

Teacher Silence and Voice as Predictors of Ethical Responsibility in School Organizations

Beatrise U. Villanueva¹, Francis Michael P. Yambao²

¹DepEd Teacher III, Centro Escolar University

²Dean, Graduate Schol, Centro Escolar University

ABSTRACT

This research examined teacher organizational silence, teacher voice and the professional ethics of teachers working in a public secondary school. More specifically, this research studied how much teachers experience organizational silence; how much do they express their voices; and the amount of ethical responsibility exhibited. Additionally, does organizational silence or voice influence ethical responsibility? This study used a quantitative, descriptive-correlational type of research methodology. Data collection occurred using an electronic survey for sixty (60) junior high school teachers representing various subjects within Angono National High School. Data were collected using a five-point Likert scale. Descriptive statistics, Pearson product moment correlations and multiple regression statistical analyses were performed upon the collected data.

Results demonstrated that teachers exhibited moderate levels of organizational silence, expressed high levels of teacher voice and extremely high levels of ethical responsibility. Results from the correlation analyses revealed a statistically significant positive association between teacher voice and ethical responsibility. Therefore, when teachers feel more comfortable expressing their thoughts and opinions, then they will exhibit greater amounts of ethical behavior at work. Conversely, organizational silence was found to be negatively correlated with a lack of significance with respect to ethical responsibility. Regression analyses further confirmed that teacher voice significantly predicted ethical responsibility, whereas organizational silence did not. Overall, the results suggest the need for developing a favorable school climate and fostering open communication as a method to foster greater ethical responsibility and create a collaborative and responsive organizational culture.

Keywords: teacher organizational silence, teacher voice, ethical responsibility, school organizations, junior high school teachers

INTRODUCTION

Teachers' role extends beyond that of the classroom teacher to include involvement in making decisions, carrying out school policies, addressing new issues, and helping to enhance the school environment (Gulo, 2024). As they fulfil these roles, teachers are expected to be responsible in an ethical manner regarding learners, colleagues, parents and the wider school community. Teachers' opportunities and willingness to share concerns, recommendations, and professional judgments, then, may be significant elements of ethical practice in school organizations.

Teachers in large public secondary schools in a highly structured administrative environment of Philippine public education, are expected to function within a known organizational hierarchy and in a known set of

institutional procedures (Basa, 2025). While teaching, there may be moments when a teacher needs to voice his or her concerns or be silent, despite attempts to promote collaboration, shared leadership, and participative decision-making in schools (Badal, 2024). Concerns can be related to practices, relationship issues, instructional methods, organizational protocols, policy application, or something that the teacher feels is inappropriate or is not consistent with professional best practices (Melaku et al., 2025). In such cases, teacher voice might be one way for teachers to share their ideas, suggestions, concerns, and professional judgments that can help to improve organization. On the other hand, organizational silence can be manifested when teachers avoid sharing information, concerns, and opinions about organizational matters.

The concept of organizational silence has been studied in organizational behavior literature as a situation where employees fail to share with the organization their concerns, information, or ideas that might otherwise be shared (Envergil & Ozdal, 2026; Katıtaş, 2026; Yan et al., 2025). When silence is considered in an educational context, it can be especially significant as teachers have first-hand knowledge of the conditions in those classrooms, of the needs of their learners, of the processes and challenges in the school, and of the issues that impact the ability to provide an education. Teacher voice, however, is a reflection of teachers' readiness to share their thoughts, concerns, suggestions and professional opinions (Gozali et al., 2017). In a positive way, teacher voice can enable schools to uncover issues, think differently about a problem and enhance organizational processes (Zhou et al., 2026). It could also give teachers a way to fulfill their responsibilities and ethics.

There can be multiple layers of teacher voice, organizational silence and ethical responsibility, however, that might not be so simple. Sometimes teachers are reluctant to voice their concerns due to the potential for power dynamics, fear of possible repercussions, lack of confidence that their concerns will be listened to, and a perception that speaking up won't make any difference (Gillett-Swan & Baroutsis, 2023). The organizational climate is thus likely to influence teachers' ability to share professional opinions and worries. The team members are more likely to raise their ideas, questions, and concerns when they feel interpersonal risk is manageable, for instance, from the perspective of psychological safety. Analyses of organizational behavior and ethical leadership also indicate that organizational factors and leadership behaviors can affect the way employees engage, communicate, and react to ethical issues (Serang et al., 2024). These viewpoints can serve as a starting point for investigating teacher voice and organizational silence as organizational behaviors that could be correlated with the teachers' ethical responsibilities.

Although there is increasing focus on teacher involvement and organizational behavior in educational practice, there is a key empirical gap. Existing literature on voice and silence of teachers have not adequately established the relationship between these two organizational communication behaviors to the teacher's ethical responsibility, especially in Philippine public schools (Ayento, 2026; Zacarias & Flores, 2024). More specifically, it is not yet known whether teachers' openness to sharing their concerns, ideas, and professional judgments is a significant predictor of their ethical responsibility and whether when they were silenced, this also led to differences in ethical responsibility (Daniel & Sapo, 2020). Such a distinction is crucial because teacher voice does not necessarily stand in opposition to organizational silence and vice versa; it is not always an indicator or an assumption of ethical or unethical action. For a variety of professional and organizational reasons, teachers may not speak up, and teacher voice may offer a more direct pathway for teachers to respond to issues that impact students and the school community. Given this gap, the study of the predictive relationships between these variables may offer evidence of the organizational conditions of teachers' ethical practice, and this is important to educational leadership. The

finding could have implications for developing school cultures in which teachers can voice concerns and suggestions in a constructive manner, if teacher voice is linked to ethical responsibility. Concurrently, a study of organizational silence could yield a clue as to whether teachers' reluctance to speak up is a factor in their ethical responsibility or if it relies on other organizational and individual factors. This sort of evidence can help to develop a more sophisticated picture of communication behaviors in school organizations, rather than the attitudes of speaking up and no speaking up being interpreted as ethical or unethical, respectively.

This literature review study therefore investigated teachers' voice and organizational silence as factors affecting teachers' ethics in the Philippine public secondary schools. In particular, the study aimed to establish if there is a significant relationship between teacher voice and organizational silence and ethical responsibility. The study also makes a contribution to the field of educational leadership and organizational behavior by offering empirical findings about the link between teachers' communication behaviors and ethical responsibility in the school environment. From a practical perspective, the results can guide policy makers and school leaders in building a supportive culture for teachers, through providing them opportunities to voice concerns and participate in school improvement, while providing them with a psychologically safe setting. This work aims to offer a more evidence-based view of the factors that might enable teachers to be ethically engaged in the school organization through these contributions.

Statement of the Problem

The importance of teacher voice to ethical and effective school organizations is well recognized. However, many teachers are silent about issues that affect classroom teaching-learning process, student welfare, and organizational integrity.

The study aimed to determine the relationship between teacher organizational silence, teacher's voice, and ethical responsibility among junior high school teachers of Angono National High School. Specifically, this study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of teacher organizational silence among teachers in the school organization?
2. What is the level of teachers' willingness to speak up (teacher voice) in school-related matters?
3. How do teachers perceive their ethical responsibility in relation to speaking up in the organization?
4. Is there a significant relationship between:
 - 4.1. teacher silence and ethical responsibility?
 - 4.2. teacher voice and ethical responsibility?
5. To what extent do teacher silence and voice predict ethical responsibility?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Silence in School Organizations

Organizational silence continues to be a significant concern in many institutions, including schools. Morrison (2023) found that employee silence occurs in organizations where individuals feel that speaking up is risky or unlikely to result in change. This is especially true in educational settings as teachers often work within structured hierarchies that may discourage open communication (Wang & Fan, 2025).

Recent studies have proved that organizational silence is influenced by factors such as leadership style, psychological safety, and organizational climate (Brinsfield, 2020). In schools, teachers may be silenced due to fear of negative consequences, lack of administrative support or past experiences of being ignored

(Appiah-Odamé & Frempong, 2025; Kassandrinou et al., 2023). This can limit opportunities for school improvement and may allow problematic practices to continue.

Teacher Voice and School Improvement

Teacher voice has gained increasing attention in recent years as a key factor in school development and reform. Liang et al. (2012) provided a foundational framework for understanding voice behavior that is widely used in recent studies. More recent research indicates that teacher voice contributes to innovation, collaboration, and improved school decision-making (Grover and Nguyen, 2020).

When teachers feel supported and psychologically safe, they are more likely to express their thoughts and concerns (Frazier, 2017). Conversely, environments that do not embrace openness and trust can suppress teacher voice, leading to disengagement and reduced participation in school improvement initiatives (Baldonado & Villocino, 2025).

Ethical Responsibility in Teaching

Ethical responsibility is still a major component of the teaching profession. Recent literature emphasizes that teachers are expected not only to follow rules but also to act in ways that promote fairness, integrity, and student well-being (Tirri, 2019). Ethical responsibility is connected to teachers' professional identity and moral decision-making in the classroom and within the school organization (Murugan et al., 2025).

Studies have also shown that ethical behavior at schools is influenced by values of both individual and organizational culture (Cabanting et al., 2025; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2021). Teachers with an elevated sense of ethical responsibility are more likely to take action when faced with issues that affect students, even if such actions involve risks.

Relationship Between Silence, Voice, and Ethics

Recent research has started to explore the relations of silence, voice, and ethical responsibility. Studies indicate that organizational silence may inhibit ethical action, as individuals who choose not to speak up about concerns may fail to address important issues (Morrison, 2023). On the other hand, voice behavior is often associated with ethical responsibility, as speaking up can help prevent harm and facilitate positive change within the organization (Arham et al., 2022).

In school contexts, teacher voice can be seen as an expression of ethical commitment, especially when teachers express concern for student welfare or when teachers challenge ineffective practices (Paulmann & Weinstein, 2025). However, the decision to raise one's voice is often shaped by organizational factors such as leadership, trust, and perceived support (Nguyen et al., 2020).

Local and Regional Evidence (Philippine and comparable contexts)

Recent studies in the Philippine educational setting have identified the teachers' willingness to speak up is often influenced by organizational culture, leadership practices, and perceived support within the school. In many public schools, hierarchical structures and deference to authority can sometimes discourage open communication, leading teachers to remain silent even when they know there are issues affecting teaching-learning process.

Specifically, the study by Department of Education (DepEd, 2020) emphasized the need for supportive school environments where teachers feel safe to share their ideas and concerns. However, there are also reports that some teachers are reluctant to raise issues due to fear of negative evaluation, conflict with administrators, or lack of feedback mechanisms.

In a Philippine-based study, teacher voice was found to be positively associated with school improvement and professional engagement, particularly when school leaders practiced open communication and

participatory decision-making (Garcia & Dimaculangan, 2019). This suggests that promoting teachers' speak-up increases the likelihood that they will contribute to innovation and improvement in the school. On the other hand, organizational silence has also been observed in local school settings. Cultural values like pakikisama and hiya can influence their decision to avoid conflict or maintain good relations with colleagues and administrators, prompting teachers to keep silent (Nunez, 2025). These cultural factors can limit a teacher's willingness to express concerns, even when the concerns are ethically significant.

Similar patterns are found in comparable Southeast Asian contexts. For instance, studies in Indonesia and Vietnam show that high power distance and strong hierarchical systems impede employee voice and increase silence in organizations (Nguyen et al., 2020). In these situations, teachers often rely on leadership support and organizational trust before deciding to speak up.

Professional standards and cultural expectations also have great influence on ethical responsibility of teachers in the Philippine setting. Teachers are expected to act in the best interest of students, maintain integrity, and contribute to a positive learning environment. However, the capacity to act on such ethical responsibilities is often a function of organizational conditions. When teachers feel unsupported and unsafe they may struggle to translate their ethical beliefs into action.

Overall, both local and regional studies suggest that teacher voice, organizational silence, and ethical responsibility are closely interconnected. Teachers may be aware of their ethical responsibility to speak out but may be encouraged or discouraged from doing so by organizational and cultural factors can either support or hinder their willingness to do so. This underscores the need to develop school environments that foster psychological safety, trust, and open communication.

Gaps in the literature and rationale for the present study

Even though the literature on organizational silence and voice has grown, the majority of research has been conducted in corporate or non-educational environments. There is still lack of research on teachers specifically especially in public secondary schools in the Philippines.

International organizations like UNESCO (2017) and OECD (2019) emphasize the importance of teacher agency, ethical practice, and participatory school culture. However, there is a lack of empirical studies on the influence of teacher silence and teacher voice on ethical responsibility in real school settings.

This study seeks to fill this gap by examining the predictive relationship between teacher silence, teacher voice, and ethical responsibility among junior high school teachers in a public secondary school.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to examine the predictive relationship between teacher silence, teacher voice, and ethical responsibility in school organizations. The descriptive component was used to determine the levels of the key variables, while the correlational component assessed the relationships among these variables. In addition, a predictive approach was utilized to determine the extent to which teacher silence and teacher voice predict ethical responsibility.

This design is appropriate as the study aims to analyze naturally occurring variables without manipulation and in establishing statistical associations and predictive effects among them.

This design allowed the researcher to examine both the strength and direction of relationships among variables while identifying predictive effects.

Participants and Sampling

The number of teachers who participated in this study was 60 teachers representing 37.5% of all the junior

high school teachers, total 160. The sample size was considered sufficient for the study's planned descriptive and multiple regression analyses within the accessible population, particularly because the study involved two predictor variables—teacher voice and organizational silence. The sample also covered all eight subject departments, thus representing the major instructional areas in the school. The number of teachers eligible for the sample was the number of teachers who were willing to give a complete response during the period of data collection, and was not calculated formally using a probability-based sample size.

The application of stratified purposive sampling was thus suitable to the actual conditions of data collection, as it allowed the researcher to get the viewpoints of each subject department, and still had to fulfill the inclusion criteria of the study and respect voluntary participation. The approach intentionally ensured representation within the identified departmental strata, unlike simple convenience sampling. However, the sample may also have been selected with some form of selection or nonresponse bias since the participants were not selected through probability sampling and that participation was voluntary. Therefore, the results should not be extended to the general population of junior high school teachers, with caution, except for the teachers who participated in this study. The total number of participants was 160 teachers who were distributed in eight subject departments namely, Filipino, English, Mathematics, Science, Araling Panlipunan, Edukasyon sa Pagpapakatao, Technology and Livelihood Education (TLE) and MAPEH.

Initially, a study was planned to use proportionate stratified random sampling in order to ensure representation from the different subject departments. Probability sampling was not completely possible, though, due to the availability and willingness of teachers to participate in the data-collection time frame. Thus, a stratified purposive sampling with voluntary consent was used for this study. The teachers were classified in their subject area, and participants were selected purposefully if they were of the target population.

Multicollinearity was not a concern ($VIF = 1.18$; Tolerance = 0.846). The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that residuals deviated from normality, $W = 0.883$, $p < .001$. Inspection of the Q-Q plot revealed departures from the diagonal line, particularly in the tails, suggesting the presence of non-normal residuals. Despite this violation, regression analyses were retained because linear regression is generally robust to moderate departures from normality, particularly when sample sizes are adequate.

Research Instruments

The study used a structured questionnaire to gather divided into of three parts, each referring to one of the main variables of the study.

The first part measured organizational silence. This section was adapted from existing organizational silence measures based on the framework of Morrison and Milliken (2000). It included items about captured how often teachers hold back their own ideas, concerns, or feedback within the school. The items were about different forms of silence, such as staying quiet due to fear of negative consequences or believing that speaking up would not make a difference.

The second part focused on teacher voice. This was adapted from the Teacher Voice Behavior Scale developed by Liang, Farh, and Farh (2012). It measured the extent to which teachers express their suggestions, concerns, and ideas to improve school practices. The items included both promotive voice and prohibitive voice.

The third part measured ethical responsibility. This section was developed by the researcher and was based on the ethical framework of Carroll (1991). It assessed teachers' sense of moral responsibility in acting

for the benefit of students and the school, particularly in relation to speaking up about important issues. A pilot test was done for the ethical responsibility construct (n=60). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the 10-item Ethical Responsibility scale. The KMO value was 0.869, while Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(45) = 512.351$, $p < .001$, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. A one-factor solution explained 63.58% of the total variance, with factor loadings ranging from 0.487 to 0.912. The scale demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.926$). These findings provide preliminary evidence of the construct validity and one-dimensionality of the Ethical Responsibility scale.

All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Procedure

Permission was obtained from the principal of Angono National High School prior to the actual data gathering through a formal request letter. Once approved, the researcher contacted the heads of the departments in an attempt to help disseminate the questionnaires to the selected respondents.

Using stratified purposive sampling, respondents were identified from each subject department based on their availability and willingness to participate.

The questionnaires were distributed using an online platform (Google Forms). The respondents were given an informed consent form before answering, explaining the purpose of the study and assuring them that their participation was voluntary and their responses would be kept confidential. They were also told that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time.

The respondents were given adequate time to respond to the questionnaire. Then, the researcher collected the completed responses and checked if they were complete. All data collected were then organized, coded and ready for statistical analysis.

Ethical standards were upheld throughout the process, especially in maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of all participants.

Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods based on the research questions and objectives. After all responses were gathered, the data were organized, coded, and entered a statistical software for analysis.

To determine the levels of organizational silence, teacher voice, and ethical responsibility, mean and standard deviation were used. These descriptive statistics provided a general understanding of the respondents' perceptions and tendencies in relation to the variables of the study.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) was used to examine the relationships among the variables. We used this to see if there was a significant relationship between teacher silence and ethical responsibility, and teacher voice and ethical responsibility. The level of significance was 0.05.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the extent to which teacher silence and teacher voice predict ethical responsibility. This enabled the researcher to evaluate the individual and combined effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical research standards, including voluntary participation, anonymity, confidentiality of responses, and compliance with data privacy regulations. Participants were assured that no identifying information would be disclosed.

RESULTS

In this section, the results of the study based on the data gathered from the respondents are discussed and explained. The findings are presented in line with the research questions, which are the level of organizational silence, teacher voice and ethical responsibility; the correlations between these variables; and the predictive effect of organizational silence and teacher voice on ethical responsibility.

Level of Teacher Silence, Teacher Voice, and Ethical Responsibility

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the key variables in the study.

Table 1. Level of Teacher Organizational Silence, Teacher Voice, and Ethical Responsibility

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Teacher Organizational Silence	3.02	0.95	Moderate
Teacher Voice	3.58	0.81	High
Ethical Responsibility	4.51	0.57	Very High

As shown in Table 1, the level of teacher organizational silence among teachers was moderate ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.95$). This indicates that teachers sometimes choose to withhold their ideas or concerns, although not consistently. This suggests that while teachers are not entirely silent, there are still situations where they hesitate to speak up, possibly due to perceived risks or lack of expected outcomes.

In contrast, the level of teacher voice was high ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 0.81$), indicating that teachers generally express their ideas and suggestions to improve school practices. This suggests that teachers are still actively participating in communication processes within the school, even in the presence of some level of silence.

Meanwhile, ethical responsibility was found to be very high ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 0.57$), showing that teachers strongly value ethical behavior and are committed to acting in ways that promote fairness, integrity, and student welfare.

These findings suggest that while teachers may occasionally remain silent, they still maintain strong ethical standards and are willing to speak up when necessary.

Relationship Between Teacher Silence, Teacher Voice, and Ethical Responsibility

To determine the relationships among the variables, Pearson correlation analysis was conducted. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlation Between Teacher Silence, Teacher Voice, and Ethical Responsibility

Variable	r	p-value	Interpretation
Teacher Organizational Silence and Ethical Responsibility	-0.22	0.086	Not Significant
Teacher Voice and Ethical Responsibility	0.45	0.0003	Significant

As shown in Table 2, teacher organizational silence had a negative but not statistically significant relationship with ethical responsibility ($r = -0.22$, $p = 0.086$). This indicates that although higher levels of silence tend to be associated with lower ethical responsibility, the relationship is not strong enough to be considered significant in this study.

On the other hand, teacher voice showed a moderate, positive, and statistically significant relationship with ethical responsibility ($r = 0.45$, $p = 0.0003$). This suggests that teachers who are more willing to express their ideas and concerns are also more likely to demonstrate strong ethical responsibility. This finding highlights the importance of open communication in promoting ethical practices within school organizations.

Predictive Influence of Teacher Silence and Voice on Ethical Responsibility

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine whether teacher silence and teacher voice significantly predict ethical responsibility. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression Analysis Predicting Ethical Responsibility

Predictor	Beta (β)	p-value	Interpretation
Teacher Silence	-0.033	0.666	Not Significant
Teacher Voice	0.302	0.002	Significant

Model Summary: $R^2 = 0.204$, $F = 7.289$, $p = 0.0015$

As shown in Table 3, the regression model was statistically significant ($F = 7.289$, $p = 0.0015$), indicating that teacher silence and teacher voice, when taken together, significantly predict ethical responsibility. The model explained approximately 20.4% of the variance in ethical responsibility ($R^2 = 0.204$), suggesting that while these variables are important, other factors may also influence ethical behavior. Among the predictors, teacher voice emerged as a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.302$, $p = 0.002$), indicating that teachers who actively express their ideas and concerns are more likely to demonstrate higher ethical responsibility.

In contrast, teacher silence was not a significant predictor ($\beta = -0.033$, $p = 0.666$), suggesting that remaining silent does not significantly influence ethical responsibility in this study.

DISCUSSIONS

The results show that teacher voice has a significant impact on ethical responsibility, and that teacher silence does not. A more open expression of concerns, ideas, and professional judgments is shown to be more reflective of teachers' ethical responsibility. This could be because learners are given an opportunity to voice their concerns about learners, instructional methods, or school operations, which can be addressed by the teacher through speaking out. In the context of organizational behavior, voice is seen as a constructive way to engage in an organization that can help improve the organization (Morrison, 2023). The non-significant correlation between teacher silence and ethical responsibility indicates that "silence does not necessarily mean no ethical commitment. There may be perceived risks, organizational hierarchy, and uncertainty about whether concerns are addressed that may cause teachers to remain silent. In the context of psychological safety, teachers will be more likely to voice concerns if they think voicing concerns won't lead to negative interpersonal or professional consequences. As a result, the organizational climate could shape teachers' decisions to voice or not voice.

Ethical responsibility was explained by the regression model ($R^2 = 0.204$), which means that part of the differences in ethical responsibility can be attributed to teacher voice and silence. The rest of the 79.6% may have other factors related to them, for example, ethical leadership, organizational climate, professional values, perceived organizational support and teaching experience. This indicates that there

are several factors at the individual and organizational level that play a role in determining ethical responsibility.

The results underscore that supportive, psychologically safe school environments are critical. School leaders can foster teacher voice by frequently seeking teachers' feedback, creating formal feedback and consultation processes, addressing concerns positively, and allowing for respectful dissent. Professional development could also enhance teachers' capacity to make ethical choices and communicate effectively. The results of the study, however, must be interpreted with caution because of the limited number of teachers (60) in one school and the cross-sectional design of the study and should not be considered as evidence of causal relationships. Larger samples of teachers in various schools could be utilized in future studies to explore other factors that might add to teachers' moral responsibility.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the levels of teacher silence, teacher voice, and ethical responsibility among junior high school teachers, as well as the relationships among these variables and their predictive influence on ethical responsibility.

Findings indicated that teachers demonstrated a moderate degree of teacher silence and a high degree of teacher voice. These results suggest that although teachers may choose to remain silent when issues develop in the workplace, they also tend to engage in school processes and participate in idea generation through expression of their thoughts. Moreover, results indicate that teachers demonstrated a very high level of ethical responsibility. The data suggests that the sample of educators demonstrated a strong allegiance to the values inherent in being a professional educator, including maintaining integrity and ensuring the welfare of students.

Relationships between variables were identified. Teacher voice was positively associated with ethical responsibility. Results support that those teachers who are more willing to "speak out" are more likely to exhibit behaviors consistent with ethical responsibility. Conversely, teacher silence did not significantly relate to ethical responsibility. Therefore, it appears that silence itself does not inherently contribute to ethical actions by educators.

Following further analysis regarding predictors of ethical responsibility, findings supported that teacher voice predicted ethical responsibility; however, teacher silence was not a significant predictor. Thus, teacher participation in school activities (i.e., vocalizing opinions) is critical to creating a climate for ethics within school environments.

Overall, the study underscores the value of fostering a school environment where educators feel psychologically safe and trusted, thus encouraging them to express their views openly. Encouraging teacher voice not only strengthens communication but also contributes to the development of a more ethically responsive and collaborative school culture.

References

1. Arham, A. F., Norizan, N. S., Azhari, N. D., Karim, R. A., & Malan, I. N. B. (2022). Speak Up! Factors Contributing towards Employee Voice Behaviour. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 12(9). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v12-i9/14706>
2. Ayento, N. A. (2026). Transparency, accountability and ethical leadership practices of school heads: their influence on teacher commitment and school climate. *International Journal of Sustainability and Advanced Integrated Research*, 2(2), 1226–1232. <https://doi.org/10.65339/ijlsair.v2.i2.312>

3. Badal, B. (2024). Silence is Also a Voice, Right? Reflections on Silence as Resistant Teacher Voice in the Context of Curriculum Change in South Africa. *Africa Education Review*, 20(4), 104–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18146627.2024.2400250>
4. Baldonado, M. M., & Villocino, R. P. (2025). BUILDING TRUST AND RESPECT: TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES WITH SCHOOL LEADERS. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 338–349. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra23693>
5. Basa, W. (2025). Public high school teachers' welfare and quality of teaching upon implementation of the immediate removal of administrative tasks in Candelaria, Zambales. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19224069>
6. Brinsfield, C. T. (2020). Employee silence motives: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(3), 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2429>
7. Cabanting, A. P. R., Francisco, R. H. F. R., Espilla, A. J. E., Basa, S. G. M., Abongan, N. T., Barreza, K. J. B., Cruda, R. L., Bataller, M. C., Ponce, K. J. B., Alon, J., Clamores, K. J. M., & Pelandas, A. M. O. (2025). The relationship between personal values and organizational values on the attitudes of the secondary school teachers. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(III), 1785–1804. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90300141>
8. Daniel, W., & Sapo, S. (2020). Teachers' perception of professional ethics and its impact on their professionalism. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 8(6), 400–410. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-8-6-6>
9. Department of Education. (2020). Basic education learning continuity plan in the time of COVID-19. Department of Education, Philippines. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/DepEd_LCP_July3.pdf
10. Envergil, D., & Ozdal, M. A. (2026). Organizational silence and work alienation: a study on public hospital health employees. *BMC Health Services Research*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-026-14745-2>
11. Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vacheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113–165. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183>
12. Garcia, M. B., & Dimaculangan, E. D. (2019). Teacher voice and school improvement: Basis for participatory school leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(3), 1–8.
13. Gillett-Swan, J., & Baroutsis, A. (2023). Student voice and teacher voice in educational research: a systematic review of 25 years of literature from 1995–2020. *Oxford Review of Education*, 50(4), 533–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2023.2257132>
14. Gozali, C., Thrush, E. C., Soto-Peña, M., Whang, C., & Lushei, T. F. (2017). Teacher Voice in Global Conversations around Education Access, Equity, and Quality. *FIRE Forum for International Research in Education*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.18275/fire201704011107>
15. Gulo, F. A. (2024). Teachers' role and the development of curriculum. *Sintaksis Publikasi Para Ahli Bahasa Dan Sastra Inggris*, 2(1), 226–230. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sintaksis.v2i1.373>
16. Kassandrinou, M., Lainidi, O., Mouratidis, C., & Montgomery, A. (2023). Employee silence, job burnout and job engagement among teachers: the mediational role of psychological safety. *Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine*, 11(1), 2213302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2023.2213302>

17. Katıtaş, S. (2026). Unpacking the effect of organizational silence on teachers' turnover intention: the mediating role of work alienation. *SAGE Open*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251414812>
18. Liang, J., Farh, C. I. C., & Farh, J.-L. (2012). Psychological antecedents of promotive and prohibitive voice: A two-wave examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0176>
19. Melaku, A. K., Ali, A. Y., & Tesfaye, T. M. (2025). Teachers' and students' perception, practices, and challenges of active learning strategy utilization in primary schools of North Wollo Zone, Ethiopia. *Smart Learning Environments*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00391-4>
20. 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>
21. Morrison, E. W. (2023). Employee voice and silence: Taking stock a decade later. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 79–107. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-054654>
22. Murugan, A., Pandiamani, B., & Suresh, K. M. (2025). Honesty as a moral and professional virtue in teaching: A conceptual framework integrating virtue ethics, teacher identity, and ethical practice. *Dialnet (Universidad De La Rioja)*. <https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2025.16.06.02>
23. Nguyen, Q., Grover, S. L., & Nguyen, T. (2020). Voice behavior and its impact on organizational effectiveness: Evidence from educational settings. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(4), 673–688. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2019-0253>
24. Nunez, A. L. (2025). Cultural Values in Leadership Practices of Filipino Teacher-Leaders in South Central Maryland: Input for Transformational Leadership Framework. *AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v10i1.150>
25. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en>
26. Paulmann, S., & Weinstein, N. (2025). Motivating tones to enhance education: The effects of vocal awareness on teachers' voices. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(2), 551–564. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12737>
27. Serang, S., Ramlawati, R., Suriyanti, S., Junaidi, J., & Nurimansjah, R. A. (2024). The role of ethical leadership on employees' behaviours and commitment to the organisation. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(0). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v22i0.2373>
28. Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2021). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (5th ed.). Routledge.
29. Tirri, K. (2019). Teachers' professional ethics in education. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of teacher education*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1179-6>
30. UNESCO. (2017). Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444>
31. Wang, Y., & Fan, Z. (2025). The impact of communities of practice on professional development among Chinese teachers: a Mixed-Methods longitudinal study. *SAGE Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251359824>
32. Yan, M., Shi, Z., Zhou, A., & Zeng, S. (2025). Analysis and interpretation of organizational silence behavior of male nurses from the perspective of phenomenology. *BMC Nursing*, 24(1), 864.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-025-03519-6>

33. Zacarias, A. M., & Flores, J. E. (2024). Exploring school leaders' ethical leadership and teachers' organizational citizenship behavior. *Puissant*, 5, 1630-1645.
34. Zhou, X., Li, Y., & Feng, Y. (2026). Psychological safety and teacher voice behavior: Power distance orientation in Chinese schools. *Acta Psychologica*, 267, 106922.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106922>