

Opinions of High School Administrators on Teachers' Organizational Dissent Behaviors*

Murat ÖZDEMİR^a

Cankırı Karatekin University

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to find out the reasons that trigger teachers' dissent, how the dissenters behave and the effects of organizational dissent on the teachers, administrators, and the school. The study was conducted with the qualitative methods. 15 school administrators working in five different schools located in Mamak District in Ankara participated in the search. The data were collected with the semi-structured interview form and analyzed with the content and descriptive analysis methods. For the purpose of presenting the data, the frequencies of the administrators' opinions were tabled and also administrators' views were described with the direct quotations. Eventually, it has been seen that the basic reason that triggers the teachers' dissent behavior is official work that is given by their administrators. Another result is that dissenters commonly minimize their relations with their administrators. School administrators also think that they commonly show tolerance to the dissenters and their attitude toward them is positive. On the other hand, they consider the organizational dissent as a factor that affects their comfort negatively. And lastly they think that organizational dissent cause destructive results at school.

Key Words

Organizational Dissent, Whistle Blowing, Pedagogy of Dissent.

- * This article was derived from authors' dissertation entitled "The Opinions of Administrators and Teachers Working in Public High Schools in Ankara Province on Organizational Dissent". The author of this article would like to thank to Prof. Dr. İnayet AYDIN for her great contribution in preparation of the study.
- a PhD. Murat Özdemir is currently an Assistant Professor at the Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economy. His research interests include dynamics of reform and change in Turkish educational system, organizational dissent, science of educational administration, educational leadership, ethics in public administration, democratic values of prospective teachers, qualitative research in social sciences, comparative education, organization and school metaphors. *Correspondence:* Assist. Prof. Murat ÖZDEMİR, Cankırı Karatekin University, Faculty of Art, Department of Educational Sciences, Cankırı/Turkey. E-mail: mozdemir@karatekin.edu.tr Phone: +90 376 254 1205.

Organizational democracy has been extensively investigated in the organizational literature in the last decades (Cheney, 1995; Chiles & Zorn, 1995; Dachler & Wilpert, 1978; Derber & Schwartz, 1983; Kassing, 1997a; Marshall & Stohl, 1993; Vredenburg & Brender, 1993). Organizational dissent as being one of the basic indicators of democracy is an important variable in diagnosing organizational problems as well (Kassing, 2002; Shahinpoor & Matt, 2007). Similarly, some writers suggest that organizational dissent may contribute to organizational success and increase the job satisfaction of workers (Hegstrom, 1990; Redding, 1985; Stanley, 1981). Organizational dissent may also result in negative effects including organizational conflict and violence (Shahinpoor & Matt, 2007). The term "dissent" has Latin roots. In Latin, *dis* means apart, and *sentire* means feelings. Thus, dissent means 'feeling apart' (Kassing, 1997b). Organizational dissent has two parts; one of which is disagreement

and the other part is to articulate disagreement with different ways inside or outside of organization (Ardoğan, 2004; Kassing & DiCioccio, 2004; Redding, 1985; Türk Dil Kurumu [TDK], 2010). Therefore dissent can be defined as “particular form of employee voice that involves the expression of disagreement or contradictory opinions about organizational practices and policies” (Kassing, 2002, p. 189). There are some organizational events which trigger the organizational dissent including employee treatment, organizational change, decision making, inefficiency, role-responsibility, resources, ethics, performance evaluation, and preventing harm (Graham, 1986; Kassing, 2001; Kassing & Armstrong, 2002). There are several ways of expressing dissent. The most common ones are (i) whistle-blowing (Aktan, 2006; Jubb, 1999), (ii) articulated dissent (Cannings, 1992; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992; Kassing, 2000; Kassing & Armstrong, 2001; Kassing & Avtgis, 1999, 2001), (iii) latent dissent (Farrell & Rusbult, 1992) and, (iv) displaced dissent (Kassing, 1998). Studies showed close relationship between various organizational variables and organizational dissent (Avtgis, Thomas-Maddox, Taylor, & Patterson, 2007; Goodboy, Chory, & Dunleavy, 2008; Kassing, 2000; Kassing & DiCioccio, 2004; Kassing & McDowel, 2008; Payne, 2007; Sprague & Ruud, 1988). And also, some other studies have concentrated on the possible effects of dissent (Graham, 1986; Hegstrom, 1990). The dissent literature in educational settings can be classified as political (Chisholm, 1999; Cliggett & Wyssmann, 2009; Favela, 2010; Kirk, 2009; Murillo & Ronconi, 2004) and pedagogical (Gordon, 2008; MacKinnon, 2000; McMurray, 2007; Mulcahy & Irwin, 2008). But these research areas do not directly concentrate on the organizational dissent behavior of teachers at schools. Therefore the purpose of present study is to find out the reasons that trigger teachers’ dissent, how dissenters behave and the effects of organizational dissent on teachers, administrators and the school.

Method

The study which is a descriptive survey was carried out with qualitative research method which aims to understand peoples’ life styles, stories and behaviors, organizational structures and social change (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Study Group

15 school administrators working in different pub-

lic high schools located in Mamak district in Ankara in 2009-2010 academic year participated in the study. Because the research was carried with qualitative methods, the numbers of the participants were restricted.

Instrument

In order to collect data, semi-structured interview form was developed by the researcher. In process of developing the form, the literature about organizational dissent was comprehensively examined and 25 high school teachers were interviewed to explore the main dimensions of organizational dissent. Draft form was examined by experts. The form had three main questions which targeted to reveal what triggered organizational dissent, how dissenters behaved and what the possible outcomes of dissent on teachers, administrators and schools were.

Processes and Data Analysis

After the instrument was developed, participants were interviewed with semi-structured interview form by the researcher. Then the interview documents were analyzed with content and descriptive analyzing techniques. Because there is a fundamental theory and conceptual basis about the research topic, the researcher used *a priori* concepts in the processes of coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990 cited in Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2003, p. 165). Then, the data were put under the sub-categories and main categories. And finally, the frequencies and percentages of the sub-categories and main categories were determined and tabled.

Validity and Reliability

For internal-validity (i) the data were interpreted just after they were presented in the findings section. In addition, (ii) direct quotations of the participants were presented in the text to support the findings. For external validity (i) detailed information about the basic steps of the study including design, study group, instrument, processes, and data analyzing techniques were presented and (ii) interview documents were kept for the further confirmation. The reliability study was also conducted. For this purpose, two experts were asked to code the documents based on the coding list. The coding which were performed by two different experts were compared according to the ‘the formula of agreement percentage’ (Türümlü, 2000 cited in

Yeşildere & Türnüklü, 2007). The results showed high level of agreement between the experts.

Findings and Discussion

Findings show that the most common reason of the organizational dissent at schools is to charge the teachers with extra jobs. There are also other reasons which trigger teachers' dissent. These are, (i) lack of sufficient qualifications for a job, (ii) prejudice, (iii) resisting to changes, (iv) organizational decisions, (v) favoritism, (vi) using the organizational sources and (vii) injustice. All of these findings are consistent with the similar studies (Agocs, 1997; Baykal & Kovancı, 2008; Dent & Goldberg, 1999; Johnson & Sharma, 2004; Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979; Köksal, 2008; Marken, 1999; Zayim, 2005). Finding also revealed that whistle blowing is not common among Turkish teachers. When dissent triggering events happen, teachers usually minimize their communication with their administrators. In addition, some teachers prefer articulated dissent. These findings are similar with previous studies (Arnold & Penemon, 1991; Farrell & Rusbult, 1992; Gorden & Infante, 1987; Graham, 1986). According to findings, school administrators communicate with the dissenters in a positive manner. Although some of the administrators think that the dissent at schools contributes for their personal improvement, some others think that dissent make them uneasy. And last finding imply that dissent produce either constructive or destructive results at schools. These findings also support similar studies (Hegstrom, 1990; Kassing, 2002; Shahinpoor & Matt, 2007).

Results

This study revealed the basic triggering events of the organizational dissent behaviors of teachers according to opinions of school administrators. The findings imply that there exist some personal and administrative reasons which push teachers to dissent. Secondly, it was found out that whistle blowing is not common among Turkish teachers according to administrators. And lastly, dissent may cause different results including destruction or construction at schools. Because the study was conducted with a small group of school administrators, huge groups including teachers can be included in the further studies on organizational dissent at schools.

References/Kaynakça

- Agocs, C. (1997). Institutionalized resistance to organizational change: denial, inaction and repression. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16 (9), 917-931.
- Aktan, C. C. (2006). Organizasyonlarda yanlış uygulamalara karşı bir sivil erdem, ahlaki tepki ve vicdani red davranışı: Whistleblowing. *Mercek Dergisi, Ekim*, 1-13.
- Ardoğan, R. (2004). Teorik temeller ve tarihsel gerilimler arasında islam kültüründe siyasal muhalefet. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8 (2), 171-189.
- Arnold, D. F., & Ponemon, L. A. (1991). Internal auditors' perceptions of whistle-blowing and the influence of moral reasoning: an experiment. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, 10 (2), 1-15.
- Avtgis, T. A., Thomas-Maddox, C., Taylor, E., & Patterson, B. R. (2007). The influence of employee burnout syndrome on the expression of organizational dissent. *Communication Research Reports*, 24, 97-102.
- Baykal, K. ve Kovancı, A. (2008). Yönetici ve astlar arasındaki anlaşmazlıkların çözümüne yönelik bir araştırma. *Havacılık ve Uzay Teknolojileri Dergisi*, 3 (3), 21-38.
- Cannings, K. (1992). The voice of the loyal manager: Distinguishing attachment from commitment. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5, 261-272.
- Cheney, G. (1995). Democracy in the workplace: Theory and practice from the perspective of communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23, 167-200.
- Chiles, A. M., & Zorn, T. E. (1995). Empowerment in organizations: employees' perceptions of the influences of empowerment. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 23, 1-25.
- Chisholm, L. (1999). The democratization of schools and the politics of teachers' work in South Africa. *Journal of Comparative Education*, 29 (2), 111-126.
- Cliggett, L., & Wyssmann, B. (2009). Crimes against the future: Zambian teachers' alternative income generation and the undermining of education. *Africa Today*, 55 (3), 25-43.
- Dachler, H. P., & Wilpert, B. (1978). Conceptual dimensions and boundaries of participation in organizations: A critical evaluation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 1-39.
- Dent, E. B., & Goldberg, S. G. (1999) Challenging 'resistance to change'. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 25-41.
- Derber, C., & Schwartz, W. (1983). Toward a theory of worker participation. *Sociological Inquiry*, 53, 61-78.
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1992). Exploring the exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect typology: the influence of job satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 5, 201-218.
- Favela, A. (2010). Lasting lessons from Oaxaca: Teachers as luchadores Sociales: An inside account of the historic 2006 Oaxacan teachers' movement and why it is still relevant today. *Radical Teacher*, 88, 63-72.
- Goodboy, A. K., Chory, R. M., & Dunleavy, K. N. (2008). Organizational dissent as a function of organizational justice. *Communication Research Reports*, 25 (4), 255-265.
- Gorden, W. I., & Infante, D. A. (1987). Employee rights: content, argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness and career satisfaction. In C. A. B. Osigweh (Ed.), *Communicating Employee Responsibilities and Rights: A Modern Management Mandate* (pp. 149-163). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

- Gordon, M. (2008). Toward a pedagogy of dissent. *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice*, 21 (2), 20-27.
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8, 1-52.
- Hegstrom, T. G. (1990). Mimetic and dissent conditions in organizational rhetoric. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 18, 141-152.
- Johnson, R. A., & Sharma, S. (2004). *The struggle against corruption: A comparative study*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Jubb, P. B. (1999). Whistleblowing: A restrictive definition and interpretation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21, 77-94.
- Kassing, J. W. (1997a). Articulating, antagonizing, and displacing: A model of employee dissent. *Communication Studies*, 48, 311-332.
- Kassing, J. W. (1997b). *Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent State.
- Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 12 (2), 183-229.
- Kassing, J. W. (2000). Investigating the relationship between superior-subordinate relationship quality and employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports*, 17, 58-70.
- Kassing, J. W. (2001). From the looks of things: assessing perceptions of organizational dissenters. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14 (3), 442-470.
- Kassing, J. W. (2002). Speaking up: Identifying employees' upward dissent strategies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16 (2), 187-209.
- Kassing, J. W., & Armstrong, T. A. (2001). Examining the association of job tenure, employment history, and organizational status with employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports*, 18, 264-273.
- Kassing, J. W., & Armstrong, T. A. (2002). Someone's going to hear about this: examining the association between dissent-triggering events and employee's dissent expressions. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 39-65.
- Kassing, J. W., & Avtgis, T. A. (1999). Examining the relationship between organizational dissent and aggressive communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 76-91.
- Kassing, J. W., & Avtgis, T. A. (2001). Dissension in the organization as a function of control expectancies. *Communication Research Reports*, 18, 118-127.
- Kassing, J. W., & DiCioccio, R. L. (2004). Testing a workplace experience explanation of displaced dissent. *Communication Reports*, 17, 111-120.
- Kassing, J. W., & McDowell, Z. (2008). Talk about fairness: Exploring the relationship between procedural justice and employee dissent. *Communication Research Reports*, 25, 1-10.
- Kirk, J. A. (2009). The NAACP campaign for teachers' salary equalization: African American women educators and the early civil rights struggle. *Journal of African American History*, 94 (4), 529-552.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 106-114.
- Köksal, N. (2008). Öğretmenlik mesleği genel yeterliklerinin öğretmen, müdür ve bakanlık yetkilileri tarafından değerlendirilmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23 (1), 36-46.
- MacKinnon, C. T. (2000). Politics of community participation in a public school. *Educational Studies*, 31 (3), 225-248.
- Marken, G. A. (1999). Improving your leadership skills. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 44 (1), 40-41.
- Marshall, A. A., & Stohl, C. (1993). Participating as participation: A network approach. *Communication Monographs*, 60, 137-157.
- McMurray, A. J. (2007). The role of discussion and dissent in creating civic understanding. *American Secondary Education*, 36 (1), 49-58.
- Mulcahy, D. E., & Irwin, J. (2008). The standardized curriculum and delocalization: Obstacles to critical pedagogy. *Radical History Review*, 102, 201-213.
- Murillo, M. V., & Ronconi, L. (2004). Teachers' strikes in Argentina: Partisan alignments and public-sector labor relations. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 39 (1), 77-98.
- Payne, H. J. (2007). The role of organization-based self-esteem in employee dissent expression. *Communication Research Reports*, 24, 235-240.
- Redding, W. C. (1985). Rocking boats, blowing whistles, and teaching speech communication. *Communication Education*, 34, 245-258.
- Shahinpoor, N., & Matt, B. F. (2007). The power of one: Dissent and organizational life. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 37-48.
- Sprague, J. A., & Ruud, G. L. (1988). Boat-rocking in the high technology culture. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 32, 169-193.
- Stanley, J. D. (1981). Dissent in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 6 (1), 13-19.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (TDK). (2010). *Türk dil kurumu sözlüğü*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Vredenburg, D., & Brender, Y. (1993). The relevance of democracy to organizational management. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 6, 99-114.
- Yeşildere, S. ve Türnüklü, E. B. (2007). Öğrencilerin matematiksel düşünme ve akıl yürütme süreçlerinin incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 40 (1), 181-213.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2003). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Zayım, N. (2005, Kasım). *Tıp bilimsinde teknolojik değişim yönetimi; insan ve organizasyona ilişkin konular*. 2. Ulusal Tıp Bilişimi Kongresi'nde sunulan bildiri, Tıp Bilişimi Derneği, Antalya, Türkiye.