent behavior undertaken as they feel unsure that their information and opinions can influence uncertain situations in the organization and as a form of anticipation so as not to lose their job.

Based on the theory and research results on collectivity, diffident silence, and affective commitment, the researcher can understand that employee collectivity is assumed to be a situation that can provide harmony and care among employees. This will strengthen attachments among employees. The existence of emotional attachment will provide benefits for the organization as it will make employees choose to remain in the organization. Sometimes this harmonious behavior is formed because many employees
choose to be silent in situations where they believe they will not be able to provide solutions for the company. As a result, the existence of diffident silence enables us to strengthen the effect of collectivity on affective commitment. Moreover, according to Brinsfield (2009), diffident silence appears to avoid losing a job. The description of collectivity, diffident silence, and affective commitment, the researcher found a dynamic where the existence of diffident silence shown by the employees will be able to strengthen or weaken the effect of collectivity on affective commitment. If diffident silence is strong, the effect of collectivity on affective commitment will be stronger, and vice versa. Considering the dynamics of the theoretical relationship, hypothesis was proposed.

2 THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

This study was a quantitative method. It is research method that works with numbers, the data of which is in the form of numbers (scores or values, ratings, or frequencies), analyzed using statistics to answer specific research questions or hypotheses and to predict that a certain variable affects other variables. The framework of the research can be seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Hypothesis model of the research
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Source: Nindyati & Iskandar, 2009

Figure 1 describes that in the causality test there is the third variable affecting the course of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The third variable is called the moderator variable (Nindyati & Iskandar, 2009); (Baron & Kenny, 1986) . Both Nindyati and Iskandar, as well as Baron and Kenny suggest that in a study the third variable can play a role as a moderator if it meets the assumptions:

1. Line a: There is an effect of a predictor (X) on the outcome (Y)
2. Line b: There is an effect of the moderator (M) on the outcome (Y)
3. Line c: There is an effect of the product (X*M) on the outcome (Y)
The moderator model can be said to be confirmed if the line c is significant. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), information is obtained that to prove the role of the moderator variable, there is no effect between the predictor and the moderator. In addition, it must be significant between line a and line b, though this does not directly prove the existence of a moderator role, as described in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Moderator Analysis Model

Source: Baron and Kenny (1986)

3 METHODOLOGY

The population of respondents to this study were employees of PT X located in Jakarta and West Java. In this study, non-probability sampling was employed, i.e., sampling which does not provide equal opportunities for each element of the population to be selected as a sample. In this study, the type of sampling is convenience sampling, which is sampling considering the availability and willingness of respondents to become the subjects of research. This sampling technique was selected due to the availability of respondents to PT. X. The number of respondents was 104 derived from the head office and branch office of PT. X with total population were 305. In this study, total respondents were n = 104 employees of private companies in Jakarta. The demographic description of respondents was composed of gender (male, n = 83 and female, n = 21), years of employment < 5 years (n = 74), 5-10 years (n = 21) and, > 10 years (n = 9), structural positions (n = 33), and non-structural positions (n = 71).
3.1 DATA INSTRUMENTS

The measuring instrument used for collecting the data is a questionnaire with a scale using a Likert approach that moves from scale 1 for a very inappropriate response to scale 5 for a very appropriate response. All questions in this research instrument were adapted from the original. The process of adapting the questions in the questionnaire is carried out by conducting back translation, then an analysis is carried out by an expert judgement to see the suitability of the questions with the original questions and the constructs of the instrument compilers. With the assessment of questions in each instrument by this expert judgement, cultural biases can be minimized.

3.2 AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

To measure the first variable, affective commitment, the measuring instrument developed by Allen and Meyer (1996) consisting of six items was employed. Allen and Meyer have several times revised the measuring instrument that they have made. In this study, there was a change in the number of items as there was an item that did not meet the psychometric requirements. As a result, five items were finally used with Cronbach alpha (\( \alpha \)) 0.701.

3.3 DIFFIDENT SILENCE

The second variable, diffident silence, used a measuring instrument developed by Brinsfield (2009) with a total of five items, with Cronbach alpha (\( \alpha \)) 0.743.

3.4 COLLECTIVITY

The third variable is collectivity measured using the measuring instrument developed by Moch and Wagner (Saragih, 2007). The measuring instrument of collectivity including 1 item that cannot be used in the subsequent hypothesis test as it does not meet the psychometric requirements. Collectivity instrument consists 9 items with Cronbach alpha (\( \alpha \)) 0.852.

3.5 DATA COLLECTING PROCEDURE

Data collecting is carried out by following the data collection procedure, namely prospective respondents are asked for their willingness to become research participants by filling in informed consent stating their willingness to fill in instruments, the data
provided will be processed, analyzed and published in scientific journals (national or international). Instrument work by research participants was carried out using a direct process and through the Google Form media. Data collection is carried out from February 7 to March 7, 2022.

3.6 ETHICS APPROVAL

This study had been had ethical approval from Health Research Ethics Committee Institute of Health Science Strada Indonesia, Number: 2885/KEPK/I/2022.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 RESULT

Based on the result of analyzing the description of each research variable, information was obtained on the average value and standard deviation presented in table 2 and the result of the correlation between the research variables. The information is obtained that with the measuring scale for each variable that moves from 1 to 5, a conclusion can be drawn that for diffident silence, the average respondent showed diffident silence more than the mean hypothetical value (MH=3). Therefore, it can be understood that the respondents feel less confident to convey their ideas (diffident silence). Meanwhile, related to collectivism, the average respondent shows collectivity more than the mean hypothetical (MH=3). In other words, respondents develop a collective culture in their lives. The variable of affective commitment provides information the same as that of collectivism indicating that respondents show affective commitment above the mean hypothetical (MH = 3) of the affective commitment itself. In terms of affective commitment, respondents feel that they are committed to their organization as they find positive feelings about their organization. There are similar values between the respondents and the organization.
In this study, a statistical analysis test was conducted to find out the confirmation of the proposed hypothesis. The moderation test was undertaken using regression analysis with the application of SPSS 24. The regression analysis used was a gradual regression analysis so that predictions were gradually made by including predictors in the regression. This was done to find out:

1. The effect of collectivity on affective commitment
2. The effect of collectivity and diffident silence on affective commitment
3. The effect of collectivity, diffident silence, and product (collectivity*diffident silence)

The result of the gradual regression analysis can be seen in table 3.

**Table 2. Results of the analysis of descriptions and correlations between research variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diffident Silence</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collectivity</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data, 2022

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ change</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>Sig. $F$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.237&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>6.051</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.474&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>21.911</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.521&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>6.477</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2022

a. Predictors: (constant), collectivity

b. Predictors: (constant), collectivity, diffident silence

c. Predictors: (constant), collectivity, diffident silence, product

Based on table 3, information is obtained:

1. Model 1 indicates that the effect of collectivity on affective commitment is proven to be significant with $R = 0.237$; with a predictor contribution of 5.6% ($R^2$) with the value of $F$-Change = 6.051 ($p=0.016$; $p<0.05$).
2. Model 2 added by the variable of *diffident silence* describes that *diffident silence* is proven to play a significant role as a moderator in the affective commitment with $R = 0.474$, with the predictor contribution increasing from model 1 of 5.6% to 22.4% ($R^2$) and the value of $R^2$-change of 16.8% with the value of F-Change = 21.911 ($p=0.000; p<0.01$).

3. Model 3 by adding the product to the regression analysis. From the model 3, information is also obtained that the product properly plays a role in the affective commitment. It can be seen from the increasing role of the predictor in the affective commitment by 27.1% ($R^2$) (in model 2 = 22.4%) and the value of $R^2$-change by 4.7% with the value of F-Change = 6.477 ($p=0.012; p<0.05$). Based on the value of $p$, it can be said that F-Change is significant.

By taking into account models 1 to 3, a conclusion can be drawn that collectivity and *diffident silence* can predict the strengths of affective commitment experienced by the employees. In addition, *diffident silence* is also proven to be a moderator in the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment.

In addition to the result of the gradual regression analysis in table 3, information is also obtained relating to the regression coefficient found in table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivity</td>
<td>2.361</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>5.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivity</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>4.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffident silence</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>1.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivity</td>
<td>-1.803</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td>-0.223</td>
<td>-1.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffident silence</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>-0.320</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.012*</td>
<td>-2.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data, 2022

Table 4 shows the prediction of each predictor. However, this study is focused on model 3 in which all predictors are found. Based on table 4, a regression equation can be made as shown at Figure 3.
Figure 3 describes that the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment at diffident silence is low (purple line). This situation explains that when employees show low diffident silence, the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment is also low. On the contrary, the green line indicates the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment to employees with high diffident silence. The green line explains that the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment increases with the existence of high diffident silence. Therefore, the diffident silence confirmed was the moderator in the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment.

5 DISCUSSION

This study aims to know if diffident silence can play a role as a moderator in the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment. Based on the result of data analysis, information is obtained that the proposed research hypothesis, that diffident silence plays a significant role as a moderator in the effect of collectivity on the affective commitment, is confirmed. In other words, the existence of diffident silence can enhance the role of collectivity in strengthening the affective commitment of employees of a private company in Jakarta. On the other hand, in organization climate where open communication is encouraged, the positive effects of collectivity on affective commitment might be enhanced.

Organizational commitment was initially investigated in terms of emotional-affective commitment (Kanter, 1968). Kanter suggests that what binds employees to their organization is their emotional attachment. Based on Kanter's research, Allen and Meyer developed an organizational commitment formed based on emotional attachment (affective), referred to as affective commitment, i.e., a commitment that arises as
employees feel that their goals are like those of the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Employees choose to stay in the organization because they feel a sense of harmony. In its development, Allen and Meyer added types of commitment, including continuance commitment and normative commitment. However, research conducted by Mercurio reveals that affective commitment is at the core of employees’ commitment to the organization (Mercurio, 2015). In line with the subsequent studies related to organizational commitment, Allen and Meyer (1996) confirm that studies on commitment are generally focused on affective commitment, with a major role in improving employees’ performance. Based on the opinion of Mercurio and Allen & Mayer, this research is focused on the affective commitment of employees.

Previous studies suggest that the affective commitment of employees to the organization has a positive impact not only individually (employee performance) but also organizationally (organizational performance) (Triandis, 1989). The result of this study supports that strengthening affective commitment can be undertaken by gaining positive benefits from diffident silence, especially its role as a moderator in the effect of collectivity of employees to enhance their affective commitment. Employees whose behavior is based on collective values, one of which is to maintain harmony, have a stronger effect on affective commitment, when the employees also choose to show diffident silence. The silent behavior of employees in the organization gives benefits by not triggering the emergence of embarrassment due to the ideas conveyed or sharpening the discomfort that may threaten the harmony in the existing relations. Disharmonious situation will make employees feel emotionally uncomfortable, and this condition will have a negative impact on strengthening affective commitment. Meanwhile, employees who choose to perform silence, especially diffident silence, will save from negative labeling when they voice. Employees who feel harmony in their organization and choose to show a strong diffident silence will also have a positive impact on the formation of affective commitment, and vice versa even though employees feel harmony but have a weak diffident silence (tend to voice) then the affective commitment formed is not too strong.

The result of Hofstede’s research has been criticized, mainly related to the impression of simplifying the diversity of national culture into only five dimensions, and the cultural measurement carried out by Hofstede is at the national or regional level, which results in doubts when measured at the individual level. A further study conducted
by Reisinger (2009) reveals that though there are many criticisms related to Hofstede’s cultural theory, this theory can still explain the great benefits of comparing the national culture with the culture of the group of a nation or country. This cultural understanding is accepted not only as related to the values of a job but also as the general values underlying human behaviors universally. What Reisinger has concluded is also supported by other researchers (Rinuastuti et al., 2014), suggesting that Hofstede’s measurement of national culture is a manifestation of the national identity of certain citizens reflected in their behaviors. Therefore, cultural measurement can be undertaken at the individual level, and the result obtained is like that at the state level. By employing the basis of the research conducted by Rinuastuti et al., this study also measures collectivism at the individual level.

The previous studies made as the basis for building the research hypotheses suggest that the collectivity of employees (at the individual level) has an effect on the affective commitment (Triandis, 1989) (Felfe, Yan, & Six, 2008). The result of Triandis and Felfe et al.’s research is in line with the result of this study, claiming that collectivity also has an effect on the affective commitment. Employees with a collectivity orientation can appreciate their existence as part of a group and have a sense of belonging to the group, which in turn develop into their social identity. In addition, employees are also encouraged to develop a relation attachment to their organization encouraged by the need to fulfill emotional needs. Attachment among employees is an important determinant to strengthen the affective commitment.

Collectivity, characterized by interdependence, harmony in groups, interpersonal relationships, and focus on common goals, will help form ownership of social entities. In a particular group, individual membership is an important aspect in forming employees’ self-concept. In this group, individual membership also has the potential to strengthen organizational commitment, especially affective commitment. Furthermore, it is also described that employees with high affective commitment will remain to be in the organization/company because of their wishes. Based on the social identity theory presented by Tajfel and Turner (2003), relating to the attachment to the organization for a long time, employees will identify themselves with the organization/company. Employees will describe their relationship as a ‘company man/woman’ and make the organization their family.
In general, studies of employee silence will deal with two things, including inflicting a loss on the organization as stated by Perlow and William (Wulandari, 2013) and providing benefits for the company (Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). The losses for the organization usually have psychological impacts such as experiencing humiliation and hatred, destroying communication, inhibiting creativity, weakening productivity, and having an impact on job dissatisfaction, which can result in employee turnover. On the other hand, the benefits for the company are related to assisting the management in reducing the intensity of providing excessive information, minimizing personal conflicts, and enhancing the privacy of the information of colleagues. Research results Deniz, N., Noyan, A., & Ertosun, Ö. G. (2013) explained that employee silence is an inefficient process and has a negative impact on all facets in the organization, including organizational commitment. Employees who are silent are usually because they protect themselves from the risks that may arise when employees convey their ideas. This employee silence triggers employees to not care about their organization, and increases employees' feelings of insecure which will reduce the employee's commitment to their organization.

More specifically related to diffident silence, employees show their silent behaviors due to feelings of insecurity, doubts of their own abilities (self-doubt), and uncertainty about the work situation and what to say. This will lead to feelings of fear, shame to speak, or losing their job (Brinsfield, 2009). Employees show behaviors of avoiding negative responses to what is conveyed because employees finally find difficulties in communicating their thoughts or showing their disagreement. Based on this, it can be understood that when employees are less confident in their abilities to avoid negative responses from their colleagues or from the organization, they decide or choose not to convey their voices or to be silent. Research conducted by Handayani, Haryadi, and Purnomo (Handayani et al., 2017) suggests that diffident silence in KKP (Indonesia Ministry of Marine and Fisheries) in Central Java, shows that diffident silence has a negative effect on the affective commitment of employees.

On the other hand, the result of this study reveals that diffident silence also indicates a positive effect on the affective commitment. This is contradictory to the previous research conducted on ASN KKP (Public Service in Indonesia Ministry of Marine and Fisheries) showing a negative effect. This means that the higher the employees show diffident silence behavior, the lower the employees’ affective
commitment (Handayani, Haryadi, & Purnomo, 2017). It differs from the result of this study, where the subjects are employees of a private company, explaining that diffident silence can have a positive effect on affective commitment. This means that the higher employees perform diffident silence, the greater the affective commitment of the employees. The diffident silence indicates an effect on the affective commitment by looking at the reasons why employees choose to show silent behavior. Employees who choose to indicate diffident silence are based on the encouragement of not getting an embarrassment or a label that makes them uncomfortable in the organization. The embarrassment and discomfort will reduce emotional attachment to the organization. A weak emotional attachment to the organization will reduce the affective commitment. Related to this study, the more employees choose diffident silence, the stronger their affective commitment, because by performing diffident silence, employees will be protected from the possible emergence of embarrassment and discomfort. Silence is his best option for employees, as those with a voice often face risks to reputation, receiving sanction or retaliation.

The study participants mostly come from sub-urban area. Hofstede (2005) explains that Indonesia generally shows a collective culture. Several studies indicate that there has been a shift in the collectivity of employees in Indonesia, especially employees working in big cities, such as Jakarta, as a metropolitan city. As a result, mix of cultures is strongly possible for a cultural shift to occur, including collectivity (Gumelar, Vania, & Maulana, 2018). Gumelar et al further describe that people living in urban areas like Jakarta tend to express a western lifestyle that inclines to be individualistic. This is one of the triggering factors for changing their cultural preferences to become more individualist-oriented. Based on this, the target of the research needs to be expanded, not only in Jakarta and West Java. It is necessary to consider conducting research in other companies to see if the result of this study is consistent. It is expected that there will be updates related to the presence or absence of cultural changes, especially collectivity.

6 CONCLUSION

This study develops a hypothetical model based on various previous studies which explain that affective commitment is formed because there are several other variables including collectivity and employee behavior in conveying ideas. Collectivity is a study that explains the existence of individual behavior based on the willingness to maintain
harmony within the group. In organizational studies, the individual's willingness to convey this idea has two poles, namely disclosure and silence. In this study, the employee silence variable is discussed, to be precise, diffident silence which acts as a moderator on the correlation of collectivity with affective commitment. Diffident silence is understood as an employee's silent behavior based on a desire to strengthen comfort and security in a perceived uncertain work situation.

Information from the research is that collectivity plays a role in affective commitment. Likewise, with diffident silence. With these two findings. The results of further exploration explain that different silence is a moderator of the correlation between collectivity and affective commitment. This explains that employees who have an affective commitment because of the collectivity will strengthen their affective commitment when the employee chooses to be diffident. This is because when employees increase their diffident silence, they will feel more secure and comfortable, thus helping to strengthen the role of harmony in affective commitment.

This research shows a potential research problem that still needs to be reviewed for further research, including research on companies that have different fields such as services or services. This will provide information on the comparison of the models that occur. Besides that, it is also necessary to study other aspects of silence in employee silence, considering the collective Indonesian culture, usually this silence is chosen as an effort to maintain harmony, are reluctant or because there are bad feelings.
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