

## PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Examining Organizational Communication in Terms of Relationships Between Organizational Dissent, Perceived Organizational Power Distance and Psychological Capital

AUTHORS: Emir SEÇKİN,Merve MAMACI

PAGES: 51-61

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2783406>



## Examining Organizational Communication in Terms of Relationships Between Organizational Dissent, Perceived Organizational Power Distance and Psychological Capital

Emir Seçkin, Merve Mamacı\*

İstanbul Kent University, Fenerbahçe University

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 19.11.2022

Received in revised form:  
11.12.2022

Accepted: 30.12.2022

**Key Words:** Organizational dissent,  
organizational power distance,  
psychological capital, psycap,  
organizational communication

ORCID: 0000-0001-6052-8198,  
0000-0001-7882-3670,

Type of Article: Research Article

### ABSTRACT (EXTENDED)

**Objectives:** Employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment is very important for the steady growth and development of an organization. Today, with the increase in the competitive environment, the attempts of organizations to understand how to ensure this stability have also increased. Also, it is seen that the high psychological capital of the employees and their dissent behavior increase the performance, while the high organizational power distance both reduces the performance and constitutes an obstacle in exhibiting the organizational dissent behavior. It is known that one of the most important factors contributing to the growth and development of organizations is that employees' expression of the problems that arise in the functioning of the organization and their dissatisfaction. There are many individual, relational and organizational factors that affect organizational dissent, which expresses the ability of employees to express their views openly. One of the individual factors is the psychological capital level of the employees, and one of the organizational factors is the perceived organizational power distance. The concept of psychological capital expresses the individual's awareness of who he is and his cognitive capacity. Positive psychological capital has defined as a new movement that goes beyond economic capital, which refers to what we have, human capital, which refers to what we know, and social capital, which refers to who we know, to express who we are. According to this approach, discovering the strengths of individuals and enabling them to reveal these strengths in the most effective way contributes to individual well-being, while positively reflecting on performance and increasing productivity. Positive psychological capital provides competitive advantage by enriching the knowledge and human capital at the individual and organizational level. Organizational power distance is related to how the power balance in the subordinate-superior relationship is perceived. The concept of power distance was first aimed to explain the structure of societies. In the concept of organizational power distance, the inequality of power distribution between superiors and subordinates in organizations is mentioned. The participation of the members of the organization in organizational decisions, the level of initiative and responsibility also express the power distance. Studies have shown that high psychological capital increases organizational dissent behavior, while high power distance reduces dissent behavior. Accordingly, this research aimed to give insight for organizational communication by examining the relationships between perceived organizational power distance, psychological capital and organizational dissent.

**Design/methodology/approach:** The sample of the study consists of 300 participants who voluntarily participated in the study with the snowball sampling method. Demographic form, organizational power distance scale, organizational dissent scale and psychological capital scale were used to gather data.

**Results:** Correlation analysis showed that there is a significant and positive relationship between organizational dissent and psychological capital and a negative significant relationship between organizational power distance and psychological capital. Lastly, it has founded that there is a negative and significant relationship between organizational power distance and organizational dissent.

**Practical implications:** This research draws attention to the importance of individual factors such as psychological capital in organizational communication. It provides an empirical basis for the initiatives of workplaces to increase the psychological capital levels of their employees. In addition, by drawing attention to the spread of organizational dissent culture, it paves the way for organizations to conduct cultural analysis.

**Originality/value:** In the Turkish sample, organizational dissent, perceived organizational power distance and psychology capital concepts are evaluated together and it has a unique value in terms of being research that reveals empirical data with quantitative study.

**Authors note:** This article is derived from the first author's Master thesis data.

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: merve.mamaci@fbu.edu.tr,

Cite As/ Alıntı: (2022). Examining Organizational Communication in Terms of Relationships Between Organizational Dissent, Perceived Organizational Power Distance and Psychological Capital. *İş'te Davranış Dergisi*, 7(2), 51-61, <https://doi.org/10.25203/idd.1207384>.

## Örgütsel İletişimin Örgütsel Muhalefet, Algılanan Örgütsel Güç Mesafesi ve Psikolojik Sermaye Arasındaki ilişkiler Üzerinden İncelenmesi

Emir Seçkin, Merve Mamacı\*

İstanbul Kent University, Fenerbahçe University

### MAKALE BİLGİSİ

#### Makale Tarihiçesi:

Başvuru: 19.11.2022

Revizyon: 11.12.2022

Kabul: 30.12.2022

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Örgütsel muhalefet, örgütsel güç mesafesi, psikolojik sermaye, örgütsel iletişim

ORCID: 0000-0001-6052-8198,  
0000-0001-7882-3670,  
Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi

### ÖZ

**Amaç:** Örgütlerin büyümesine ve gelişmesine katkıda bulunan en önemli faktörlerden birinin, örgütsel muhalefet olduğu ve çalışanların örgütün işleyişinde ortaya çıkan sorunları ve memnuniyetsizliklerini ifade etmeleri olduğu bilinmektedir. Bu araştırma, algılanan örgütsel güç mesafesi, psikolojik sermaye ve örgütsel muhalefet arasındaki ilişkileri ampirik açıdan inceleyerek örgütsel iletişim konusuna yeni bir içgörü kazandırmayı amaçlamıştır.

**Tasarım/Yöntem:** Araştırmanın örneklemini kartopu örnekleme yöntemi ile çalışmaya katılan 300 katılımcı oluşturmaktadır. Verilerin toplanmasında demografik form, örgütsel güç uzaklığı ölçeği, örgütsel muhalefet ölçeği ve psikolojik sermaye ölçeği kullanılmıştır.

**Sonuçlar:** Korelasyon analizleri sonucunda, örgütsel muhalefet ile psikolojik sermaye arasında anlamlı ve pozitif yönde ve örgütsel güç mesafesi ile psikolojik sermaye arasında anlamlı ve negatif yönde ilişkiler olduğu bulunmuştur. Son olarak, örgütsel güç mesafesi ile örgütsel muhalefet arasında negatif ve anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

**Uygulama Çıkarımları:** Bu araştırma, örgütsel iletişimde psikolojik sermaye gibi bireysel faktörlerin önemine ve örgütsel muhalefet kültürünün yaygınlaşmasına dikkat çekerek çalışanların psikolojik sermaye düzeylerinin artırılmasına yönelik eğitimlerin oluşturulmasına ve örgütlerin kültür analizlerini yapabilmelerine ampirik bir zemin hazırlayarak ön ayak olmaktadır.

**Özgün Değer:** Türkiye örnekleminde örgütsel muhalefet, algılanan örgütsel güç mesafesi ve psikoloji sermaye kavramlarını bir arada değerlendirerek nicel çalışma ile ampirik veri ortaya koyan bir araştırma olması açısından özgün bir değer taşımaktadır.

**Yazar notu:** Bu makale, ilk yazarın Yüksek Lisans tezi verilerinden türetilmiştir.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Effective communication is a building block for organizations that are changing and constantly competing with each other. Employees working for a common goal ensure goal-directed action with healthy communication. It can be thought that healthy organizational communication can positively affect the motivation, performance, and socialization processes of the employees. Healthy and effective communication is also important in terms of the development of organizations, their survival, making the right decisions and the correct flow of information within the organization. The attitudes of individuals who have knowledge and the performances and attitudes of employees who have limited access to information may differ from each other. Therefore, effective communication has an important place in terms of employee attitudes. When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are significant relationships between variables such as effective organizational communication and leadership, employee commitment (Ramos-Maçães & Román-Portas, 2022; Mehra & Nickerson, 2019).

According to Schein (1990), organizational culture is the set of values, norms and beliefs shared among the members of an organization that affect the behavior and decisions of employees. Based on this explanation, it can be said that the organizational culture and the values adopted by the employees are determinative in terms of the characteristics of organizational communication. At the same time, the communication style that employees come together and create within the organization also creates the organizational culture. According to Meng and Berger (2019), an open and supportive organizational culture increases the effectiveness of communication and increases the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees.

As is expected, employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment is very important for the steady growth and development of an organization. Today, with the increase in the competitive environment, the attempts of organizations to understand how to ensure this stability have also increased. Also, it is seen that the high psychological capital of the employees and their dissent behavior increase the performance, while the high organizational power distance both reduces the performance and constitutes an obstacle in exhibiting the organizational dissent behavior. It is known that one of the most important factors contributing to the growth and development of organizations is that employees' expression of the problems that arise in the functioning of the organization and their dissatisfaction (Shahinpoor & Matt, 2007).

There are many individual, relational and organizational factors that affect organizational dissent, which expresses the ability of employees to express their views openly. One of the individual factors is the psychological capital level of the employees, and one of the organizational factors is the perceived organizational power distance. The concept of psychological capital expresses the individual's awareness of who he is and his cognitive capacity (Luthans et al., 2005). Organizational power distance is related to how the power balance in the subordinate-superior relationship is perceived (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). Studies have shown that high psychological capital increases organizational dissent behavior, while high power distance reduces dissent behavior. Accordingly, this research aimed to examine the relationships between perceived organizational power distance, psychological capital, and organizational dissent behavior.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Psychological Capital

Luthans et al. (2004) defined positive psychological capital as a new movement that goes beyond economic capital, which refers to what we have, human capital, which refers to what we know, and social capital, which refers to who we know, to express who we are. According to this approach, discovering the strengths of individuals and enabling them to reveal these strengths in the most effective way contributes to individual well-being, while positively reflecting on performance and increasing productivity (Luthans & Avolio, 2003). Positive psychological capital provides competitive advantage by enriching the knowledge and human capital at the individual and organizational level. The concept of psychological capital is a high-level structure consisting of four elements, namely self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience, and expresses more than the sum of these elements (Luthans et al., 2004; Siu, 2003). It is argued that the openness of psychological capital types to development and change reflects on positive psychological capital as a whole and is closely related to both individual well-being and high job performance (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009).

*Self-efficacy* is defined as the evaluation of the motivations, cognitive competencies, and beliefs of the members in the organizational field that they need to perform a task (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Individuals with a sense of self-efficacy believe and have confidence in themselves that they will successfully complete the task, no matter how difficult it is. People with this feeling are able to exhibit patient and motivated behaviors during the task, thanks to their positive beliefs about themselves (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Also, individuals with high self-efficacy have some common characteristics as keeping goals high, being resistant to the difficulties, and being successful in motivating themselves (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

Another component of psychological capital is *optimism*. According to Seligman (1998), optimism is an individual's evaluation of positive events and experiences as internal, permanent, and generalizable, and negative events as external, temporary, and

context-specific. While the optimistic view that negative events are temporary and situation-specific affects the psychological resilience and well-being of the individual positively, a pessimistic perspective pushes the individual to learned helplessness (Segerstrom, 2005; Seligman, 1998). On the other hand, it is thought that an individual with a pessimistic perspective can also learn about optimism, and as a result of successfully developing this perspective, their quality of life will increase and their life will become more meaningful (Seligman, 2002).

*Hope* is defined as the positive belief that a person will be motivated by revealing the ways that he can use in line with his goals and thinking about these ways, and that he will achieve these goals (Synder, 1994). According to Synder (2002), individuals with high hopes are self-confident in reaching their goals, they can solve the problems they encounter thanks to this confidence, and they can achieve success by developing alternative solutions to unsolvable problems. Individuals with high hopes are more likely to be successful because they do not give up easily in the face of obstacles and act in a determined and planned manner towards the solution of the problem (Luthans, Norman, Avolio, & Avey, 2008).

*Psychological resilience* as last component is also expressed as the positive psychological capacity that enables the individual to return to their former state after challenging situations such as obstacles, failures, and increasing responsibilities (Luthans, 2002). According to Norman (2006), resilience includes not only being resilient in the face of negative situations, but also resolutely advancing towards one's goal in the face of unexpected and positive situations for which one is caught unprepared. In this respect, psychological resilience also requires being resistant to uncertainty and flexible in adapting to change, unlike other psychological capital components (Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Studies have shown that psychological resilience has many positive contributions to the lives of individuals, both in the individual and organizational field. While individual resilience enables individuals with traumatic experiences to become functional again after the traumatic experience (Richardson, 2002), it makes it easier for the individual to cope with difficulties in the organizational field and helps them to be motivated again by learning from the difficulties they encounter (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

## 2.2. Organizational Dissent

In order to better understand the definition and scope of the concept of organizational dissent, it is thought that it is important to go down to the etymological origin of this concept. According to the Turkish Language Association (2021), the concept of "dissent" refers to an opinion, an action, an attitude, etc. The state of being against is in the form of a group of people who have an opposite or opposing view. The origins of the word dissent, which is the English equivalent of the word opposition, are based on the Latin word *dissentire* (Morris, 1969). In the word *dissentire*, "dis" means separate, different, while "sentire" means to feel. When we look at the origin of the word, when we consider the concept of dissent as feeling separate, we can define the concept of organizational dissent as feeling separate from one's organization (Kassing, 1997).

According to Kassing (1998), employees prefer to dissent in three different ways: vertical (overt), horizontal (latent) and displaced dissent. Vertical (open) dissent is when employees convey their ideas to people who can directly affect the decisions made in the organization. Employees who engage in vertical dissent convey their ideas to their managers, managers or any superiors, waiting for a solution to the situation they are not satisfied with (Kassing, 1998). Employees who engage in vertical dissent believe that their opposition will be perceived as constructive, and they will not face retaliation (Kassing & Kawa, 2013).

Contrary to vertical dissent, horizontal (latent) dissent means that employees convey their ideas to their colleagues who are not active in this process, instead of expressing their ideas to those who have the authority to solve problems (Kassing, 1998). The most important factor in the emergence of this type of dissent is the presence of a triggering event, but the lack of a suitable environment where employees can share their ideas about this event with their superiors (Kassing, 2011). In this context, it can be thought that organizational factors play a more important role in the emergence of horizontal dissent. Employees prefer horizontal dissent when they think that they have poor quality relationships with their managers or that their managers are not open to giving positive feedback (Kassing, 2000). Similarly, the perception of authority can lead employees to horizontal dissent behavior (Tutar & Sadykova, 2014).

Displaced dissent occurs when employees express their opposition to friends, partners, or family members who are not at work (Kassing, 1998). It is thought that the emergence of this type of dissent is similar to horizontal dissent, and that employees tend to be displaced dissent when they do not have a suitable environment for vertical dissent. Displaced dissent employees need a safe environment where their ideas will not be judged (Kassing et al., 2012).

## 2.3. Organizational Power Distance

The concept of power distance was first introduced by Hofstede (1980) to explain the structure of societies. Considered in a social context, a high-power distance results in a large difference between the powerful and the powerless and the implementation of the decisions taken by the powerful by the powerless. In the concept of organizational power distance, the inequality of power distribution between superiors and subordinates in organizations is mentioned (Hofstede & Hofstede,

2005). The participation of the members of the organization in organizational decisions, the level of initiative and responsibility also express the power distance (Uzun & Tamimi, 2007).

In organizations with high power distance, employees obey the orders of their managers and are not involved in the decision-making process in any way. In organizations with low power distance, employees follow the orders of their managers if they think they are right (Hon, 2002), expect their managers to get ideas from them (Begley et al., 2002), and see themselves as equivalent to their managers (Özgener, Ögüt, & Kaplan, 2008). High power distance arises when employees accept the inequality between them and their managers, take orders from their superiors and find it necessary to obey these orders (Hofstede, 1980). Employees in organizations with high power distance apply the orders given to them without questioning and see their managers at a higher level than themselves (Şekerli & Gerege, 2011). Employees with high power distance do not feel willing to participate in these decisions because they see participating in the organizational decision-making process as a weakness of their managers (Rhee, Dedahanov, & Lee, 2014).

In organizations with high power distance, there is a centralized structure and top-down communication is weak (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). In this centralized structure, the authority, and boundaries of each employee in the organization have been determined and subordinates expect orders from their superiors (Acaray & Şevik, 2016). Societies where high-power distance in organizations is parallel to social power distance and where power distance is high reflecting this approach to organizational culture (Kemikçiran, 2015). For this reason, being able to determine the characteristics of societies with high power distance is of great importance for the arrangements to be made to bring the power distance in organizations closer to the equilibrium point. Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) argued that one of the main characteristics of societies with high power distance is that the strong in these societies are considered "right and good". In organizations with high power distance, employees are divided into decision makers and those who implement the decisions. Contrary to high power distance, there is an equal hierarchical power among employees in organizations with low power distance (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). It is known that organizations with low power distance are mostly common in societies with low power distance. Some of the characteristic features of societies with low power distance are that these societies have a high level of development and an individualistic culture (Aydıntan, 2005). Hofstede (2010) states that some of the characteristics of low power distance societies are that inequalities in the society are minimized and the use of power is based on a legal basis. In organizations with low power distance, superiors want their subordinates to be included in the decision-making processes and respect their subordinates' ideas (Hofstede, 1983a). However, employees in organizations with low power distance are not involved in the decision-making process, and even if they only take orders from their managers, they apply these orders because they think they are correct and necessary (Hon, 2002). In organizations with low power distance, subordinates can easily reach their superiors (Çelik, 2007). In these organizations, subordinates can develop closer relationships with their superiors as they expect their superiors to consult them and can request their superiors to express their opinions (Begley et al., 2002).

In low power distance organizations, the hierarchical pyramid among employees is quite low and there are limited number of employees with supervisory authority. However, the salary difference between employees in organizations with low power distance is quite small, and the fringe benefits they have been almost equal (Sülüş-Örenç, 2021). Since a positive communication style is dominant in subordinate-superior relations in these organizations, subordinates do not hesitate to consult their superiors for ideas or to conflict with their superiors. This situation ensures that more ideas are generated in the solution of emerging problems and that the problems are solved in a shorter time (Doğan, 2012). Studies have shown that employees in organizations with low power distance are freer to express their opinions and encourage other employees to express their opinions (Çelik, 2007). When low power distance and organizational dissent behaviors are considered together, it is expected that employees will determine dissent strategies in low power distance organizations.

Based on literature review; the hypothesis of this research are as follows:

**H1:** *There is a positive and significant relationship between psychological capital and organizational dissent*

**H2:** *There is a negative significant relationship between psychological capital and organizational power distance*

**H3:** *There is a negative significant relationship between organizational power distance and organizational dissent*

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Participants

The sample of the study consists of 300 participants who voluntarily participated in the study with the snowball sampling method, had an active working life and were at least high school graduates. The ages of the participants of the study ranged from 21 to 65 (average age = 34.21; sd = 11.105). 59% of the participants were women (n=177) and 41% were men (n=123). The age of female participants was between 21 and 65 (mean age=33.06; sd=10.376); The age of male participants ranged between 22-65 (mean age=35.85; sd=11.928).

### 3.2. Data analysis

The data obtained in the research were subjected to statistical analysis with the SPSS v.21 program. Before starting the statistical analysis, it was verified whether the scores of the participants from the scales met the assumption of normal distribution, by examining the normality tests and the skewness and kurtosis values of the bell curve they created. In the Shapiro-Wilk normality test, it was observed that the total score of the Organizational Power Distance Scale and the sub-dimension of Consent to Power and the Organizational Dissent Scale total score of the same scale showed normal distribution, Psychological Capital Scale and subscales did not exhibit normal distribution. Thereupon, the skewness (Skewness) and kurtosis (Kurtosis) values of the scales were examined. Statisticians have various views for skewness and kurtosis values. For example, Tabaschnick and Fidell (2013) found skewness and kurtosis values within  $\pm 1.5$ ; reported that data can be considered normally distributed if the skewness value is within the range of  $\pm 2$  and the Kurtosis value is within the range of  $\pm 7$ . Therefore, statistical analyzes were carried out with parametric tests. Pearson correlation analysis was carried out in the correlation analysis.

### 3.3. Data Collection Procedure

Before starting the research, approval was obtained from the Istanbul Kent University Ethics Committee. The data of the research were collected over the internet via Google Forms. The participants were sent the link via cell phones or e-mail, and they were asked to share it with other people who fits in terms of qualities of sample. Thus, the data collection process was carried out with the snowball sampling method and volunteerism was taken as the basis for participation. Before answering the questions to the participants, they also approved the voluntary consent form for participation in the study, which is available at the same link.

### 3.4. Data Collection Tools

**Demographic Information Form:** This form was prepared by the researcher and the participants were asked about their age, gender, relationship status, children, education level, working status, working time at their workplace, total work experience, the sector they work and the city they live in.

**Organizational Power Distance Scale:** The Organizational Power Distance Scale was developed by Yorulmaz, Çolak, Altinkurt & Yılmaz (2018) to determine perceptions about organizational power distance. This scale consists of 20 items and 5-point Likert type (1: Never, 5: Always). Subdimensions of the scale are; *Acceptance o Power* of the Scale (Ex: I show more respect to people in managerial positions), *Instrumental Use of Power* (Ex: I try to be close with managers to make my work easier), *Legitimation of Power* (Ex: I find it normal for managers to give some privileges to employees with the same worldview) *Consent to Power* (For example: If I am not going to influence the decision of the management, I will consent to the decisions taken). In the original study the Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the sub-factors of the scale were found to be .79 for the Acceptance of Power, .77 for the Instrumental Use of Power, .74 for the Legitimation of Power, and .79 for the Consent to Power. The Cronbach Alpha of the scale for the sample of this study was found to be .82. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated as .50 for the Accepting Power, .73 for the Instrumental Use of Power, .70 for the Legitimation of Power, and .73 for the Consent to Power.

**3.4.3. Organizational Dissent Scale:** The Organizational Dissent Scale (SME) was developed in 1998 by Kassing. The Turkish standardization of the scale was carried out by Dağlı (2015). The scale consists of 15 items in a 5-point Likert type (1: Never, 5: Always). The factors of the scale were named as *Upward Dissent* (Ex. I hesitate to ask questions or presenting opposing ideas in my school) and *Lateral Dissent* (Ex. I do not question the school administration). In the original study the correlation coefficient of the whole scale is .98, the test-retest reliability is .84, and the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient is .85. Cronbach Alpha values for the sub-dimensions are .79 for Upward Dissent and .82 for Lateral Dissent. For this study, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .82 and the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated as .82 for the Upward Dissent and .78 for Lateral Dissent.

**3.4.5. Psychological Capital Scale:** The Turkish standardization study of the Psychological Capital Scale (Luthans et al., 2007), which was developed to explain the psychological capital structure, was carried out by Çetin and Basım (2012). A six-point Likert-type scale consisting of 24 items, *Optimism* (Ex. When there are uncertainties in my job, I always want the best.), *Psychological Resilience* (Ex. Because I have had difficulties before, I can overcome difficult times at work.), *Hope* (Ex. It consists of four sub-dimensions: sometimes I fulfill the business goals that I set for myself.) and *Self-Efficacy* (For example, I feel confident when presenting information to a group of colleagues.). While the total Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was .91, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions were .67 for Optimism, .81 for Hope, .68 for Psychological Resilience and .85 for Self-Efficacy. The test-retest coefficients of the scale are .70 for Optimism, .73 for Hope, .77 for Psychological Resilience, and .72 for Self-Efficacy. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale for the sample of this study was found to be .95. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency

coefficient values for the sub-dimensions of the scale were calculated as .81 for Optimism, .87 for Hope, .85 for Psychological Resilience, and .90 for Self-Efficacy.

#### 4. FINDINGS

##### Relationships Between Organizational Power Distance, Organizational Dissent Scale and Psychological Capital Levels Correlation Analysis

In Table 1, the Pearson correlation analysis findings between the scores of the individuals on the Organizational Power Distance Scale, the Organizational Dissent Scale and the Psychological Capital Scale are given.

**Table 1**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1.Power Distance Total	1												
2.Acceptance of Power	.70**	1											
3.Instrumental Use of Power	.81**	.49**	1										
4.Legitimation of Power	.62**	.29**	.36**	1									
5.Consent to Power	.76**	.29**	.43**	.34**	1								
6.Organizational Dissent Total	.42**	.25**	.22**	.27**	.45**	1							
7.Vertical Dissent	.47**	.26**	.26**	.29**	.51**	.82**	1						
8.Horizontal Dissent	.19**	.13*	.08	.14*	.20**	.78**	.29**	1					
9.Psychological Capital Total	.18**	.12*	.12*	.16**	.13*	.36**	.42**	.15**	1				
10.Hope	.22**	.15**	.14*	.22**	.16**	.37**	.42**	.17**	.87**	1			
11.Resilience	.14*	.08	.11	.13*	.09	.32**	.38**	.12*	.93**	.75**	1		
12.Optimism	.07	.03	-.07	.06	.04	.23**	.28**	.08	.88**	.62**	.79**	1	
13.Self-efficacy	.21**	.17**	.12*	.16**	.17**	.39**	.46**	.15**	.89**	.71**	.80**	.75**	1

\*p<.05; \*\*p<.01

As seen in Table 1, there is a significant and positive relationship between organizational dissent and psychological capital. Participants' organizational dissent and psychological capital ( $r=.36$ ;  $p<.01$ ), hope ( $r=.37$ ;  $p<.01$ ), resilience ( $r=.32$ ;  $p<.01$ ), optimism ( $r=.23$ ;  $p<.01$ ), self-efficacy ( $r=.39$ ;  $p<.01$ ) scores were found to be positively significant. As organizational dissent increases, psychological capital, hope, resilience, optimism and self-efficacy increase. Also, participants' vertical dissent and psychological capital ( $r=.42$ ;  $p<.01$ ), hope ( $r=.42$ ;  $p<.01$ ), resilience ( $r=.38$ ;  $p<.01$ ), optimism ( $r=.28$ ;  $p<.01$ ), self-efficacy ( $r=.46$ ;  $p<.01$ ) scores were found to be positively significant. As vertical dissent increases, psychological capital, hope, resilience, optimism, and self-efficacy increase. In addition, horizontal dissent and psychological capital ( $r=.15$ ;  $p<.01$ ), hope ( $r=.17$ ;  $p<.01$ ), psychological resilience ( $r=.12$ ;  $p<.01$ ), and self-efficacy ( $r=.15$ ;  $p<.01$ ) scores were positively correlated. As horizontal dissent increases, psychological capital, hope, resilience and self-efficacy increase. No significant relationship was found between other variables.

When the second hypothesis of the research is checked, it has been seen that there is a negative significant relationship between organizational power distance and psychological capital has been confirmed. Organizational power distance total scores and psychological capital total scores of participants ( $r=-.18$ ;  $p<.01$ ), hope ( $r=-.22$ ;  $p<.01$ ), psychological resilience ( $r=-.14$ ;  $p<.05$ ) and self-efficacy ( $r=-.21$ ;  $p<.01$ ) scores were negatively correlated. As organizational power distance increases, psychological capital, hope, psychological resilience and self-efficacy decrease.

Lastly, the third hypothesis of the research, that there is a negative significant relationship between organizational power distance and organizational dissent has been confirmed. Organizational power distance total scores and organizational dissent total scores ( $r=-.42$ ;  $p<.01$ ), vertical dissent ( $r=-.47$ ;  $p<.01$ ) and horizontal dissent ( $r=-.19$ ;  $p<.01$ ) scores were found to be negatively correlated. As organizational power distance increases, organizational dissent and its sub-dimensions decrease.



## 5. CONCLUSION, DISCUSSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In the correlation analyzes carried out to determine the relationship between the research variables; it has been seen that psychological capital and its sub-dimensions have positive relationships with organizational dissent and negatively with power distance. Also results showed that; perceived organizational power distance has negative relationship with organizational dissent.

Considering the relationship between organizational dissent behavior and psychological capital, which is the first hypothesis of the research, it is seen that psychological capital and all its sub-dimensions are in a positive relationship with both horizontal and vertical dissent behavior. Although all the relationships between these two variables are positive, it is quite remarkable that the strongest relationships are between vertical dissent and total psychological capital, hope and self-efficacy. A similar result emerged in a previous study, and it was observed that employees' self-efficacy perceptions were a significant predictor of external dissent behaviors, and that self-efficacy was in a stronger relationship with external dissent compared to implicit dissent (Bakan, Doğan, & Yılmaz, 2017). Researchers have suggested that employees with high self-efficacy tend to carry their discontent to senior management and that self-efficacy is an important determinant of external dissent behavior. Similarly, Acaray & Şevik (2018) examined the effect of psychological capital on organizational dissent behavior and reported that psychological capital showed a positive relationship with all types of dissent behavior. Like this research, it was seen that the type of dissent behavior that total psychological capital showed the strongest relationship was vertical dissent. Studies examining the relationship between organizational silence and psychological capital have given similar results, showing that organizational silence decreases as psychological capital (Dağtekin, 2017) and self-efficacy (Kahya, 2015) increase. It is an important finding that especially the self-efficacy sub-dimension of psychological capital has a strong relationship with vertical dissent behavior, which is one of the dissent behaviors that is desired in organizations and increases job performance. It is thought that the interventions aimed at increasing the self-efficacy perceived by the employees will have a positive effect on the job performance by increasing the vertical dissent behavior (Acaray & Şevik 2018). In summary, the relationships between the research variables are in line with the findings in the literature, organizational dissent behavior and psychological capital decrease as the power distance increases; as psychological capital, especially self-efficacy and hope levels increase, organizational dissent behavior also increases.

The second hypothesis of the research is that power distance is negatively related to psychological capital. It was observed that as the perceived power distance increased, the total psychological capital, hope levels and self-efficacy of the employees decreased. When this negative relationship is examined within the framework of the literature, it is thought that low psychological capital may result in an increase in perceived power distance. In other words, it is quite expected that individuals with high self-efficacy have low perceived power distance. It is thought that employees who are more confident in their professional skills and ability to use their cognitive resources effectively can see themselves in a more equal position with their superiors. On the other hand, past studies show that as authentic leadership behavior (Rego, Sousa, Marques, & Cunha, 2012) and organizational support (Avolio & Avey, 2008) increase, psychological capital also increases. These findings suggest that the supportive behaviors of the managers, in other words, the low power distance, may increase the psychological capital of the employees. Due to the limited number of studies in this area, it is very difficult to make an interpretation about the causality of the relationship. While high psychological capital results in low perceived power distance, low perceived power distance may increase psychological capital. Therefore, more studies are needed to examine how power distance and psychological capital change together.

Lastly, perceived total power distance and power acceptance, power legitimation, power consent, and power instrumental use dimensions are negatively related to organizational dissent behavior. On the other hand, no significant relationship was found between the instrumental use of power, which is one of the sub-dimensions of power distance, and horizontal dissent. These findings support the third hypothesis that there is a negative relationship between organizational power distance and organizational dissent. As individuals' perceived power distance increases, their tendency to engage in dissent behavior decreases. Although power distance shows a negative relationship with both types of dissent behavior, it has a stronger relationship with vertical dissent. This rather expected finding shows that the remoteness of the superior-subordinate relationship in the organizations shows that the employees are more reluctant to express their dissatisfaction with their managers. It is known that the existence of a tolerant environment in organizations where employees can express their opinions openly increases the vertical dissent behavior (Payne, 2014). The high organizational power distance, the acceptance of power by the employees in the organization, their legitimation and consent to power constitute an obstacle to exhibiting dissent behavior. Looking at the past studies, there are studies showing that employees who are afraid of losing their relations with their superiors are reluctant to exhibit vertical dissent behavior (Ötken & Cenkci, 2012), and that employees in organizations with high power distance tend to follow their orders without questioning (Şekerli & Gerede, 2011). Çelik (2007) showed that in organizations with low power distance, managers care about employee feedback and encourage employees to openly express their opinions. Similarly, another study showed that the manager's openness to the ideas of the employees increases the organizational voice behavior (Detert & Burris, 2007).

In conclusion, the findings of this research carry certain theoretical and practical implications. It has been shown that there is a correlational relationship between psychological capital, which is one of the personal characteristics of individuals, and organizational dissent, which is a part of organizational communication. At the same time, personal characteristics revealed that there is a relationship with the perception of organizational power distance, which is one of the different dimensions of culture. The findings revealed that these variables are a complex phenomenon by revealing the importance of perception of both individual characteristics and cultural elements in understanding organizational communication. For further studies, the predictive power of these variables can be determined. Different individual factors related to the concept of organizational dissent, which is related to organizational communication, can be examined.

It is stated by the authors that organizations need employees who do not hide their thoughts, are aware of environmental changes and share their ideas in appropriate ways to maintain their competitive structure and improve their ability to keep up with environmental changes (Vakola & Dimitris, 2005). When the ability to oppose is considered as being able to communicate effectively, presenting opposing views and sharing ideas, it can be argued that it is of vital importance for organizations. In this respect, taking initiatives that will ensure the spread of organizational dissent by organizations will make positive contributions to the organization. In order to encourage employees to display vertical opposition behavior, both effective communication, feedback-forward feedback to both employees and managers receiving trainings including techniques such as attempts can be made to establish it in the institutional structure. The ability of employees exhibiting dissent behavior to present their opposing views and the development of personal characteristics such as psychological capital will also contribute. It can be thought that with the development of their psychological capital, results such as performance and work output may also have positive results.

## **6. LIMITATIONS**

In this study, it can be said that there are various limitations due to the data collection method. Depending on the use of self-report scales, the possibility of response bias and social desirability may have occurred. In addition, the simultaneous collection of the scales distributed to the participants in order to obtain information about the variables may have caused common method bias and thus threatening the validity of the results regarding the relationships between the scales. Common method bias is a research limitation that misleadingly increases the relationships between variables (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The answers received from the participants were obtained by the questionnaire method. For this reason, it can be said that the results obtained are limited to the scales filled by the participants. Due to the quantitative nature of the data obtained, it may have been an obstacle in terms of in-depth analysis of the subjects examined in the research. Considering that the employees participating in the research voluntarily participated in the research, it can be said that there may be differences between those who agreed to participate in the research and those who did not, and these differences may affect the results. Finally, this research is a cross-sectional study and there is no cause-effect relationship in such studies. Also, the Cronbach alpha value of the power acceptance dimension, which is one of the sub-dimension of the organizational power distance scale, is at the level of .50.

## REFERENCES

- Avey, J. B., Luthans, F. & Jensen, S. M. (2009). Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resource Management*, 48 (5), 677-693.
- Aydıntan, B. (2005). Değişim ve Yeniden Yapılanmada Başarılı Bir Örnek: Arçelik. *Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7 (3), 71-89. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/gaziuiibfd/issue/28337/301179>. Erişim tarihi: 22.11.2021.
- Bakan, İ., Doğan, İ. F. & Yılmaz, Y. S. (2017). Çalışanlarda Mesleki Öz Yeterlik Algısı ile Örgütsel Muhalefet İlişkisi. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9 (2), 54-70.
- Basim, H. N. & Çetin, F. (2011). Yetişkinler için psikolojik dayanıklılık ölçeği'nin güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik çalışması. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 22 (2), 104-114.
- Begley, T. M., Lee, C., Fang, Y. & Li, J. (2002). Power distance as a moderator of the relationship between justice and employee outcomes in a sample of Chinese employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17 (8), 692-711. doi:10.1108/02683940210450493.
- Çelik, M. (2007). *Örgüt Kültürü ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı-Bir Uygulama* (Doktora tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi SBE, İşletme ABD, Erzurum.
- Dağtekin, G. (2017). *The Relationship Between Psychological Capital and Organizational Silence: A Research on Telecommunications Sector* (Master's thesis). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Dağlı, A. (2015). Örgütsel Muhalefet Ölçeği' nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14 (53), 198-218.
- Detert, J. R. & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership Behavior and Employee Voice: Is the Door Really Open? *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 869-884.
- Doğan, B. (2012). *Örgüt Kültürü*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. California: Sage Publication.
- Hofstede, G. & Hofstede, G. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind, revised and expanded (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). *Dimensions of National Cultures in Fifty Countries and Three Regions*. In J. B. Derogowski, S. Dziurawiec, & R. C. Annis (Eds.), *Explications in Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 335-355). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Hon, C. (2002). *A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Transformational Leadership, Organizational Culture and Organizational Effectiveness in Taiwanese Sport/Fitness Organizations*. (Doctorate thesis). Dephne-Alabama: United States Sport Academy.
- Kahya, C. (2015). Mesleki Özyeterlik ve Örgütsel Sessizlik İlişkisini Belirlemeye Yönelik Ampirik Bir Çalışma. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 5 (1), 293-314.
- Kassing, J. W. (1997). Articulating, Antagonizing, and Displacing: A Model of Employee Dissent. *Communication Studies*, 48 (4), 311-332.
- Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and Validation of the Organizational Dissent Scale. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 12 (2), 183-229.
- Kassing, J. W. (2011). Stressing out about dissent: Examining the relationship between coping strategies and dissent expression. *Communication Research Reports*, 28(3), 225-234.
- Kassing, J. W., Piemonte, N. M., Goman, C. C. ve Mitchell, C. A. (2012). Dissent Expression as an Indicator of Work Engagement and Intention to Leave. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 49 (3), 237-253.
- Kassing, J. W. & Kava, W. (2013). Assessing Disagreement Expressed to Management: Development of the Upward Dissent Scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 30 (1), 46- 56.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive Organizational Behavior: Developing and Managing Psychological Strengths. *The Academy of Management Executive*. 16 (1), 57-72.
- Luthans, F. & Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, Social and Now Positive Psychological Capital Management. *Organizational Dynamics*. 33, 143-160.
- Luthans, F., Youssef C. M. & Avolio, B.J. (2007). *Psychological Capital*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Luthans, F., Norman, S., Avolio, B. ve Avey, J. (2008). The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital in the Supportive Organizational Climate-Employee Performance Relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (29), 219- 238.
- Mehra, P. & Nickerson, C. (2019). Organizational communication and job satisfaction: What role do generational differences play?. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 27(3), 524-547.
- Meng J. & Berger B. K. (2019). The impact of organizational culture and leadership performance on PR professionals' job satisfaction: Testing the joint mediating effects of engagement and trust. *Public Relations Review*, 45(1), 64-75.
- Morris, W. (1969). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ötken, A. B. & Ceneci, T. (2013). Beş Faktör Kişilik Modeli ve Örgütsel Muhalefet Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Öneri Dergisi*, 10 (39), 41-51.
- Özgener, Ş., Ögüt, A. & Kaplan, M. (2008). *İşgören-İşveren İlişkilerinde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Sinizm, Örgütsel Davranışta Seçme Konular, Organizasyonların Karanlık Yönleri ve Verimlilik Azaltıcı Davranışlar*. ed. M. Özdevecioğlu ve H. Karadal, (53-72), Ankara: İlke Yayınevi.
- Payne, H. J. (2014). Examining the Relationship between Trust in Supervisor-Employee Relationships and Workplace Dissent Expression. *Communication Research Reports*, 31(2), 131-140.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Ramos-Maçães, M.A. & Román-Portas, M. (2022). The effects of organizational communication, leadership, and employee commitment in organizational change in the hospitality sector. *Communication & Society*, 35 (2), 89 -106.

- Rego, A., Sousa, F., Marques, C. & Cunha, M. P. E. (2012). Authentic leadership promoting employees' psychological capital and creativity. *Journal of Business Research*, 65 (3), 429–437. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.10.003>
- Rhee, J., Dedahanov, A. & Lee, D. (2014). Relationships among power distance, collectivism, punishment, and acquiescent, defensive, or prosocial silence. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42 (5), 705–720.
- Schein E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychological Association*, 45(2), 109–119.
- Segerstrom, S. C. (2005). Optimism and immunity: Do positive thoughts always lead to positive effects? *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 19 (3), 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2004.08.003>.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). *Learned Optimism*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. Free Press
- Shahnpoor, N. & Matt, B. F. (2007). The Power of One: Dissent and Organizational Life. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 74, 37-48.
- Stajkovic, A. D. & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 240-261.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. Free Press.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 249-276.
- Sülüş-Örenç, H. (2021). *Okul Müdürlerinin Yalnızlığı ile Örgütsel Güç Mesafesi Arasındaki İlişki*. (Yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Şekerli, E. B. & Gerece, E. (2011). Kültürün EKY'ye Etkileri ve Türk Pilotların Hofstede Kültür Boyutları Açısından Durumları. *İş, Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 13 (1), 19-38.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.
- TDK (2021). <https://sozluk.gov.tr>. Erişim tarihi: 21.11.2021.
- Uzun, Ö. & Tamimi, Y. (2007). Örgüt Kültüründe Güç Mesafesi Boyutunun Metaforlarla Analizi (Tekstil Sektöründe Faaliyet Gösteren Bir İşletme Örneği). *Eskişehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8 (1), 1-26.
- Vakola, M., & Dimitris, B. (2005). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Silence: An Empirical Investigation. *Employee Relations*, 27(4-5), 441-458.
- Yorulmaz, Y. İ., Çolak, İ., Altinkurt, Y. & Yılmaz, K. (2018). Örgütsel Güç Mesafesi Ölçeği Geçerlik ve Güvenirlilik Çalışması. *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8 (4), 671-686. Erişim adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/trkefd/issue/39371/411916>. Erişim tarihi: 22.11.2021
- Youssef, C. M. & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace the impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33, 774-800.