1992

Development of a scale to measure an organization's tolerance for dissent

Bonnie M. Schultz
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Schultz, Bonnie M., "Development of a scale to measure an organization's tolerance for dissent" (1992). *Master's Theses*. 416.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.9ja8-saxp>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/416

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 1350110

**Development of a scale to measure an organization's tolerance
for dissent**

Schultz, Bonnie Marie, M.A.

San Jose State University, 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

DEVELOPMENT OF A SCALE TO MEASURE AN
ORGANIZATION'S TOLERANCE FOR DISSENT

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Communication Studies Department
San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By

Bonnie M. Schultz

August, 1992

APPROVED FOR THE COMMUNICATION STUDIES DEPARTMENT

Dr. Tim Hegstrom

Dr. Stephanie Zimmermann

Dr. Shawn Spano

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

DEVELOPMENT OF A SCALE TO MEASURE AN ORGANIZATION'S TOLERANCE FOR DISSENT

by Bonnie M. Schultz

The purpose of this thesis is to develop a scale to measure employees' perceptions of their organization's tolerance for dissent. Such an instrument could provide helpful feedback to organizations. Future researchers could also test theories relating tolerance for dissent to different organizational structures.

The sample for this study included 190 employees from the Pacific Stock Exchange and the San Jose, California office of Coopers & Lybrand. Each employee filled out a questionnaire containing items on dissent and items from a Freedom of Speech scale, an Employee Rights scale and a Job Satisfaction scale.

The results indicate a strong correlation between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Freedom of Speech, Employee Rights and Job Satisfaction scales. Since Freedom of Speech and Tolerance for Dissent are similar constructs, these results support the validity of the Tolerance for Dissent scale. In addition, results indicate that the more employees perceive that an organization is tolerant of dissent, the more job satisfaction they will perceive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the many people who helped and supported me with this research. Without the invaluable guidance and support of my committee members, Tim Hegstrom, Shawn Spano and Stephanie Zimmermann this thesis would not have been possible. Their continued encouragement, support and input was greatly appreciated.

A special thanks to Tim Hegstrom. He not only helped me every step of the way, he continually made time for me in his busy schedule. I will always be grateful for his belief that I could reach his high standards.

When the first company that agreed to conduct my survey couldn't and I felt like giving up, my sister Marie Schultz came to the rescue and was able to enlist the help of her company, the Pacific Stock Exchange. I am very grateful to her for her help and undying belief in me. I also want to thank my dear friend, Cindi Marie, for her constant encouragement and connections that enabled me to conduct the survey at Coopers and Lybrand.

In addition, I would like to thank Meg Laxier, Elaine Criger and Dr. Wen Shu Lee for their support.

Finally, I will be eternally grateful to the Dragon for his love, encouragement, support and confidence in me. Without him I wouldn't have been able to muster the perseverance to continue on. I will always be grateful to you, and I will always love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Review of Literature	2
Justification	20
Definition of Dissent	22
II. METHODS, PROCEDURES AND RESULTS	24
Methods.	24
Procedures	27
Results	29
III. DISCUSSION	43
Conclusions	43
Recommendations for Measuring Tolerance for Dissent	46
Tolerance for Dissent: Short Form	46
Recommendations for Further Research	50
REFERENCES	51
APPENDICES	55
A. Pilot Study Instrument	56

	Page
B. Principal Study Instrument	60
C. Freedom of Speech Scale	65
D. Job Satisfaction Scale	66
E. Employee Rights Scale	67
F. 25 Item Corrected Tolerance for Dissent Scale	68
G. Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech Scale	71
H. Tolerance for Dissent Short Form Scale . . .	74
I. Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech Short Form Scale	75

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE	
1. Item Analysis for the Pilot Study Tolerance for Dissent Scale	31
2. Item Analysis for the Tolerance for Dissent Scale	34
3. Item Analysis for the Freedom of Speech Scale . .	35
4. T-Tests for Sex	38
5. Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Age	40
6. Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Ethnic Background	41
7. Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Education	42
8. Item Analysis for the Combined Tolerance for Dissent Scale and Freedom of Speech Scale.	45
9. Item Analysis for the Tolerance for Dissent Scale Short Form	47
10. Item Analysis for the Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech Short Form	47
11. Comparison of the Five Scales	48
12. Correlation Analysis for the Tolerance for Dissent Scale with the other scales	49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. EVLN Model	5
2. Principled Organizational Dissent Model . . .	8

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

American organizations' tolerance for dissent among its workers will be tested as more companies follow the growing trend of soliciting employee participation in the forms of problem solving teams and empowerment programs. The question, then, is not whether the employees will participate, but is management ready to listen to what they have to say?

According to Redding (1985), in the past, the "management knows best" philosophy evolved during the last decades of the last century and the early years of the twentieth century, when poorly educated, semi-literate immigrants dominated the workforce. This philosophy makes up the preeminent cultural ideology in American corporations today. Redding points to the many popular seminars and courses on interpersonal communication guaranteed to achieve success by pleasing the boss. Also included in this ideology are the premises "don't rock the boat" and "to get along, go along". This dominant cultural ideology leaves little room for dissent.

In fact, Lea Stewart (1980) takes this one step further by asserting that, "Americans do not have the same

rights, such as freedom of the press, freedom of speech and due process at work as they do at home" (p. 3). Since employees are dependent on the corporation for economic survival, they are also vulnerable to the corporation's demands.

Unfortunately, Corporate America's dominant cultural ideology is at odds with most of the new employee empowerment and participation programs. The primary concern of this study is to develop a scale to measure employees' perceptions of their organizations' tolerance for dissent. Hirschman (1970) argues that an organization's responsiveness to the dissenting "voice" is central to the economic health of the organization. For example, if employees are not willing to point out problems and mistakes, these problems may go unchecked and cause the company's product or service to lose market share. Such a scale does not currently exist and would assist companies deciding to implement employee participation/empowerment programs in assessing their organizations' tolerance for dissent. This scale would also allow future researchers to test theories relating tolerance for dissent to different organizational structures and theoretical constructs.

Review of Literature

The literature on dissent can be divided into five

different categories: 1) employee voice, 2) principled dissent, 3) free speech in the workplace, 4) organizational rhetoric and dissent and lastly, 5) whistleblowing and boatrocking.

Employee Voice Literature

Hirschman (1970) started the tradition of looking at dissent in terms of an employee's voice. His seminal work discussed customers' and employees' response to declining organizations. According to Hirschman, there are two different options in response to dissatisfaction with an organization. The first option is "exit." Exit takes the form of silently cutting off contact with an organization. The second option is "voice" which he defines as any attempt to change rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs. Hirschman argues that voice is necessary to make adjustments within the organization. Adjustments are central to organizational renewal and survival.

Unlike Hirschman, Dan Farrell (1983) views loyalty as a third option to dissatisfaction with an organization and neglect as a fourth. He uses specific job behaviors to measure the exit, voice, loyalty and neglect options. Neglect is characterized by lax and disregarding behavior among workers. Twelve job behaviors were selected as examples of the four theoretical categories: exit, voice,

loyalty and neglect (EVLN). For example, an operationalization of exit was "getting into action and looking for another job" (Farrell, 1983, p.600). Next, a panel of expert judges sorted these twelve specific behavioral responses into perceived categories. Their categories matched the EVLN model. Nonexpert subjects then made paired similarity ratings of the same twelve job behaviors. Next, a second set of nonexpert subjects rated each of the twelve responses on six attribute scales: active/passive, masculine/feminine, constructive/destructive, direct/indirect, rational/nonrational and unilateral/bilateral. Farrell concluded that the four response model, exit, voice, loyalty and neglect (EVLN), could be described by two conceptual dimensions: active/passive and constructive/destructive (see Figure 1). He suggests that the EVLN model should be useful in building predictive theories.

Spencer (1986) investigates the relationship between the extent to which employees have opportunities to voice dissatisfaction and voluntary turnover. He also uses Hirschman's concepts of exit and voice as the theoretical foundation for his research. Employees from one hundred and eleven short-term general care hospitals were surveyed. The questionnaire asked whether or not the nurses had access to the following voice mechanisms: 1) formal grievance

MDSCAL CONFIGURATION OF RESPONSES TO JOB DISSATISFACTION
AND FOUR VECTORS REPRESENTING ATTRIBUTE RATINGS.

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job satisfaction:
A multi-dimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 596-607.

FIGURE 1

procedure, 2) suggestion system, 3) employee management meetings, 4) counseling service, 5) ombudsman, 6) nonmanagement task forces, 7) question and answer program, and 8) survey feedback. The results indicated that regardless of whether a union is present, high retention rates are associated with high numbers of mechanisms for employee voice.

Gorden, Infante and Graham (1988) hypothesized that a subordinate's satisfaction will be greater when the organization is receptive to voice. Hirschman's definition of voice was also used in this study. Subordinate satisfaction was defined as satisfaction with work, career, pay, superior and the superior's upward effectiveness. Organizational receptivity was conceptualized as superior and subordinate being argumentative but not verbally aggressive, subordinates' perception that their superiors encourage them to argue and the organization's commitment to employees, quality and employee rights. One hundred and fifty working students participated in this study. The subjects completed the Management Commitment to Quality scale which contained five items. An example of one of these items is: In my workplace there is a commitment to quality. The hypothesis was strongly supported by the results. Conditions found especially conducive to employee voice were the subordinates' perceptions that their superiors encouraged argument and that their organization

was committed to quality in product, work life and employee rights.

Principled Organizational Dissent

Jill Graham (1986) developed a theoretical model of principled organizational dissent (see Figure 2). Literature from the social sciences, humanities, law and journalism were used to develop this model. Principled organizational dissent is when "dissent concerns issues of principle such as justice, honesty, or economy" (Graham, 1986, p.3). The goal of this model is to chart the dissent process from beginning to end through each stage. The stages of this process are adapted from the models of whistleblowing, prosocial behavior and upward political influence. Six stages of the process of principled organizational dissent are proposed. The individual's perceptions, beliefs and behavior are used as the unit of analysis in developing the stages. The first stage begins when the individual becomes aware of an issue of principle which she/he interprets as involving wrongdoing. During the next stage, the individual decides whether the issue is serious, whether he/she has a responsibility to respond and whether a response is feasible. The third stage is a decision to respond or not. Once the individual has decided to respond, she/he must select a type and magnitude of

PRINCIPLED ORGANIZATIONAL DISSENT MODEL

Graham, J.W. (1986). Principled Organizational dissent: A theoretical essay. In B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 8 (pp. 1-52). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

FIGURE 2

response. Many channels usually exist to respond, for example, alert the supervisor or write a memo. The last stage is the individual's perception of the organization's response.

The organization will respond on two levels: a response to the issue itself and a response to the dissident. Feedback arrows are included from the last stage to the first to accommodate the fact that "awareness of a principled issue" a second time is affected by the organization's response to the first episode of dissent. "Perceived feasibility of response" may also change after the first episode of dissent. Therefore, feedback arrows are also included from the last stage to the "perceived feasibility of response" stage. This model sets the stage for a program of research on the topic.

Since Hirschman's definition of employee voice includes the possibility of employees speaking out on issues of principle, it can be argued that Graham's definition of principled organizational dissent can be encompassed in Hirschman's definition.

Free Speech In the Workplace

Gorden and Infante have been pursuing a program of research dealing with freedom of speech in the workplace. The next few paragraphs chronicle their progress. Their major findings have been that employees who perceive they

have freedom of speech in the workplace are more satisfied with their superior and job.

Infante and Gorden (1985) hypothesize that the more subordinates perceive their superiors are high in argumentativeness and low in verbal aggressiveness, the more the subordinates will also be argumentative and have job satisfaction. Argumentativeness is defined as the ability to discuss controversial issues, advocate a position on an issue and refute the positions others take. Verbal aggressiveness on the other hand is attacking the self-concept of another. Argumentativeness is considered constructive and verbal aggressiveness is considered destructive. Subjects were asked to complete the Argumentativeness Scale, the Employee Rights Scale and a scale for measuring career satisfaction. The Employee Rights Scale consisted of twenty items to assess the individual's perceptions of how his or her organization protects or violates the rights of employees. The hypothesis of this study was strongly supported: the more subordinates perceive their superiors are high in argumentativeness and low in verbal aggressiveness, the more likely subordinates will also be argumentative and have job satisfaction.

Infante and Gorden (1987) posit that argumentativeness will be positively associated with communicator style

variables, while verbal aggressiveness will be negatively associated. It was also hypothesized that argumentativeness produces desirable organizational communication outcomes. One hundred and thirty one superior-subordinate dyads participated in the study. The superiors completed the Montgomery and Norton (1981) version of the Communicator Style Measure. The subordinate was rated by the superior on these style characteristics: impression leaving, open, dramatic, dominant, precise, relaxed, friendly, attentive, animated and communicator image. The subordinate was also rated on five items adapted from the Argumentativeness Scale and five items from the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale. Superiors then rated themselves in terms of effectiveness in upward communication on a five item Superiors' Argumentativeness scale. Next, the subordinates rated their superiors on communicator style, argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness and upward effectiveness.

The results revealed that subordinates coupled argumentativeness and low verbal aggressiveness of their superiors with such affirming communicator styles as friendliness and attentiveness. Also, superiors' upward effectiveness, both as self perceived and as judged by subordinates, was predicted by a superior's argumentativeness plus relaxed and impression leaving communicator styles. Superiors linked subordinates' argumentativeness with attentive, animated, relaxed

impression leaving, dominant and friendly communicator styles.

Four different hypotheses were tested by Gorden and Infante (1991). The first hypothesis stated that employees will perceive less freedom of speech in the workplace than is desired. The second hypothesis stated employees who perceive more as compared to less freedom of speech in the workplace will evaluate their organizations as more economically stable, more participative in terms of decision-making and more committed to product quality, the quality of worklife and employee rights. The third hypothesis was employees who perceive more as compared to less freedom of speech in the workplace will be more satisfied with work, pay, promotions, supervisors and coworkers, and will have more organizational commitment. The last hypothesis stated that the extent to which employees perceive that they have freedom of speech in the workplace will explain variability in organizational commitment not explained by the organization's commitment to product quality, commitment to employee's work-life quality and the organization's economic stability. Employees in a variety of organizations completed a questionnaire. The questionnaire items were adapted from the Free Speech Scale (Gorden & Infante, 1980), which was written for students and addressed freedom of speech on

campus. Four of these five items seem to deal directly with organizational dissent and should have a positive correlation with the tolerance for dissent scale developed in this study. The results revealed that employees do desire more freedom of speech in the workplace than they currently have. All of the other hypotheses were also supported by the model.

In addition to a Free Speech Scale, Gorden and Infante (1987) developed a scale to measure employee rights. Two hypotheses and one research question were developed. The first hypothesis stated that employees who are in management will have the more favorable perceptions of how their organizations deal with employee rights. The second hypothesis stated that employees with the most years of employment will have the more favorable perceptions of how their organizations handle employee rights. The research question asked whether the size of an organization is related to how employee rights' violations are perceived. Three hundred employees in approximately 260 different work organizations completed a 45 item questionnaire. Items for the scale came from corporate policy handbooks and statements, free speech cases decided in the courts, union literature, interviews of 30 employees and other literature on the subject. Three of these items deal directly with organizational dissent, so the scale should have a high correlation with the tolerance for dissent scale to be

developed in this study. The results revealed that the perceptions of employees in management were more favorable than those employees who were not in management. The second hypothesis that employees with the most years of employment would have more favorable perceptions of employee rights was also supported.

Although the free speech, employee rights and personality trait studies add to the literature, they look at the concept of dissent by studying communicator style variables such as argumentativeness and aggressiveness instead of dissent itself.

Organizational Rhetoric

Hegstrom (1990) posits that two rhetorical conditions exist in organizations today: the dissent condition and the mimetic condition. Mimesis, which links organizational theory with Plato's criticism of rhetoric, exists when messages are adapted to please the organizationally powerful. The dissent condition encourages tolerance for dissent and the mimetic condition inhibits dissent. Organizational theory is concerned with the problem of dissent, especially as it relates to the challenge of integration of the individual and the organization. In this sense, organizational integration is the blending of the organization's and employees' needs and

values which Hegstrom suggests is hopeless without tolerance for dissent. Hegstrom (1990) argues that, "if organizational dissent is central to the question of integration in organizational theory, it is also an example of a problem, both ancient and contemporary in rhetorical theory" (p.143). Organizational dissent is related directly to the mimetic nature of rhetoric. Rhetorical theory's concern over mimesis and organizational theory's concern that organizational values may outweigh individual values encompass the same problem. Hegstrom concludes that organizational rhetoric highlighting hierarchical differences is mimetic and inhibits the possibility of organizational integration. On the other hand, the dissent condition invites opposing views and makes organizational integration a possibility. A test of tolerance for dissent might ideally discriminate between instances of the organizational dissent condition and instances of organizational mimesis.

Whistleblowing and Boatrocking

The next section of literature focuses on dissent as it occurs in the form of whistleblowing and boatrocking. These studies assume a more qualitative and descriptive approach. Dissent is not measured quantitatively in the following studies.

A model of the steps through which whistleblowing

incidents progress was developed by Stewart (1980). Fifty-one actual incidents were analyzed to derive her model. Consistent patterns of events were discovered after examining the incidents. The first step in whistleblowing is awareness of an organizational product or policy which one feels is unethical, immoral, illegal or will endanger the public. In step two, concern is expressed to the immediate superior and the organization member perceives that the superior is not going to act upon the concerns. The organization member then expresses her/his concerns to higher ups in the organization's hierarchy. In this third step, the member perceives that the higher ups are also not going to act upon his/her concerns. In step four the organization member takes the concerns to a regulatory body which is in charge of overseeing the organization or government agency. At this step the concerns become public. The organization member may at this point take the concerns to the public press. The organization member is then isolated by her/his superiors in step five. In the last step the organization member is terminated from the organization by being fired or forced to resign. In the whistleblowing cases examined, only two deviated from this pattern.

Redding (1985) argues that since boatrocking and whistle blowing are communicative acts and raise basic

freedom-of-speech issues, they are topics that teachers of speech communication should be concerned with. He also argues that our society and educational system discourage dissent and promote conformity. He offers a set of propositions to support his case. The first proposition argues that in recent years there has been a dramatic shift in educational objectives from wiping out social evils to climbing the career ladder. Proposition number two posits that the speech communication field is concerned with pragmatics, especially techniques used to make a speaker successful. The fact that most students will work in an organizational, bureaucratic world is the third proposition. Proposition number four states that most organizations are characterized by hierarchy. In turn, hierarchy requires that almost everyone has a boss and getting along with superiors is critical to career success. The fact that getting along with superiors is a central concern of students and since getting along is a matter of communicating, the teachers of speech communication occupy a strategic position with regard to preparing students for the organizational world. This is proposition number five. Proposition number six argues that most of the instruction in speech communication reinforces a basic assumption of the working world, "that the safest way to get along on the job is to go along" (Redding, 1985, p. 248). The last proposition posits that phrases like "Please the boss," and

"Don't rock the boat" make up the dominant organizational ideology.

Redding (1985) recommends that speech teachers need to be consciousness-raisers. He also suggests that students be exposed to the total spectrum of the organizational world including discussion on the communication problems of dissenters, boat-rockers and whistleblowers. In closing, Redding offers a continuum of "Bad Managerial Decisions" arranged in approximate descending order according to perceived severity of the problem. The continuum starts with the clearly illegal, the clearly immoral or unethical, the insane, the incredibly stupid, the insensitive, the inefficient or unpractical and the last one is the irritating or annoying.

Sprague and Ruud (1988) focus on internal communication in Silicon Valley high technology organizations. High technology is characterized by the authors as highly skilled labor (scientists and engineers), a fast rate of growth, a high ratio of Research and Development expenditures to sales and a worldwide market for its products. The authors take an interest in talk that expresses disagreement with authority, specifically boat-rocking. In this article boat-rocking represents the "final step" before the organization member takes his/her concerns outside of the organization. Sprague and Ruud's research

was guided by the following three questions: 1) What situations move employees to rock the boat? Where between Redding's extremes of the clearly illegal and the merely annoying do the examples fall? 2) What communication strategies do employees use in expressing dissent? Once a person has decided to speak up, he or she must choose a strategy for communicating. How, when, where and to whom will the dissent be expressed? 3) How do employees account for their boat-rocking decisions? What reasons are given for voicing disagreement and also the reasons given for failure to dissent or failure to press concerns beyond a certain point?

Interviews were conducted with employees of various levels from different organizations. Twenty-two episodes collected from these interviews were then subjected to account analysis. The results were as follows: 1) Boat-rocking was motivated by a desire to do something they found necessary. It was initiated when underutilization or inappropriate use of professionals existed and where there were quality problems. Most incidents, however, reflected employees' resistance to change. Most cases of dissent fell in the middle ranges of severity on Redding's scale. 2) Employees confronted superiors in private or meetings, by writing notes or a letter or by phone. Most dissenters opted for face to face dissent. Most employees were honest and open although sometimes blunt. Some employees were

oblivious as to the method they used. 3) Boat-rocking was accounted for by feelings of integrity, "the noble self" encouragement of dissent programs and care for the company.

These articles contribute significantly to the whistleblowing/boatrocking literature. However, they study the problem of dissent mostly through qualitative and case study approaches. What is now needed is a way to quantitatively uncover employees' perceptions of their organization's tolerance for dissent. The development of such a scale is the purpose of the current study.

Justification

Existing studies of internal dissent have either relied exclusively on qualitative methods or have studied dissent indirectly by looking at some other variable, such as argumentativeness. In this study, an attempt has been made to study tolerance for dissent directly. The scale suggested here measures tolerance for dissent in various aspects of organizational life including superior/subordinate relationships, departmental contexts, and perceived attitudes of upper management.

The use of this scale should have many advantages. The first advantage would be that companies deciding to implement employee participation/empowerment programs could assess their organizations' tolerance for dissent. This

would be a necessary first step in implementing these programs. If participation programs are implemented and employees don't feel they can voice their dissent or participate, then the effort is wasted.

The scale could also be used to provide feedback to management about the viability of "voice" from organizational members. According to Hirschman (1970), feedback in the form of "voice" and "exit" is necessary for the organization to make adjustments essential to organizational renewal and survival.

A third advantage is that future researchers of the subject could test theories relating tolerance for dissent to different organizational structures. Different organizational systems and structures might result in different levels of tolerance for dissent.

Fourth, the scale permits researchers to study dissent quantitatively. Most of the research has studied dissent either qualitatively or indirectly by focusing on personality traits such as argumentativeness. The Freedom of Speech in the Workplace Scale (Gorden & Infante, 1980) is an exception. However, the current scale includes more items and potentially detects finer distinctions in tolerance for dissent. We are able from this research to get a sense of the extent to which tolerance for dissent is different from "Freedom of Speech." This instrument may provide a more direct measure of the construct.

A fifth advantage is that the scale allows for a more systematic focus on internal dissent, not just whistleblowing. Much of the previous research has focused on whistleblowing, which occurs when the employee voices his/her dissent outside of the organization.

Definition of Dissent

The employee voice literature uses Hirschman's definition of employee voice to define dissent. According to Hirschman (1970) voice is,

any attempt at all to change, rather than to escape from an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority with the intention of forcing a change in management, or through various types of actions and protest, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion. (p.30)

Graham (1986) defines principled organizational dissent as, "where dissent concerns issues of principle such as justice, honesty or economy" (p. 3). Redding (1985) refers to two different forms of dissent. Those employees expressing dissent within the boundaries of an organization

are called boatrockers. When the dissenter takes his case outside of the organization, it is considered whistleblowing.

Since Graham's (1986) definition of dissent is included in Hirschman's employee voice definition and since we want to limit our study to internal dissent, Hirschman's definition of dissent will be used as our conceptual definition. The scale itself is an operational definition of tolerance for dissent in this, and perhaps, future studies. Graham's model of principled organizational dissent will serve as the theoretical foundation for the questionnaire development.

CHAPTER II

Methods, Procedures and Results

The next section will review the methods, procedures and results of the study.

Methods

This section will include information on the organizations, subjects, scales and instrument design used.

Organizations

Two organizations, Coopers & Lybrand and the Pacific Stock Exchange participated in this study. Coopers & Lybrand is the fifth largest of the Big 6 accounting firms. While Coopers & Lybrand sat out the accounting mergers of the 1980's, it has become the unexpected beneficiary as the refuge for partners defecting from other international mergers. The company aggressively uses technology, including sophisticated computer programs that use large, specialized databases to analyze client problems. Coopers has joined IBM to offer computer consulting targeted to consumer goods companies, health care firms, and pharmaceutical concerns. The headquarters for Coopers is located in New York city. The San Jose, California office which participated in this study has a total of 249 employees.

The Pacific Stock Exchange is a self-regulating organization that operates under the oversight of the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. The Exchange has responsibility for regulating its members to ensure compliance with Exchange rules as well as the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act. Five main types of securities are dealt with at the Exchange including, common stock, American depository receipts, preferred stock, warrants and rights, and bonds. The Exchange was formed by the merger of the San Francisco Stock and Bond Exchange, and the Los Angeles Oil Exchange in 1957. The Exchange is located in San Francisco, California and employs 148 people.

Differences between the two organizations and the Tolerance for Dissent Scale was measured by using a t -test. There were no statistically significant differences found between the organizations, ($t(170) = .08$, $p = .94$). The mean for the Pacific Stock Exchange was 89.28 and the mean for Coopers & Lybrand was 89.46. Therefore, since the organizations are in a similar industry and the purpose of this study is to develop a scale, the results will combine both organizations as one.

Subjects

Demographics of the sample population from the

principal study were collected. The demographics included were sex, age, ethnic background and education completed. It turned out that 48% of the respondents were male and 52% were female. The majority of respondents, 52% were in the age group of 21 to 30. Most (77%) of respondents were white and the rest were minorities. In the area of educational background, 47% of respondents have a bachelor's degree.

Instrument Design

The theoretical basis for the instrument was the steps in Jill Graham's theoretical model of principled organizational dissent. These steps are awareness of an issue of principle, perceived issue seriousness, perceived feasibility of response, attribution of personal responsibility for responding, decision to respond to the issue, magnitude of behavioral response and perceived organizational response to behavior. Items were written for each of these topics in order to include information about each of the posited determinants of dissent. Redding's continuum of "Bad Managerial Decisions" arranged in approximate descending order according to perceived severity of the problem were used as items in the scale. Redding's continuum ties in neatly with Graham's concept of perceived issue seriousness. Each item on the questionnaire was measured on a Likert scale from one to five. Initially, Thirty four items were used. This instrument is included as

Appendix A.

Scales

During the principal administration of the test, construct validity was measured by correlating the dissent scale with, 1) Infante & Gorden's Free Speech Scale (1980) (Appendix C), 2) selected items on job satisfaction from the Michigan Organizational Assessment package (1978) (Appendix D), and 3) selected items from Infante and Gorden's Employee Rights Scale (1987) (Appendix E). Items which most represented dissent were chosen from the Employee Rights scale. Since perceived freedom of speech and employee rights are similar constructs as perceived tolerance for dissent, we expected a positive correlation, .80 or higher, with the constructs "freedom of speech" and "perceived employee rights." In addition, a positive correlation was expected between those employees perceiving a large tolerance for dissent and those expressing a high degree of job satisfaction.

Procedures

The next section examines the pilot study and principal test procedures.

Pilot Study Procedures

Twenty-one working San Jose State University students completed the questionnaire as part of a pre-test of the Tolerance for Dissent instrument (see Appendix A). This pre-test was given to an undergraduate communication studies class.

The scale was then tested for reliability using the internal consistency method of Cronbach's alpha coefficient at .80. Item analysis information was collected to note which items did not contribute to reliability. An item to whole test correlation of at least .30 was used as a standard. See the next section for a report of the results.

Principal Test Administration

An improved questionnaire (Appendix B) was then given to employees of the Pacific Stock Exchange, San Francisco, California and employees of Coopers & Lybrand, San Jose, California. One hundred and fifty questionnaires were sent to the Pacific Stock Exchange and 200 to Coopers & Lybrand. Questionnaires were distributed by the Human Resources Department in departmental group meetings to employees. Employees were given three weeks to complete the survey and turn it into the Human Resources Department. The Pacific Stock Exchange returned 130 questionnaires, which is an 88% return rate. Coopers & Lybrand returned

60 questionnaires for a 24% return rate. The overall response rate was 54%.

The scale was also tested for reliability by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient at .80. Item analysis information was collected and items not reaching an item to whole test correlation of at least .30 were deleted. Construct validity was measured by correlating the Tolerance for Dissent scale with the Freedom of Speech, Job Satisfaction and Employee Rights scales. Demographic information of the population sample was also collected.

Results

This section will review the results of the pilot study and the principal study.

Pilot Study Results

Twenty one working SJSU students completed the questionnaire as part of a pre-test for the Tolerance for Dissent instrument (see Appendix A). This pre-test was given to an undergraduate communication studies class.

The scale was then tested for reliability using the internal consistency method of Cronbach's alpha coefficient at .80. Item analysis information was collected to note which items did not contribute to reliability (see Table 1). An item to whole test correlation of at least .30 was used as a standard. Seven items were deleted. These

items are included here with their initial item number.

1. When problems are pointed out, decision-makers in this organization immediately take steps to resolve them.
2. Employees here are rewarded for passing along information needed to make corrections.
4. Those who complain the loudest and longest have the most impact within this organization.
5. Complainers in this organization are openly treated with hostility.
6. The most serious issues brought to management's attention are the first ones that are attended to.
15. When someone in this organization dissents, they have a great deal of support and protection.
20. I have noticed that other members of this organization try to help out when I need to bring bad news to those to whom I report.

After these items were deleted, the reliability estimate was .84. Item twenty-one was added which states, "When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, a lot of others are likely to notice too." Item ten which reads, "In this organization, it is better to work around a problem with other people, than confront them to improve the situation," was re-written to read, "In this organization, it is better to smooth things over with other people, than confront them to improve the situation." Even though this item resulted in an item to whole test correlation of only .27, it was retained and rewritten because it was so close to the .30 standard.

Table 1

Item Analysis for the Pilot Study Tolerance for Dissent Scale

Item number	Corrected item-total correlation	Item number	Corrected item-total correlation
Q1	.1684	Q23	.4863
Q2	.0738	Q24	.7662
Q3	.4149	Q25	.3860
Q4	-.1169	Q26	.6576
Q5	-.1361	Q27	.6857
Q6	.1499	Q28	.7247
Q7	.4631	Q29	.6183
Q8	.5813	Q30	.7060
Q9	.5550	Q31	.5311
Q10	-.2787	Q32	.6587
Q11	.4292	Q33	.5116
Q12	.6282	Q34	.5002
Q13	.3214		
Q14	.3261		
Q15	-.0080		
Q16	-.5413		
Q17	-.5664		
Q18	.3241		
Q19	-.3835		
Q20	.1430		
Q22	.4008		

Principal Study Results

This section will report the results from the principal study. This will include the reliability, validity and demographic analyses.

Reliability Analysis

The Tolerance for Dissent scale items were tested for reliability using the internal consistency method of Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha=.80$). Table 2 gives the item analysis information. An item to whole test correlation of at least .30 was used as a standard. Two items, 27 and 32 were found to perform poorly and were deleted. Item 27 resulted in a .1597 item to whole test correlation and item 32 a $-.0897$ item to whole test correlation. See Appendix F for the scale containing the final 25 items. The reliability estimate with these two items deleted is $\alpha= .91$.

The items on the other three scales: Freedom of Speech, Job Satisfaction and Employee Rights were analyzed for reliability also. See appendix C for the Freedom of Speech scale, appendix D for the Job Satisfaction scale and appendix E for the Employee Rights scale. The final reliability estimates were as follows: .79 for the Freedom of Speech Scale, .93 for the Job Satisfaction Scale, and .65 for the Employee Rights Scale. An item analysis for the

Freedom of Speech scale is reported in Table 3.

Table 2

Item Analysis for the Tolerance for Dissent Scale

Item number	Corrected item- total correlation	Item number	Corrected item- total correlation
Q13	.6226	Q36	.5084
Q14	.6553	Q37	.4653
Q15	.4799	Q38	.5578
Q16	.6217	Q39	.4484
Q17	.6750		
Q18	.5021		
Q19	.5133		
Q20	.5724		
Q21	.6168		
Q22	.5650		
Q23	.6653		
Q24	.3255		
Q25	.3686		
Q26	.4986		
Q28	.7117		
Q29	.3631		
Q30	.4634		
Q31	.4308		
Q33	.3889		
Q34	.3959		
Q35	.5744		

Table 3

Item Analysis for the Freedom of Speech Scale

Item Number	Corrected item-total correlation
Q5	.5369
Q6	.4706
Q7	.7023
Q8	.4862
Q9	.6389

Validity

The Tolerance for Dissent Scale was correlated with the Freedom of Speech Scale, Job Satisfaction Scale and selected items from the Employee Rights Scale to determine construct validity. Since perceived freedom of speech and employee rights are similar constructs as perceived tolerance for dissent, we expected a positive correlation between the Tolerance for Dissent scale, Freedom of Speech scale and Employee Rights items. A positive correlation was also predicted between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Job Satisfaction scale.

Pearson's r was used. The correlation between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Freedom of Speech scale was $r = .81$, $p < .001$. According to Lutz (1983), this represents a very strong correlation. The correlation between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Job Satisfaction scale was $r = .61$, $p < .001$ level, which represents a strong correlation. Lastly, the correlation between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Employee Rights scale was $r = .67$, $p < .001$ level which also represents a strong correlation. Therefore, as predicted, perceived freedom of speech and employee rights are strongly correlated with perceived tolerance for dissent suggesting that they are measuring similar constructs. In addition, a strong correlation of $r = .61$, $p < .001$ was found between

those employees perceiving a large tolerance for dissent and those expressing a high degree of job satisfaction. Thus, the Tolerance for Dissent scale performs as we would expect a valid scale to perform in relation to previously used measures of these other constructs.

Demographic Analysis

Demographics of the test population were collected, including sex, age, ethnic background and education. A t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between male and female perceptions of tolerance for dissent. Eighty-three males and 89 females answered all items used in the scale. The results indicate that there are no significant differences between male and female perceptions of tolerance for dissent. Table 4 reports these results.

Table 4

T-Test for Sex

Variable	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
Male	88.46	14.29	170	-.77	.441
Female	90.16	14.56			

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for significant differences among age groups, groups from different ethnic backgrounds and groups representing different levels of education. No statistically significant differences were found ($\alpha = .05$). Tables 5 through 7 report these results. The fact that there is no differences between Tolerance for Dissent and the cohort groups suggests that all groups have similar perceptions of Tolerance for Dissent.

Table 5

Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Age

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Groups	4	534.5613	133.6403	.65	.6305
Within Groups	165	34132.9446	206.8663		
Total	169	34667.5059			

Group	Number in Group	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Age 0-20	3	99.33	5.69
Age 21-30	86	89.07	13.20
Age 31-40	55	90.03	16.09
Age 41-50	13	86.31	17.43
Age 51-60	13	86.31	17.43
Age 61-up	0	0	0

(n=170)

Table 6

Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Ethnic Background

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Groups	4	387.6360	96.9090	.46	.7666
Within Groups	164	34721.1569	211.7144		

Group	Number in Group	Mean	<u>SD</u>
White	131	90.06	14.80
Black	10	88.30	12.50
American Indian	1	87	0
Hispanic	11	86.36	16.20
Asian	16	85.75	12.12

(n=169)

Table 7

Analysis of Variance for Tolerance for Dissent by Education

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squaes	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Groups	4	812.6970	203.1743	.98	.4186
Within Groups	166	34320.8585	206.7522		
Group	Number in Group		Mean	<u>SD</u>	
High School Graduate only	3		86	24.52	
Some College	56		88.77	13.94	
Bachelors degree	82		88.22	14.21	
Advanced degree	29		92.62	14.73	
(n=171)					

CHAPTER III

Discussion

The previous chapter described the results of data analysis including the reliability, validity and demographic tests. This chapter discusses conclusions that can be drawn from the results, limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.

Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to develop a scale to measure employees' perception of their organization's tolerance for dissent. It was predicted that a positive correlation would exist between the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Freedom of Speech scale and the Employee Rights items and that a moderate correlation would exist with the Job Satisfaction scale.

The results of this study indicate that a strong correlation does exist between the Tolerance for Dissent scale, the Freedom of Speech scale, the Employee Rights scale and the Job Satisfaction scale which suggests that the construct validity of the scale is as expected.

It was also interesting to note that there were no significant differences between perception of tolerance for dissent and one's sex, age, ethnic background and educational level. There was also no difference between the

two organizations, the Pacific Stock Exchange and Coopers & Lybrand.

In order to measure whether the Freedom of Speech scale and the Tolerance for Dissent scale are measuring the same construct, the items on both scales were combined and tested for reliability (see Table 8). The reliability coefficient was improved to .93 as compared to .91 for the Tolerance for Dissent scale when the Freedom of Speech items were added. This suggests that the construct Freedom of Speech is really being measured as Tolerance for Dissent even though they may be different theoretically. In addition, items from the Freedom of Speech Scale (Infante & Gorden, 1980) focus on dissent.

Table 8

Item Analysis for the Combined Tolerance for Dissent Scale
and the Freedom of Speech Scale

Item number	Corrected item- total correlation	Item number	Corrected item- total correlation
Q5	.6032	Q29	.3566
Q6	.5674	Q30	.4783
Q7	.6896	Q31	.4190
Q8	.5686	Q33	.3706
Q9	.6609	Q34	.3721
Q13	.6450	Q35	.5451
Q14	.6930	Q36	.4612
Q15	.5238	Q37	.4564
Q16	.6397	Q38	.5562
Q17	.6661	Q39	.4361
Q18	.5017		
Q19	.5190		
Q20	.5688		
Q21	.6238		
Q22	.6184		
Q23	.6824		
Q24	.3166		
Q25	.3791		
Q26	.4796		
Q27	.7413		

Recommendations for Measuring Tolerance for Dissent

The combination scale of the Freedom of Speech items and the Tolerance for Dissent items discussed above is probably the best scale studied here as the final reliability estimate was .93 (see Appendix G). This scale will be especially helpful when precision of measure is needed.

Tolerance for Dissent Scale: Short Form

Two short five item tests were developed to measure dissent. The first one combined the five most reliable items from the Tolerance for Dissent scale. The reliability estimate was .85 (see Table 9). The second short test combined the best items from the Tolerance for Dissent scale and the Freedom of Speech scale. The reliability estimate for this scale was .86 (see Table 10). (See Appendix H for the Tolerance for Dissent scale, short form and Appendix I for the Combined short form). Either one of these tests can be used as a short form to measure Tolerance for Dissent. Table 11 displays a comparison of mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum and reliability among all of the scales. Either of these scales is recommended for multi-variate studies when the length of the questionnaire is an issue. Correlation of the various scales is good evidence that the scales are measuring the same construct (see Table 12).

Table 9

Item Analysis for the Tolerance for Dissent Scale: Short Form

Item number	Corrected item-total correlation
Q13	.6181
Q14	.6730
Q17	.6046
Q23	.7168
Q28	.7019

Table 10

Item Analysis for the Combined Tolerance for Dissent Scale and Freedom of Speech Scale: Short Form

Item number	Corrected item-total correlation
Q7	.7020
Q14	.6798
Q17	.5941
Q23	.7371
Q28	.7146

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, Maximum and Reliability Analysis for all Scales

Scale	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Min.	Max.
Tolerance for Dissent	89.34	14.41	41	124
Freedom of Speech	16.48	4.07	5	25
Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech	105.95	17.89	46	149
Tolerance for Dissent Short Form	16.11	4.41	5	25
Combined Short Form	16.54	4.56	5	25

Scale	Reliability
Tolerance for Dissent	.91
Freedom of Speech	.79
Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech	.93
Tolerance for Dissent Short Form	.85
Combined Short Form	.86

Table 12

Correlation of the Tolerance for Dissent Scale with the other scales

Scale	Correlation coefficient
Combined	.99**
Freedom of Speech	.81**
Dissent Short Form	.88**
Combined Short Form	.87**

** $p < .001$

Recommendations for Further Research

One limitation of this study was the test population itself. Both participating companies were in financial service industries. Obviously different results may be found if a different test population is used. In future studies it would be recommended to use employees from other industries, manufacturing, engineering, non-profit, public sector and so forth. It would also be interesting to collect data on employees' level in the organization and department. This information could provide answers as to whether one's level in the hierarchy or department effects one's perception of Tolerance for Dissent.

In future studies it would be interesting to use the Freedom of Speech scale and the other two short item tests and see if reliability improves or retards with a different test population.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1979). Educational Research. New York, NY: Longman.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1978). The Michigan assessment package. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center.
- Daniels, T. D. & Spiker, B. K. (1987). Organizational Communication. Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- DeNisi, A. S. & Klaas, B. S. (1989). Managerial reactions to employee dissent: the impact of grievance activity on performance ratings. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 705-716.
- De Wine, S., Nicotera A. M., & Parry, D. (1991). Argumentativeness and aggressiveness, the flip side of gentle persuasion. Management Communication Quarterly, 4, 386-411.
- Downs, C. A. (1988). Communication Audits. Glenview, IL: Foresman.
- Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job satisfaction: A multi-dimensional scaling study. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 596-607.
- Goldhaber, G. M. (1986). Organizational Communication. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Gorden, W. I., & Infante, D. A. (1980). Attitudes toward free speech: Trends, measurement, and individual difference considerations. Free Speech Yearbook 1980 (pp. 115-125). Annanda VA: Speech Communication Association.
- Gorden, W. I., & Infante, D. A. (1987). Employee Rights, Content, Argumentativeness, Verbal Aggressiveness and Career Satisfaction. Communicating Employee Responsibilities and Rights: A Modern Management Mandate. Ed. Chimeze A. B. Osigweh. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Gorden, W. I., & Infante, D. A. (1991). Test of a Communication Model of Organizational Commitment. Communication Quarterly, 39, 144-155.

- Gorden, W. I., Infante, D. A., & Graham, E. E. (1988). Corporate conditions conducive to employee voice: A subordinate perspective. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 1, 101-110.
- Gorden, W. I., Infante, D. A., & Izzo, J. (1988). Variations in voice pertaining to dissatisfaction/satisfaction with subordinates. Management Communication Quarterly, 2, 6-22.
- Graham, J. W. (1986). Principled organizational dissent: A theoretical essay. In B. M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 8, 1-52.
- Hedderston, J. (1991). SPSS/PC+ Made Simple. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hegstrom, T. (1990). Mimetic and Dissent Conditions in Organizational Rhetoric. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 2, 141-152.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). Exit, Voice, and loyalty. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Infante, D. A. & Gorden, W. I. (1985). Superiors' argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness as predictors of subordinates' satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 12, 117-125.
- Infante, D. A. & Gorden, W. I. (1987). Superior and subordinate Communicator profiles: Implications for independent-mindedness and upward effectiveness. Central States Speech Journal, 38, 73-80.
- Kreps, G. L. (1990). Organizational Communication. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Lutz, Gene M. (1983). Understanding Social Statistics. New York: Macmillan.
- Montgomery, Barbara M., & Norton, Robert W. (1981). Sex Differences and Similarities in Communicator Style. Communication Monographs, 48, 121-132.
- Mumby, D. K. (1988). Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology and domination. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.
- Osigweh, C. A. B. (1987). Communicating Employee Responsibilities and Rights. New York: Quorum.

- Osigweh, C. A. B. (1989). Managing Employee Rights and Responsibilities. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Redding, W. C. (1985). Rocking boats, blowing whistles, and teaching speech communication. Communication Education, 34, 245-258.
- Rogers, D. P. & Trombetta, J. J. (1988). Communication climate, Job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. Management Communication Quarterly, 4, 494-511.
- Smith, M. J. (1988). Contemporary Communication Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Spencer, D. G. (1986). Employee voice and employee retention. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 488-502.
- Sprague, J. & Ruud, G. L. (1988). Boat-rocking in the high-technology culture. American Behavioral Scientist, 32, 169-193.
- Stewart, L. P. (1980). "Whistle blowing": Implications for organizational communication. Journal of Communication, 30, 90-101.
- Stanley, J. C. & Hopkins, K. D. (1972). Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Walter, G. A. (1984). Organizational Development and Individual Rights. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20, 423-439.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Pilot Study Instrument

EMPLOYEE COMMUNICATIONS SURVEY

If you are currently employed, please answer these questions with respect to your current organization, if not answer them with respect to your last employer. Please circle the number which best describes your answer.

1. When problems are pointed out, decision-makers in this organization immediately take steps to resolve them.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

2. Employees here are rewarded for passing along information needed to make corrections.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

3. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

4. Those who complain the loudest and longest have the most impact within this organization.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

5. complainers in this organization are openly treated with hostility.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

6. The most serious issues brought to management's attention are the first ones that are attended to.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

7. If an issue is serious, my co-workers and I feel free to take it to our boss.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

8. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

9. My co-workers and I will typically approach several of those in authority, if necessary, in order to effect a change.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

10. In this organization, it is better to work around a problem with other people, than confront them to improve the situation.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

11. When I notice something that needs to be fixed in this organization, there are plenty of ways to make this known.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

12. I have a great deal of confidence in my ability to make a difference in decisions affecting this organization.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

13. I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and affect changes in this organization.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

14. There is very little risk of reprisal to someone in this organization who objects to the prevailing view on an issue.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

15. When someone in this organization dissents, they have a great deal of support and protection.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

16. When someone in this organization dissents, they are likely to be isolated or fired.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

17. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

18. It is part of my job to report problems with our products/services.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

19. When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, it is best not to report it to the boss.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

20. I have noticed that other members of this organization try to help out when I need to bring bad news to those to whom I report.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

21. omitted on pilot study by mistake

22. There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

23. If I see something going on that violates one of my principles, I let other people in this organization know about it.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

24. Employees are aware of issues in this organization.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

25. Employees are kept informed of business conditions.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

26. When something goes wrong in this organization, I'm likely to know about it.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

27. I tend to notice serious problems here that need attention.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

28. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was clearly illegal.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

29. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was clearly immoral and unethical.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

30. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was psychopathic or insane.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

31. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was incredibly stupid.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

32. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was insensitive to human needs and feelings.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

33. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was inefficient or impractical.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

34. I would appeal to a higher authority if a problem in my department was irritating or annoying.

never 1 2 3 4 5 always

APPENDIX B

The Principal Study Instrument

EMPLOYEE COMMUNICATIONS SURVEY

Dear Employee:

You have been asked to participate in a research study investigating communication in organizations. This study includes a 42 item questionnaire.

There are no anticipated risks or benefits to your participation. The results of the study may be published, but no information that could identify you will be included.

Questions about this research may be addressed to Bonnie Schultz (408) 379-3532. Complaints about the research may be presented to the Communication Studies Chair Dave Elliott (408) 924-5360. Questions or complaints about research, subjects' rights, or research-related injury may be presented to Serena Stanford, Ph. D., Associate Vice-President of Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.

Your participation is completely voluntary and will have no effect on your employment. Thanks for your help.

Please circle one answer from each category:

1. SEX M F
2. AGE 20 and below 21-30 31-40 41-50
 51-60 61-up
3. ETHNIC White Black American Indian
 BACKGROUND Hispanic Asian other (specify) _____
4. EDUCATION High School graduate Some college
 Bachelors degree Advanced degree

Please circle your answer to each question according to the following scale:

SD= strongly disagree
D= disagree
N= no opinion
A= agree
SA= strongly agree

5. In my workplace I feel I have freedom of speech.
SD D N A SA
6. In my workplace superiors do not encourage subordinates to argue corporate issues.
SD D N A SA
7. In my workplace employees are penalized if they openly disagree with management practices.
SD D N A SA
8. In my workplace employees who speak up about job related matters are considered team players.
SD D N A SA
9. In my workplace there is fear of expressing your true feelings on work issues.
SD D N A SA
10. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
SD D N A SA
11. In general, I like working here.
SD D N A SA
12. In general, I don't like my job.
SD D N A SA
13. I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and affect changes in this organization.
SD D N A SA

14. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.
- SD D N A SA
15. There is very little risk of reprisal to someone in this organization who objects to the prevailing view on an issue.
- SD D N A SA
16. If an issue is serious, my co-workers and I feel free to take it to our boss.
- SA D N A SA
17. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.
- SD D N A SA
18. My co-workers and I will typically approach several of those in authority, if necessary, in order to effect a change.
- SD D N A SA
19. In this organization, it is better to smooth things over with other people, than confront them to improve the situation.
- SD D N A SA
20. When I notice something that needs to be fixed in this organization, there are plenty of ways to make this known.
- SD D N A SA
21. I have a great deal of confidence in my ability to make a difference in decisions affecting this organization.
- SD D N A SA
22. When someone in this organization disagrees with management, they are likely to be isolated or fired.
- SD D N A SA

23. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.

SD D N A SA

24. It is part of my job to report problems with our products/services.

SD D N A SA

25. When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, it is best not to report it to the boss.

SD D N A SA

26. If I see something going on that violates one of my principles, I let other people in this organization know about it.

SD D N A SA

27. When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, a lot of others are likely to notice too.

SD D N A SA

28. There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.

SD D N A SA

29. Employees are aware of issues in this organization.

SD D N A SA

30. Employees are kept informed of business conditions.

SD D N A SA

31. When something goes wrong in this organization, I'm likely to know about it.

SD D N A SA

32. I tend to notice serious problems here that need attention.

SD D N A SA

33. I would object if an activity in my department was clearly illegal.

SD D N A SA

34. I would object if an activity in my department was clearly immoral and unethical.

SD D N A SA

35. I would object if an activity in my department was irrational.

SD D N A SA

36. I would object if an activity in my department was incredibly stupid.

SD D N A SA

37. I would object if an activity in my department was insensitive to human needs and feelings.

SD D N A SA

38. I would object if an activity in my department was inefficient or impractical.

SD D N A SA

39. I would object if an activity in my department was irritating or annoying.

SD D N A SA

40. In my place of work, difference of opinions are freely voiced.

SD D N A SA

41. In my place of work, it is understood one should not argue a point vigorously.

SD D N A SA

42. In my place of work, there are communication channels through which an employee may confidentially submit complaints, comments, or questions.

SD D N A SA

APPENDIX C

Freedom of Speech Scale

5. In my workplace I feel I have freedom of speech.
6. In my workplace superiors do not encourage subordinates to argue corporate issues.
7. In my workplace employees are penalized if they openly disagree with management practices.
8. In my workplace employees who speak up about job related matters are considered team players.
9. In my workplace there is fear of expressing your true feelings on work issues.

APPENDIX D

Job Satisfaction Scale

10. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.
11. In general, I like working here.
12. In general, I don't like my job.

APPENDIX E

Employee Rights Scale

- 40. In my place of work, difference of opinions are freely voiced.
- 41. In my place of work, it is understood one should not argue a point vigorously.
- 42. In my place of work, there are communication channels through which an employee may confidentially submit complaints, comments, or questions.

APPENDIX F

Tolerance for Dissent Scale

13. I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and effect changes in this organization.
14. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.
15. There is very little risk of reprisal to someone in this organization who objects to the prevailing view on an issue.
16. If an issue is serious, my co-workers and I feel free to take it to our boss.
17. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.
18. My co-workers and I will typically approach several of those in authority, if necessary, in order to effect a change.
19. In this organization, it is better to smooth things over with other people, than confront them to improve the situation.
20. When I notice something that needs to be fixed in this organization, there are plenty of ways to make this known.
21. I have a great deal of confidence in my ability to make a difference in decisions affecting this organization.
22. When someone in this organization disagrees with management, they are likely to be isolated or fired.

23. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.
24. It is part of my job to report problems with our products/services.
25. When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, it is best not to report it to the boss.
26. If I see something going on that violates one of my principles, I let other people in this organization know about it.
28. There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.
29. Employees are aware of issues in this organization.
30. Employees are kept informed of business conditions.
31. When something goes wrong in this organization, I'm likely to know about it.
33. I would object if an activity in my department was clearly illegal.
34. I would object if an activity in my department was clearly immoral or unethical.
35. I would object if an activity in my department was irrational.
36. I would object if an activity in my department was incredibly stupid.
37. I would object if an activity in my department was insensitive to human needs and feelings.

38. I would object if an activity in my department was inefficient or impractical.
39. I would object if an activity in my department was irritating or annoying.

APPENDIX G

Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech Scale

5. In my workplace I feel I have freedom of speech.
6. In my workplace superiors do not encourage subordinates to argue corporate issues.
7. In my workplace employees are penalized if they openly disagree with management practices.
8. In my workplace employees who speak up about job related matters are considered team players.
9. In my workplace there is fear of expressing your true feelings on work issues.
13. I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and affect changes in this organization.
14. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.
15. There is very little risk of reprisal to someone in this organization who objects to the prevailing view on an issue.
16. If an issue is serious, my co-workers and I feel free to take it to our boss.
17. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.
18. My co-workers and I will typically approach several of those in authority, if necessary, in order to effect a change.

19. In this organization, it is better to smooth things over with other people, than confront them to improve the situation.
20. When I notice something that needs to be fixed in this organization, there are plenty of ways to make this known.
21. I have a great deal of confidence in my ability to make a difference in decisions affecting this organization.
22. When someone in this organization disagrees with management, they are likely to be isolated or fired.
23. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.
24. It is part of my job to report problems with our products/services.
25. When something goes wrong in my area of responsibility, it is best no to report it to the boss.
-
26. If I see something going on that violates one of my principles, I let other people in this organization know about it.
28. There is little point voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.
29. Employees are aware of issues in this organization.
30. Employees are kept informed of business conditions.
31. When something goes wrong in this organization, I'm likely to know about it.

33. I would object if an activity in my department was clearly illegal.
34. I would object if an activity in my department was immoral and unethical.
35. I would object if an activity in my department was irrational.
36. I would object if an activity in my department was incredibly stupid.
37. I would object if an activity in my department was insensitive to human needs and feelings.
38. I would object if an activity in my department was inefficient or impractical.
39. I would object if an activity in my department was irritating or annoying.

APPENDIX H

Tolerance for Dissent Scale: Short Form

13. I have noticed that my co-workers have a great deal of confidence in their ability to speak up and affect changes in this organization.
14. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.
17. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.
23. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.
28. There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.

APPENDIX I

Combined Tolerance for Dissent and Freedom of Speech Scale:
Short Form

- 7. In my workplace employees are penalized if they openly disagree with management practices.
- 14. All employees in this organization get listened to, regardless of their status in the hierarchy.
- 17. When something in this organization needs correcting, my co-workers and I feel it is our responsibility to make the case for change with those in authority.
- 23. To object to mistakes that I see being made in this organization, is just not worth the effort.
- 28. There is little point in voicing concern about problems here, because there are too many of them.