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According to the social theory of exchange, we look into how inclusive leadership affects employees' quiet behavior. We also look into how psychological safety, power distance orientation, and active personality play a part in these relationships. The structural equation model analysis of 343 data obtained from three tracking surveys found that: inclusive leaders have a significant negative effect on employee silent behavior; inclusive leadership has a significant positive impact on employees' psychological security; there is a significant negative relationship between psychological security and employees' silent behavior; and psychological security plays an intermediary role between inclusive leadership and employees' silent behavior. The power distance orientation of employees has a negative regulatory effect on the relationship between inclusive leaders and their psychological safety. In other words, employees with a high power-distance orientation experience a weakened positive impact from inclusive leadership on their psychological safety. For employees with a low power-distance orientation, inclusive leadership has a more significant positive impact on employees' psychological safety. The proactive personality of an employee can strengthen the connection between psychological safety and silent behavior. This means that employees with high initiative will experience a greater negative impact from psychological security on silent behavior, while those with low initiative will experience a less significant negative impact.
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Introduction

In the current complex and changeable external environment and the trend of an increasingly severe economic situation, enterprises are facing more fierce competition.
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Employees actively make suggestions and participate in the organization, and management and decision-making have become important channels for enterprises to maintain their own competitiveness and long-term development.

However, in the actual business activities of the enterprise, there are often some unsatisfactory situations. In the specific management practice of the enterprise, employees will not actively point out the problems in the enterprise process, and even when the organization or leader solicits their suggestions, employees often choose to silence, conceal, or filter their opinions so as to avoid substantive answers to the questions. Employee silence is a kind of negative employee behavior.

Employee silence will not only have a negative impact on employees' mentality and emotions, reduce their efficiency and work output, but also have a bad impact on the organization. Specifically, employee silence behavior not only hides the problems existing in the management but also causes a false impression to managers, making them think that enterprise management normal, unity, and harmonious relationships will eventually cause the destruction of communication channels, irreparable influence on organization management and operation, and harm the survival and development of the organization.

For individual employees, the existing research mainly studies the causes of employees' silent behavior from two aspects: endogenous factors and external situational factors. The endogenous factors of employees focus on their personal characteristics and intra-individual mechanisms, while the external situational factors focus on their leadership type and behavior.

Therefore, this study intends to start from the above two different types of influencing factors, through the interaction of external situational factors and internal individual factors, to explore the mechanism of breaking the "black box of silent behavior".

Morrison (2011) found that an important factor leading to employees' silent behavior is leadership factors: different leadership styles will have different effects on employee behavior, and an inclusive leadership style has a certain impact on employees' silent behavior.

First of all, inclusive leaders can fully listen to the opinions of subordinates, identify with their value orientation, have insight into the needs of employees, and pay attention to their behaviors. Inclusive leaders are characterized by openness, availability, and accessibility.

Therefore, leaders with inclusive characteristics can understand employees' mistakes, guide them to treat them correctly, give help, reduce employees' silent behavior, and promote the healthy and rapid development of the enterprise. Secondly, as people's demands for work independence and autonomy continue to grow, the enterprise is facing a series of management challenges that require higher standards.

Enterprises must create a more inclusive and open working environment for employees and accept various types of employees as much as possible. In this case, it becomes very important for enterprises to carry out diversified management, among which the core problem is to be able to accept various differences within the enterprise, mobilize their work enthusiasm, and make employees actively participate in the company's decision-making. Inclusive leadership largely aligns with the inclusive needs of enterprises and effectively manages the diversity and unique characteristics of personnel within the organization.
At the same time, the inclusive leadership style can reduce the employees' fear of the leadership and stimulate their confidence and courage to make suggestions, so as to achieve the purpose of reducing employees' silence.

Therefore, it is very important to deeply explore the function mechanism and boundary conditions of inclusive leaders on employees' silent behavior, which not only enriches people's understanding of the leading causes of employees' silent behavior but also deepens the academic research on the outcome variables of inclusive leadership.

While inclusive leaders can influence employees' silent behavior to a certain extent, a thorough study of their intermediaries remains necessary.

Li et al. (2022) shows that leaders can influence individuals' series of behaviors by influencing individuals' cognitive emotions, and individuals' understanding and evaluation of their environment is an important internal driving force for their actions.

Liu et al. (2021) pointed out that employees' psychological security is an independent perception of their working environment. They combine their personal experiences and feelings to perceive the organizational atmosphere, and their influence on individual explicit behavior varies accordingly. Employee psychological security is considered a perception of internal risk generated when communicating with organization members, especially with leaders.

When individuals possess a high level of psychological security, it weakens their assessment of the negative risks in their environment, leading them to adopt positive actions that promote the organization's growth, curb negative behaviors, and minimize employee silence. Based on this study and the social exchange theory as the breakthrough point, consider psychological security in inclusive leadership and employee silence behavior in the relationship between the intermediary role and inclusive leadership style by affecting staff psychological security to inhibit employee silence behavior. This helps to crack how to break through the leadership silence, this "intermediary black box."

Additionally, the individual characteristics of the employees determine the effectiveness of the leadership style, and it is not widely adaptable to various situations. Considering the role of individual values, the sensitivity of employees to power differences will affect their behavior in the organization.

The power distance guide, as an important personal cultural value construct that reflects how employees obey leadership authority, will affect their attitude and behavior in the face of inclusive leadership. Based on the introduction of the employee power distance guide as a regulating variable, we will explore the regulation of inclusive leadership on the employee silent behavior influence path.

Therefore, we speculate that different power distance-oriented employees will have cognitive differences for inclusive leaders, thus producing different effects. Similarly, active personality, as an important personality trait, also affects the way employees behave in the organization. According to the theory of social information processing, individuals process external environmental information through typical personality traits and jointly influence their (psychological) cognition and behavior.

Individuals with a high initiative personality have a stronger sense of responsibility and a more positive, enterprising spirit toward their organizations. When they face the external conditions created by inclusive leadership, they are more active, more willing to invest at a high level, and reduce the silent behavior of employees.
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Therefore, to further analyze the internal relationship between inclusive leadership, psychological security, and employees' silent behavior, we introduce two regulatory variables: power distance orientation and active personality.

From the above analysis, we can see that this study takes employees' psychological security as the starting point and explores how individual characteristics such as power distance orientation and proactive personality influence the mechanism of inclusive leadership on employees' silent behavior, providing theoretical guidance for management.

Literature review

**Relationship between inclusive leadership and the silent behavior of employees**

Silent behavior can be defined as a personal choice where employees intentionally hide their constructive insights into improving the operation and development of the organization (Morrison et al., 2000). Employee silent behavior hinders the organization's ability to detect and deal with existing problems in time and also limits the organization's foresight into potential future challenges, thus having a significant impact on the organization's innovation, adaptability, and collaboration effectiveness.

This paper believes that inclusive leadership mainly has an influence on employees' silent behavior in the following aspects:

First of all, compared with other types of leadership, inclusive leadership is good at focusing on internal and external environment changes, adjusting the influence of various factors on employees, paying attention and understanding of the employees' feelings, paying attention to communication with employees, paying attention to employees work and life, greatly improving the staff's dependence on the organization, improving the sense of belonging, building trust in leadership, encouraging employees to take the initiative to express their own views and suggestions, and helping to reduce staff silence behavior.

The inclusive leader's behavioral characteristics, which include both work and emotional resources, serve as valuable input to the employees. According to the theory of social exchange, follow the principles of mutual benefit and win-win. When the leadership invests in employee resources, after the economic and emotional needs are satisfied, employees will form a positive attitude toward leadership behavior, which may be achieved through the implementation of positive role behavior to help leaders achieve goals, reduce negative behavior, and reduce staff silent behavior as a return for leadership behavior (Rong, 2015).

With the inclusive management style of leaders, employees will want to give back to the company with high-quality work results. At the same time, employees will constantly reflect on their responsibilities to the organization and reduce the silent behavior of negative employees.

Based on the above analysis, this paper proposes the following research hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** Inclusive leadership will have a negative impact on employees' silent behavior.

**Psychological security plays an intermediary role**

Inclusive leaders communicate their ideas and feedback to their employees and establish a two-way, smooth communication channel with them. Make employees truly feel the attention and trust of their superiors. The above characteristics and behaviors of inclusive
leaders help to improve the psychological security of employees (Liu et al., 2021), so that employees will have greater motivation to put in work. In addition, in this process, employees' sense of control over their working environment and position has also been strengthened, so that they feel that their working environment can allow them to speak freely and their ideas will not be ignored, which can mobilize their enthusiasm and help break their silence (Qun et al., 2021).

Specifically, leaders implement positive strategies to manage and care for their employees, thereby enhancing their trust, and fostering an environment where employees feel free to express their opinions and ideas without fear of criticism from leaders and peers. Based on the trust basis of the social exchange theory, employees are willing to transfer their thoughts and opinions to their superiors and give them feedback. According to the social exchange theory's principle of reciprocity, when employees reflect their individual personal values, they can exhibit more positive behaviors that enhance the organization's operation and innovation. This, in turn, can reduce their silent behaviors, thereby promoting the organization's sustainable and healthy development (Jiang et al., 2022).

In conclusion, we propose the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 2: Inclusive leadership will have a positive impact on employees' psychological security.

In general, when faced with superior and subordinate communication or information transmission, employees will make two choices: truthful reflection and positive comments, or negative responses and remaining silent. However, in practice, employees generally express their suggestions to their leaders in a limited, open, and relatively controlled manner.

Therefore, in order to reduce the silence of employees and form a positive and healthy atmosphere, in addition to improving the organizational rules and regulations and optimizing the organizational environment, it is also important to improve the psychological security of employees. Drawing from the aforementioned analysis, we make the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 3: Employees' psychological security has a negative impact on their silent behavior.

Inclusive leaders are characterized by openness, support, and accessibility. In the process of communication with subordinates, they emphasize two-way respect and recognition with employees, pay attention to the internal needs of employees, listen to their opinions patiently, and send a series of positive messages to subordinates. At the same time, an open-minded and studious leader can not only find his own shortcomings but also recognize the excellence of employees, open his heart, and keep learning, reducing the psychological distance between leaders and employees and increasing the sense of belonging and identity of employees (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). Employees will greatly improve their psychological security, eliminate their inner concerns, and reward their leaders with a positive attitude and action when they perceive a reduction in psychological distance.

Employee silence behavior refers to the behavior in which employees could have put forward ideas and suggestions on the existing problems of the company according to their own feelings but have filtered and selected reservations due to various reasons. Psychological security means that individuals do not worry about their status, position, career, or harm in the department when expressing their opinions and ideas.

Therefore, employees with a higher sense of psychological security can speak freely without fear of ridicule, misunderstanding, or career risk.
On the other hand, employees with a high level of psychological security have a stronger sense of identity with the company, and they will integrate the individual and the company together and see the ups and downs of the company. For the benefit of the company, they can sacrifice their own interests. When considering the problem, they can always put the company first and stand in the position of the company to consider the problem.

Therefore, in this case, employees are more likely to express their ideas and will not remain silent. However, if the level of psychological security is low, even if they find some problems and can provide some improvement solutions or countermeasures, they will choose to ignore them and remain silent because they are worried and afraid of unnecessary harm (Li & Zhang, 2022). This shows that the psychological safety level of employees has a significant impact on their silent behavior.

When inclusive leadership in the organization builds an open, inclusive, and harmonious atmosphere, is willing to accept the opinions and views of others, and recognizes their work, employees’ sense of belonging and trust are more easily felt by the organization. They don't have to worry about their opinions about their status, image, future career development, or psychological security. Improving the psychological safety level of employees encourages them to take more risks. In this case, they will express their ideas more sincerely, rather than thinking about the consequences, and reduce the silent behavior of employees.

To sum up, this paper proposes that:

Hypothesis 4: Employees’ psychological security mediates the relationship between inclusive leadership and its silent behavior.

**Guidelines for power distance guidance**

Power distance, a cultural value variable that depicts social differences, at the national and organizational level, refers to a society's ability to accept and identify with the various degrees of power distribution within an organization. In this study, with enterprise employees as the research object, power distance is defined as a psychological trait that can reflect individual value differences, i.e., the degree to which individuals can accept and recognize the inequality of power distribution within the organization.

Individuals with a high power distance are more likely to tolerate internal injustice and recognize internal hierarchical differences. High-power distances are more conservative and more obedient to their superiors. Those with low power distance do not recognize the internal class difference but rather emphasize individual independence (Li et al., 2021).

Inclusive leaders have the characteristics of openness and inclusiveness and are willing to listen to others and learn humbly. They lead by example and influence others through their own actions. Inclusive leaders strive to create an equal and fair atmosphere in the organization. However, for these messages conveyed by inclusive leaders, high-power distance employees who value differences in power relationships and comply with organizational role norms may feel pressure and discomfort as they emphasize the hierarchical relationship between superiors and subordinates.

Therefore, inclusive leadership has less influence on these employees when they interact with them; conversely, those who value equal low power distance in power relationships prefer to establish equal relationships with their leaders.
As a result, inclusive leadership messages and behaviors are more likely to positively influence employees with low power distances.

Finally, the proposal is as follows:

Hypothesis 5: The power distance of employees can negatively regulate the relationship between inclusive leaders and their psychological security; that is, for employees with high power distance, the positive influence of inclusive leadership on the psychological safety of employees is weakened; for employees with low power distance, the positive influence of inclusive leadership on employee psychological safety is more significant.

**The regulation effect of an active personality**

Employees are individuals with varying characteristics, and there are significant differences in their cognition and reaction behaviors. Psychological constructs, such as personality traits and values, significantly influence employees' silent behaviors, and active personalities explain the differences in these individual behaviors.

Specifically, individuals with a high active personality can adapt to their surrounding environment and adjust accordingly; individuals with a low active personality usually do not act actively for their environment but choose to behave naturally (Huang et al., 2022). When employees' psychological security is high, those with a highly proactive personality are more likely to choose to change the environment rather than adapt to it. In other words, when employees have a high level of psychological security, they will actively participate and make suggestions to improve the situation, and they are likely to provide advice and opinions to the enterprise and reduce employee silence.

Therefore, employees with high initiative will make more active use of various resources in the company, actively participate in the work and tasks, and put forward positive opinions and ideas. On the contrary, low-initiative personality employees, even in the heart, feel safe; they have no incentive to contribute more to the organization. A tolerant organizational atmosphere, in their view, is a kind of burden and responsibility, so they will let their psychological pressure bear more pressure, leading them to choose silence (Chen et al., 2021).

In addition, those individuals with high initiative usually have the ability to think independently and have a long-term vision. They not only focus on work results but also on individual development and growth in the process of work (Parker et al., 2018). Compared with employees with a low level of proactive personality, employees with a high level of proactive personality are more active in the company's research and development behavior, the company's behavior, and decision-making behavior, and are more willing to participate in information exchange and knowledge sharing activities to obtain and share valuable information, reduce employees' silence, and promote the development of the enterprise. Initiative personality: a higher individual will not be bound by the external environment, can actively put their own development and enterprise goals closely together, actively find and seize their own development opportunities, make good use of resources, stimulate individual creativity, change negative situations, actively suggest for enterprises the current difficulties and problems to promote individual development, and pursue breakthrough development (Chen & Li, 2022).

It can be seen that, for employees with a high initiative personality, psychological security can better meet their independent needs so as to stimulate higher external role behavior and then reduce their silent behavior in the organization, and vice versa.
Therefore, proactive personality can affect the relationship between psychological security and employees' silent behavior.

In conclusion, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

H6: Active personality can strengthen the link between psychological security and silent behavior; that is, employees with high initiative will experience a greater negative impact from psychological security on silent behavior, while employees with low initiative will experience a less significant negative impact.

Methodology

Samples and steps
This study used questionnaires to collect the data. The sample of this survey comes from the employees of five enterprises, and the business scope of the unit covers mechanical and electrical research and development, Internet technology, automobile new energy, information consulting services, finance, and other industries. With the help of alumni and friends, the research team contacted five enterprises and conducted detailed interviews with the human resources department heads and other employees of these enterprises. The interview content mainly includes whether the direct leaders of the employees show the relevant characteristics of inclusive leadership in their work and whether the employees believe that such inclusive leadership characteristics will have a certain impact on their work attitude and work behavior.

According to the interview results, all have certain inclusive leadership styles in these five units, and employees generally believe that when their direct leaders show more inclusive leadership characteristics, they can get benefits and respond positively. This shows that it is very reasonable to collect the data required for this paper from these five enterprises.

Through telephone, email, and interviews, this study reached out to the CEO, directors, and other senior leaders of each company, explaining the significance and purpose of the survey. They also provided the formal questionnaire.

With the assistance of the superior supervisor, I contacted the human resources supervisors of the related enterprises and communicated with the human resources leaders of each enterprise. Furthermore, to increase the diversity of team backgrounds, those participating in the study tried to be involved in different departments. According to this requirement, the personnel department of each enterprise provided a list of people who could participate in the investigation and then entered each department to investigate.

In this study, we collected data in three stages to mitigate the impact of common methodological bias on the findings. At time point 1, 1,400 questionnaires were distributed through the network, and 389 were collected by employees, including the inclusive leadership style of the affiliated leaders and the power distance of the participants.

At time point 2, 389 questionnaires were distributed through the network, and 371 were collected. The questionnaires were mainly used to measure the psychological security and initiative of the participants; at time point 3, 371 were distributed through the network, and 357 questionnaires were collected.

After following the principle of questionnaire cleaning, the invalid questionnaires were removed, the questionnaires with biased answers (such as the whole questionnaire showing regular answers or the same answers), and the incomplete questionnaires were removed. Ultimately, we obtained 343 valid questionnaires, with an effective recovery rate of 85%.
In this study, demographic information was collected in the first stage among 343 valid staff subjects: 181 males, or 52.77%; 162 females, 47.23%; age, 125, 20 to 30, 36.44%; 131 to 40, 38.20%; 8741 or older, 25.36%; and the average age was 30 years. In terms of education, 26 people have a junior college degree, accounting for 7.58%; 244 people have a bachelor’s degree, accounting for 71.13%; and 73 people have a master’s degree or above, accounting for 21.29%.

In terms of working years, 106 people with less than 5 years account for 30.86%, 184 people within 6 to 10 years account for 53.50%, and 53 people with more than 10 years account for 15.64%.

Validity Test

The concept of differential validity is crucial

To compare the Pearson correlation coefficients between the main variables in the model in this study with the square root of the AVE values of each variable, if the result after the comparison is that the square root of the AVE value for each variable is larger than the correlation coefficient between the pairwise variables, then it indicates that the discriminatory validity of the various variables used in this study is good.

This study outputs the correlation coefficient matrix between variables using SPSS statistical software, and the comparison with the square root of AVE values for each variable is shown in Tab. 1 below.

It was found that there were strong correlations (p <0.01) between inclusive leaders, employee silence, psychological security, power distance orientation, and active personality. These correlations were all less than the square root of the corresponding AVE, and the scale differentiation validity was perfect.

Table 1 - Comparison of correlation coefficients and square root of AVE values (N = 343)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>IL</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>PD</th>
<th>PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>(0.720)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>-.319**</td>
<td>-.233**</td>
<td>(0.757)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.257**</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td>(0.781)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>.0119</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.261**</td>
<td>-.167**</td>
<td>(0.784)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01. IL = inclusive leader, PS = psychological security, SI = silent behavior, PD = power distance, and PP = active personality; the bold number in parentheses on the diagonal is the square root of AVE.

Structural validity

Structural validity included the five main study variables in the conceptual model of this study as the main model, while the combined method adopted these five variables to form a competition model. The next step involves comparing the goodness-of-fit situation between the main model and several competing models.
If the results of the fit of each alternative competition model are better than the results of the main model, it indicates that there may be conceptual overlap between some of the variables used in this study, so the goodness of fit index of the alternative competition model will increase significantly after combining variables.

Conversely, if the results show that the goodness of fit of each competitive model is lower or lower than the index of the main model, it indicates that the five main variables in the main model of this study are conceptually independent of each other.

In this study, we used several fit indicators to assess the fit between the main model and the competition models. These were the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI, greater than 0.90), root mean square error approximation (RMSEA, less than 0.08), and standardized residual root mean square (SRMR, less than 0.05). A value of less than 3 means that the models fit well.

In this paper, we compare the fitting index of the five-factor model, which includes inclusive leadership, power distance orientation, proactive personality, psychological security, and silent behavior, with other competitive models.

Tab. 2 displays the analysis results. The fitting results of the five-factor model are better than those of other competitive models. Specifically, in the five-factor model, $\chi^2 / df$ is 1.206, greater than 1 and less than 3; CFI is 0.978, greater than 0.9; TLI is 0.977, greater than 0.9; RMSEA is 0.022, less than 0.08; and SRMR is 0.037, less than 0.05.

The other four models are: a four-factor model combining power distance orientation and active personality; a three-factor model combining inclusive leadership, power distance orientation, and active personality; a two-factor model combining inclusive leadership and active personality, psychological security, and silent behavior; and a single-factor model combining all variables of inclusive leadership, power distance orientation, active personality, psychological security, and silent behavior.

The comparison found that the five-factor model fits significantly better than the other models, indicating that all the measurement tools used in this study have good structural validity.

Table 2 - Measurement model comparison
(results of the author survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five factor models:</td>
<td>1579.976</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL, PD, PP, PS, SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four factor models:</td>
<td>3224.326</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>2.445</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL, PD+PP, PS, SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three factor models:</td>
<td>4177.546</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL+PD+PP, PS, SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two-factor model:</td>
<td>7173.229</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>5.418</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL+PD+PP, PS+SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single factor model:</td>
<td>8924.893</td>
<td>1325</td>
<td>6.736</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL+PD+PP+PS+SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Table 3 - Mevalues, standard deviations, and correlations
(results of the author survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. gen</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. age</td>
<td>29.617</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ten</td>
<td>7.794</td>
<td>4.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. edu</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. IL</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PS</td>
<td>4.471</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SI</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PD</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PP</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01. Age = age; Gen = gender; Edu = education; ten = working years; IL = inclusive leadership. PS = psychological security, SI = silent behavior, PD = orientation, PD = power distance, and PP = proactive personality; the bold number in parentheses on the diagonal is the square root of AVE.

Tab. 3 shows the mean, standard deviation, and correlation coefficients between the two main variables in the theoretical model of this study. Specifically, the correlation between inclusive leadership and psychological security was significantly positive (r =0.367,
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p <0.01); the correlation between inclusive leadership and silent behavior was significantly negative (r = -0.319, p <0.01); and the correlation between psychological security and silent behavior was significantly negative (r = -0.233, p <0.01).

All the above results provide preliminary support for hypothesis testing and indicate a significant correlation between the core variables, allowing for subsequent hypothesis testing analysis.

Furthermore, the AVE square root of all variables in this study was greater than the correlation coefficient between the individual variables, and this result provides further support for the discriminatory validity of the main variables used in this study.

We use the Process plugin in SPSS for testing the proposed direct action hypotheses. When performing hypothesis testing, this paper controlled for gender, age, academic qualifications, and years of work.

Main effect test
Tab. 4 displays the analysis results. The study found that inclusive leadership has a negative impact on employees' silent behavior (B = -0.161, 95% CI = [-0.293, -0.028]), which supports hypothesis H1. It also has a positive impact on employees' psychological security (B = 0.642, 95% CI = [0.504, 0.781]), which supports hypothesis H2.

Finally, employees' psychological security has a negative impact on their own silent behavior (B = -0.528, 95% CI = [-0.654, -0.403], which supports hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypothesis</th>
<th>argument</th>
<th>dependent variable</th>
<th>estimated value</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>95% CI lower limit</th>
<th>95% CI superior limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>Silent behavior</td>
<td>-0.161*</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>Psychological security</td>
<td>0.642***</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Psychological security</td>
<td>Silent behavior</td>
<td>-0.528***</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.654</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001

Mediation effect test
We used the bootstrapping method (n = 5000) in this study to test the mediation effect. The Process plug-in of SPSS tested the 95% confidence interval of the regression coefficient 5000 times, determining that it is significant if the 95% confidence interval does not include 0, and not significant if it includes 0.

The Bootstrap test results are shown below in Tab. 5. The psychological security effect as a mediator between inclusive leadership and silent behavior was -0.339, and the 95% confidence interval was [-0.451, -0.255], excluding 0. This suggests that psychological security plays a significant role between inclusive leadership and silent behavior, assuming that H4 is true.
Table 5 - Results of the bootstrapping test for the mediation effect  
(results of the author survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypothesis</th>
<th>way</th>
<th>estimated value / indigo effect</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Inclusive leadership of psychological security and silent behavior</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.451 -0.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001

Regulatory effect test

Additionally, the study continues to test the regulatory hypothesis using the bootstrapping method (n = 5000), with the results displayed in Tab. 6 below.

Among them, the product of power distance between inclusive leaders and employees significantly negatively affects employee psychological security (B = -0.141; the confidence interval of the 95% CI is [-0.252, -0.031], excluding 0). Since inclusive leadership has a significant positive impact on psychological security, this is the negative positive effect of inclusive leadership; that is, the higher the power distance direction, the weaker the positive effect of inclusive leadership on psychological security; otherwise, the stronger the positive effect.

The solid and dotted lines in the figure correspond to the relationship between inclusive leadership and psychological security in the high employee power distance orientation and the low employee power distance orientation, respectively.

Table 6 - Results of the bootstrapping test for moderate effects  
(results of the author survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypothesis</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Psychological security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Inclusive leadership</td>
<td>0.642***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power distance orientation</td>
<td>-0.215***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive leadership power distance oriented</td>
<td>-0.141*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, ** p <0.01, *** p <0.001

The Tab. 6 shows that when you multiply psychological security by employee initiative personality, the negative relationship between psychological security and employee silence got a lot stronger (B = -0.132, 95% CI = [-0.184, -0.080], excluding 0). Because psychological security has a significantly negative influence on silent behavior, the active personality positively regulates the negative effect of psychological security on silent behavior; that is, the higher the active personality, the stronger the negative effect of psychological security on silent behavior; otherwise, the weaker the negative influence.

The solid and dashed lines in the figure correspond to the relationship between psychological security and silent behavior in high- and low-active personalities, respectively.
Researchers investigate the influence mechanism of silent behavior on employees. Conversely, when the employee's active personality is low (one standard deviation lower than the mean), psychological security's negative influence on silent behavior is weak, thereby supporting H6.

Table 7 - Results of the bootstrapping test for moderating effects
(results of the author survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hypothesis</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>Silent behavior</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient of action</td>
<td>standard deviation</td>
<td>95% CI superior limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Psychological security</td>
<td>-0.528***</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proactive personality</td>
<td>-0.217***</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological security, initiative and personality</td>
<td>-0.132***</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p <0.05, * * p <0.01, * * * p <0.001

Discussion

Theoretical contributions

First, this paper enriches the role of inclusive leadership. By examining the effect of inclusive leadership on employee silent behavior, it provides powerful complementary and scientific answers to whether and how it will affect the negative behavior of employees. Building up to psychological security as intermediary variable model makes inclusive leadership research interpretation, power distance guidance and initiative of personality regulation make research more comprehensive, the choice of core variables to expand the inclusive leadership and employees silent behavior path, innovative research model, help to cause more researchers and leaders, and the importance of employees silent behavior attention and attention.

Therefore, inclusive leadership theory and empirical research not only improve the theoretical framework of inclusive leadership research, enrich the diversity of the theoretical perspective of research, and expand the study of inclusive leadership to provide new ideas but also for the development of relationships. The perfect leadership theory has important theoretical significance and provides new ideas for its application in practice.

Secondly, the intermediary mechanism is deeply explored, and the action mechanism model of inclusive leaders on employee silence is constructed, exploring how inclusive leaders can act on the silent behavior of employees by affecting the psychological safety level of individuals.

Based on the theory of social exchange, it looks into and explains the relationship between independent and dependent variables, as well as the role of relational variables as middlemen. This effectively broadens the situations in which inclusive leaders can be used and the ways in which they can teach others. In this paper, the establishment of the influence mechanism reveals that inclusive leadership influences subordinates silent behavior in the "black box," deepening the silence by improving psychological security to reduce internal logic understanding and thus helping to understand why inclusive leadership affects the silent behavior of subordinate employees and filling the shortage of research in this field.
Given the current social backdrop of diversification and growing demands for work autonomy, it is necessary to explore the boundary conditions and incentive mechanisms of inclusive leadership. This paper contributes to the enrichment of inclusive leadership-related research by validating the mediation mechanism of inclusive leadership through direct effects.

Thirdly, it expands the research on the boundary conditions related to the effectiveness of inclusive leadership. In this study, power distance orientation and proactive personality were used as regulatory variables, and we explored their regulatory roles between different mechanisms of action from multiple perspectives.

Using two regulatory variables—power distance orientation and active personality—can help us understand how power distance orientation and active personality affect leadership effectiveness. This leads to a better comprehension of the role that power distance orientation and active personality play in managing an organization. This study somewhat enriches the study of power distance orientation and proactive personality as boundary conditions.

Management enlightenment
Pay attention to leadership behavior and cultivate an inclusive leadership style.

This paper proves that inclusive leadership can effectively inhibit the silent behavior of employees, and enterprises should be aware of the positive impact and positive effect of inclusive leadership on the organization so as to cultivate more inclusive leadership. We can specifically take appropriate measures in training, recruitment, talent development, and other areas.

In the selection of managers, we should not only assess their business ability but also test their operation and management concepts and compare them with the current inclusive managers. For example, test the tolerance of reserve leadership and have relevant management skills. Have a positive or negative view of an inclusive leadership style. When selecting new leaders, companies should not only consider the candidate's experience and abilities but also their personality, behavior, values, and other internal characteristics to see whether they match the company's core values.

Enterprises should conduct efficient leadership training for managers, emphasizing the characteristics of inclusive leaders in the process of training and discussing how inclusive leaders can be effective in the silence of employees. Through leadership training and management training and through the practice between groups, from points and lines, more middle and senior executives with inclusive leadership styles can create an enterprise management environment with inclusive leadership styles.

When establishing a human resource gradient, we should focus on training grass-roots managers (like group leaders) with an inclusive leadership style to enhance their management skills and abilities. It is crucial to concentrate on providing training and awareness to employees who lack an inclusive leadership style, encouraging them to adopt a more inclusive approach. We design and implement the corresponding training plan effectively for different types of managers.

Managers should consciously improve their openness, effectiveness, and accessibility; accept different ideas, listen to opinions, and encourage them to propose new ideas; be able to give timely feedback to the questions raised by employees; and provide effective communication channels for them. Establish a harmonious group atmosphere, carry out
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group activities, and enhance the communication between leaders and employees. When employees feel the inclusive behavior of leaders, they will have a strong sense of safety in their hearts and regard themselves as "members" of the unit, which improves their sense of identity to the enterprise and thus reduces the silent behavior of employees.

**Focus on the needs of employees and enhance their psychological security**

Employees with strong psychological security will regard the company as their home, and employees will have a stronger sense of mission and responsibility and be more active in doing more behaviors conducive to the organization. The results show that inclusive leadership has an inhibitory effect on employees' silent behavior, while psychological security plays an intermediary role, so it is very important to improve employees' psychological security and help employees build a psychological security defense line.

Leaders should cultivate and create an organizational atmosphere of mutual trust, fairness, justice, and freedom of speech within the department. Such a good atmosphere will reduce tension among employees, promote the expression of personal opinions, allow them to speak freely, and effectively reduce their silent behavior.

Managers should actively encourage employees to find problems and put forward bold suggestions, provide timely feedback information, improve their psychological security, and create a healthy organizational environment. At the same time, we should give full play to the openness of inclusive leaders, enhance their trust in the leaders, and let employees better participate in the decision-making of the organization.

One of the reasons for employee silence is the lack of smooth internal communication channels and suggestions, which may make employees feel that the company does not encourage them to express their ideas.

The establishment of a scientific and efficient information exchange mechanism and channel between enterprises helps to enhance the psychological security of employees and reduce the silence of employees in enterprises. The enterprise should create a communication mode different from the traditional communication mode, establish an independent feedback mechanism, such as holding an informal meeting to listen to the anonymous opinions, and use various network communication platforms, an enterprise opinion mailbox, a satisfaction questionnaire, and other ways to maintain communication with employees and diversify the suggestion channels.

Enhancing the confidentiality system is crucial when expanding the recommendation channels, and employees can utilize anonymous methods to safeguard their comments. This can significantly improve their psychological security and reduce silent behavior.

**Actively meet the basic psychological needs of employees**

First of all, company managers can appropriately expand the work authority of employees, such as by giving employees certain power to let them do what they should do.

Companies can also implement a flexible working system that grants employees a degree of autonomy in their working hours and methods, provided that this autonomy is based on the completion of work tasks.

Secondly, leaders should attach importance to people's talents, give full play to people's value and potential, and actively provide employees with meaningful and challenging work. For those who can successfully perform the company's tasks, to give full recognition and encouragement, to meet their competency needs, and to foster a sense of achievement.
Thirdly, leaders should strive to create a family corporate culture and make employees feel cared for by holding dinners and distributing festive gifts so as to enhance their sense of belonging. Managers should actively integrate with their employees, meeting their psychological needs to a high level through a variety of means.

In addition to paying attention to the performance of employees at work, we should also pay attention to and support their daily lives to improve their psychological security. for instance, providing subsidies to make employees feel safer, happier, and more fulfilling, such as dietary subsidies, car subsidies, and subsidies for parents and children; companies can organize group weddings for employees to increase their sense of belonging and identity and to carry out large-scale social activities with brother units.

While giving material rewards to the excellent employees of the enterprise, they can also recognize their parents to increase their sense of honor. They should make regular visits to their staff members' families. Provide serious illness medical insurance for direct family members, Provide a maternity leave protection system for female employees. To reduce their worries at home, Let them feel the convenience and care provided by the company and then fully into the strategic development of the company. Actively provide comments for the company and contribute to the development of the company.

Secondly, provide fully personalized and diversified support to make employees feel valued and cared for and enhance their sense of identity; strengthen humanistic care for employees; make them recognize the values and norms of the company, thus enhancing their sense of belonging; encourage employees to actively perceive their membership in the company, and provide sufficient personal and diversified support so that they feel respect and care. Strengthen the humanized care for the enterprise's employees, enabling them to identify with the company's values and action principles, enhancing their sense of belonging, and encouraging them to feel positive about their membership status. This will encourage them to express their thoughts and reduce their tendency to remain silent.

**Differentiated management to maximize the effect of inclusive leadership**

As independent individuals, different employees have different personality characteristics and inner expectations. In the practice of enterprise management, enterprise managers should implement differentiated management for employees with different personality characteristics and give full play to the positive effect of inclusive leadership by meeting the needs of employees with different personality characteristics.

Employees with varying power distances adopt differentiated management strategies. For employees with high power distance orientation, leaders should have enough care and respect for their work, praise and recognize their work achievements, communicate with them effectively, take the initiative to solicit their views, and guide them to speak freely.

For employees with low power distance, avoid the relationship between authority and superiors and subordinates; communicate with friends, not forcing or bullying, but in an equal way; and give enough power to encourage them to contribute their wisdom and strength to the development of the enterprise. Simultaneously, the recruitment process assesses the power-distance orientation of the recruited employees using testing and interview methods.

Under the same conditions, employees with low power distance orientation are selected to reduce the occurrence of employee silence from the root. Correctly understand the differences in active personalities among different individuals.
In a real management situation, the leaders should identify the active personalities of the employees in the recruitment process. Employees with a high initiative personality have high enthusiasm and tenacity. They are more willing to actively collect information and share it with others in the process of work. They have stronger interpersonal communication and communication skills, initiative and enthusiasm, dare to put forward their own ideas and suggestions, and can take the initiative to break through and reduce the silent behavior of employees. In the recruitment process, the proactive personality of employees should be identified, and employees with a high proactive personality should be given priority.

**Research deficiencies and prospects**

(1) Further enrich the study samples.

The samples in this study are from enterprises in the mechanical and electrical research and development and Internet technology industries, and inclusive leaders may have different effects on employees' silent behavior. Future studies can improve the representativeness of the sample and select more enterprises in other industries for investigation and research so as to obtain more accurate and comprehensive research results.

(2) Expand the study of the mediation effect and the regulation effect.

This study used psychological security as a mediation variable and analyzed power distance orientation and active personality as adjustment variables. However, in subsequent studies, we could add other mediating or adjustment variables to the study model, and add quantitative indicators to the questionnaire's measurement scale for further analysis.

(3) Minimize the impact of common method bias.

Despite procedural control, there may still be common methodological bias, and respondents may exaggerate their own attitudes and behaviors. In order to ensure the validity of the questionnaire data, future studies can consider the coexistence of leadership evaluation and employee self-evaluation to obtain paired data.

**Conclusion**

This study is based on data from 343 employees over three time points. Based on the theory of social exchange and social information processing, it is found that inclusive leadership has a significant negative influence on employees' silent behavior; inclusive leadership has a significant positive effect on psychological security; psychological security has a significant negative effect on employee silent behavior; and psychological security mediates the relationship between inclusive leaders and employees' silent behavior.

The power distance orientation of employees has a negative regulatory effect on the relationship between inclusive leaders and their psychological safety. In other words, employees with a high power-distance orientation experience a weakened positive impact from inclusive leadership on their psychological safety.

For employees with a low power-distance orientation, inclusive leadership has a more significant positive impact on employees' psychological safety. The proactive personality of an employee can strengthen the connection between psychological safety and silent behavior. This means that employees with high initiative will experience a greater negative impact from psychological security on silent behavior, while those with low initiative will experience a less significant negative impact.
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