The Association Between Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Case Study

Fatih Turkmen[1], Emre Aykac[2]

Abstract:

The continuation of business activities is possible with motivated and dedicated employees. In this sense, the notion that an organization is devoid of honesty and negative feelings regarding an organization are important because they tend to manifest as the display of abuse and criticism in line with such convictions and emotions and determine organizational citizenship behavior.

The objective of this study is to determine the association between organizational cynicism attitudes and organizational citizenship behavior manifestations and corrective measures to be taken by administrators aware of the current status in their enterprises.

Within this objective and target, a survey was implemented to the employees of a total of 637 five-star tourism enterprises operating in Antalya province and it has been determined that there is a significant difference between the levels of organizational cynicism and organizational citizenship behavior.

Keywords: organizational citizenship behavior, organizational cynicism attitudes, behavior.

JEL Classifications: J53, J82, L22, M51.

[1]Department of Management and Tourism, Ahmet Yasawi University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan, Email: turkmenfatih@hotmail.com
[2]Karabuk University, Social Sciences Institute, Karabuk, Turkey

1. Introduction

Cynicism has been described as Antiquity Philosophy or Ancient Greek Philosophy in the form of a philosophical thought and life style in the historical period until the 500 B.C. (Aydugan, 2012). Diogenes, who lived in 445-365 B.C. who founded the school of cynicism and was the student of and inspired by the Greek philosopher Antisthenes and Alexander the Great and a student of the sophist philosopher Gorgias and later a student of Socrates was one of the leading cynics of the Antique Era (Kalagan, 2009).

Five main points have been emphasized from the conceptualization of cynicism to the present. These focus points comprising the types of cynicism can be listed as personality cynicism, social / institutional cynicism, professional cynicism, occupational cynicism and organizational change cynicism. In this context organizational cynicism is an organization state which includes cynicism and types of cynicism or is associated with them in some way (Dean *et al.,* 1998; Abraham, 2000).

The first works of organizational cynicism in the modern sense are based on the "Minnesota Multiplex Personality Inventory" developed during the 1940's with the history of personality analysis at Minnesota University and Cook and Medley's "Cynic Hostility Scale" has been developed in line with the earliest cynicism scale (Sur, 2010). The concept of organizational cynicism began to appear in literature along with the book "The Cynical Americans," written about American workers by Kanter and Mirvis (1989) and why cynicism had manifested and spread in organizations (James, 2005; Bommer *et al.,* 2005).

According to Dean *et al.* (1998) organization cynicism is based systematically on theories such as expectancy theory, attribution theory, attitude theory, social exchange theory, emotional events theory and social motivation theory. Despite the many existing definitions of organizational cynicism, the most common definition is described by Dean *et al.* (1998) as "an individual's negative attitude towards an organization". In this context, the "cognitive, emotional and behavioral" attitude of an individual toward the organization he / she works for is discussed under three sub-dimensions. These dimensions are (Gündüz, 2014; Ayduğan, 2012):

- A belief that the organization lacks honesty;
- Negative feeling towards the organization;
- A tendency to display offensive / degrading and critical behavior towards the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and emotions.

Indirect and direct elements are also involved in the manifestation of organizational cynicism. These factors include unfulfilled expectations, promises which have not been honored, inappropriate organizational actions, low organizational performance, perception of injustice within the organization, level of commitment of employees, psychological contract violations, organizational change efforts, a relatively high

salary level of management compared to employees (James and Baker, 2008; Lucyzvyek, 2007; Sağır and Oğuz, 2012; Altınöz *et al.,* 2010) or organizational factors and individual factors such as age, gender, marital status, duration of service and education level (Erdost *et al.,* 2007; Fındık and Eryeşil, 2012).

2. Literature Review

Organ (1988) defines the concept of organizational citizenship as: *"the demonstration of optional effort and extra role behavior beyond the standards and job descriptions defined for that individual in the working environment by the individual."* With the notion of 'optional' in this definition it is stated that there are no behavioral forms required by the roles of the individuals in the organization or job descriptions (Atalay, 2010). Furthermore, it underlines that if employees do not exhibit organizational citizenship behavior they will not face any sanctions (Raub, 2008).

Another researcher, Greenberg and Baron (2000), conducted a survey in 2000 to examine organizational citizenship behavior and defined it as *"an employee going beyond the requirements that the organization has determined in a formal way and doing more than is required"*. Meyer and Allen made the same definition by describing organizational citizenship behavior as a behavior that indicates the efforts they have made for tasks other than what their job descriptions dictate (Deloria, 2001).

The first study on the dimension of organizational citizenship behavior was carried out by Smith *et al.* (1983) with structured interview technique in which managers were asked what behavior is within the scope of extra role behaviors which was followed by asking them to evaluate their subordinates with a questionnaire they prepared accordingly. The data obtained by the factor analysis showed two different factors. The first factor was manifested as the dimension of helping or thinking of others, the second dimension was manifested as a generalized adjustment dimension (Basım and Şeşen, 2006).

Organ (1988) has manifested that organizational citizenship behavior is comprised of five dimensions and these five dimensions are "Altruism" which is voluntary behavior to help others in business-related problems. Duty related punctuality, preserving resources, issues beneficial to the organization in general "Outstanding Task Consciousness-Conscience". "Courtesy", which means benevolent behavior made in the name of preventing problems of colleagues in advance. 'Citizenship Virtue-Civil Virtue' which includes employees' voluntary participation in political life, commitment, interest and development and "Gentlemanly", which means that they do not complain and tolerate problems without maximizing them (Aslan, 2009).

3. Methodology

The relationship between organizational cynicism levels of hotel employees and organizational citizenship behavior has been examined in this study and the study

hypothesis and it has been determined that "H1: there is a significant association between the organizational cynicism attitudes of hotel employees with all organizational citizenship behavior". The study population is comprised of the employees of five-star hotel operations in Antalya and a convenience sampling method has been used to sample the determined sample. Since the number of hotel workers constituting the sample was more than 10.000 the formula recommended for indefinite samples (N> 10,000) and quantitative studies by Özdamar (2001) was used (n = σ2 Zα2 / H2). The standard deviation value in the formula was determined as 1.2 (σ) as a result of the pilot test of 100 people while the significance level (α) was determined as 0.05 and the error value as (H) 0.15. Furthermore, when the significance level was 0.05 and 1,96 was used as Z theoretical value and the other parameters were substituted into the formula the minimum sample volume was calculated as 245. The replicated 2500 questionnaires were implemented at hotel companies that approved and 637 questionnaires were finally evaluated.

Demographic characteristics were used in the first part of the survey while the organization cynicism scale used by James (2005), Erdost *et al.* (2007), Tokgöz and Yilmaz (2008), Pelit and Aydugan (2011) in their studies were used to determine the employees' attitudes regarding organizational cynicism was preferred for the second part. Organizational citizenship behavior scale translated into Turkish by Basım and Şeşen (2006) have been utilized to determine organizational citizenship behavior in the last part.

4. Results

According to Table 1, the organizational cynicism scale appears to be collected under 3 factors (cognitive, affective and behavioral) that account for 65,682% of the total variance. Furthermore, Cronbach's Alpha has been calculated as α = 0.914 for the organizational cynicism scale and the organizational cynicism scale is reliable since Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for all three factors (sub-dimension) are over α = 0.70.

Table 2 explains the total variance of organizational citizenship scale as 68,188% comprised of 5 factors listing the altruism sub-dimension as the first factor comprising 22,388% of total variance while conscience sub-dimension counts for 20,282% of total variance, courtesy sub-dimension counts for 13,348% of the total variance, gentlemanly sub-dimension counts for 6,452% and civil virtue sub-dimension is the fifth factor coinciding with 5,719 of total variance. Furthermore, according to the findings in Table 2 the Cronbach's Alpha value of organization citizenship scale has been calculated as α=0,890.

According to Table 3 64,4% of the 637 employees are women and 35,6% are men. 82,6% of the employees were single while 17,4% were married. The age brackets of the employees indicated that 12,2% were in the 14-18 age groups while 47,3% were 19-23, 22,6% were 24-28, 9,6% were 29-33 and 8,3% were in the 34 and more age groups. 53,7% of the employees included in the study had associate degrees, 27,8%

were high school graduates, 12,4% had bachelor's degrees and 6,1% had graduated from elementary school. In terms of status 41,3% of the employees in the enterprise were trainees, 37,8% were temporary/seasonal workers and 20,9% were permanent staff. The distribution of employees according to work areas revealed that 45,5% were employed in the food-beverage section, 10,5% in housekeeping, 11,5% in the kitchen, 13,7% in reception, 8,8% in security, 6,8% in golf and 3,3% in the technical department. The monthly income of the employees was determined as 500 TL and less for 8,6%, 42,9% earned between 501-1000 TL, 27,% earned 1001-1500 TL, 11,1% earned between 1501-2000 TL while 9,6% earned 2001 TL and more. It was determined that 59,7% had worked in the enterprise less than one year while 27,8% had been employed between two and five years and 12,6% had been employed for more than six years.

Table 1. *Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis Results of the Organizational Cynicism Scale*

Statements	Factor Cognitive 1.	Factor Affective 2.	Factor Behavioral 3.
I believe that the hotel I work for, says one thing and does another.	0,725		
I don't see any similarity between what the hotel I work for claims they will do and what is actually done.	0,751		
I am doubtful about the realization of anything that the hotel I work for plans to do.	0,699		
I don't think there is a common point in the policies, objectives and applications of the hotel that I work for.	0,696		
The hotel I work for does not present the opportunity for those deserving to be awarded (recognition, promotion, etc.).	0,668		
I feel anxious (worry, anxiety) when I think of the hotel that I work for.		0,733	
I feel stress when I think of the hotel that I work for.		0,716	
I have noticed that I make fun of the slogans/applications of the hotel that I work for.		0,779	
I get nervous when I think of the hotel that I work for.		0,740	
The hotel I work for makes my angry.		0,564	
I complain to my friends outside the hotel about the goings on in the hotel.			0,676
I talk about how the hotel business is run with other employees.			0,751
I criticize the applications/policies of the hotel that I work for with other employees.			0,714
Meaningful looks (insinuating, negative, etc.) are exchanged with other employees when the hotel is on the agenda (hotel is talked about).			0,693
Eigenvalues	**3,142**	**3,107**	**2,947**
Variance explanation rate	**22,445**	**22,190**	**21,047**
Cumulative variance	**22,445**	**44,635**	**65,682**
Sub-Dimensional Reliability **(Cronbach's Alpha)**	**0,836**	**0,859**	**0,815**
General Scale Reliability **(Cronbach's Alpha)**			**0,914**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)=0,911　　　　Bartlett test:$\chi2$ =3928,032; p=0,000

Table 2. *Factor Analysis and Reliability Analysis Results of the Organizational Citizenship Scale*

Statements	Factor 1: Altruism	Factor 2 Conscience	Factor 3: Courtesy	Factor 4 Gentleman;	Factor 5 Civil Virtue
I do the daily work of an employee who has taken the day off.	0,755				
I help an organization employee who is dealing with an excessive work load.	0,558				
I help a new employee learn the work.	0,707				
I don't flinch from sharing my materials with others regarding work related problems.	0,776				
I spare the necessary time to help those who have encountered problems during work.	0,696				
I spend most of my time with organization related activities.		0,706			
I want to participate in all activities which will generate a positive image for my organization.		0,455			
I don't spend time on personal business during working hours.		0,787			
I respect the rights and duties of other employees.			0,661		
I warn others when unexpected problems incur to prevent them from harm.			0,620		
I make an effort not to create problems for other employees in the organization I work.			0,659		
I don't waste my time making complaints about unimportant problems.				0,711	
I try to see the positive side of events instead of focusing on problems dealing with the work place environment.				0,676	
I do not feel put upon or angry at new situations experienced during working hours.				0,744	
I take an active role in solving conflicts within the organization.				0,767	
I read the announcements, messages or short notes issued by top level management and keep them available.					0,926
I participate voluntarily in the organization's social activities.					0,627
I support developments made in the organization's structure.					0,824
I am involved in study and project groups which execute all kinds of development activity.					0,767
Eigenvalues	4,254	3,854	2,536	1,226	1,087
Variance explanation rate	22,388	20,282	13,348	6,452	5,719
Cumulative variance	22,388	42,670	56,017	62,469	68,188
Sub-Dimensional Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)	0,861	0,812	0,893	0,833	0,808
General Scale Reliability (Cronbach's Alpha)			0,890		

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)=0,923   Bartlett test: χ^2 =4785,361; p=0,000

Table 3. *Distributions of Demographic Characteristics of Employees Participating in the Survey*

Variables	Groups	f	%	Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Women	410	64,4	Marital Status	Married	111	17,4
	Men	227	35,6		Single	526	17,4
Age	14-18	78	12,2	Education	Elementary school	39	6,1
	19-23	301	47,3		High School	177	27,8
	24-28	144	22,6		Associate Degree	79	12,4

	29-33	61	9,6		Bachelor's Degree	342	53,7
	34 ≥	53	8,3		Food Beverage	290	45,5
Income	500 TL ≤			Work Area	Housekeeping	67	10,5
	501-1000 TL				Kitchen	73	11,5
	1001- 1500 TL				Reception	87	13,7
	1501-2000 TL				Security	56	8,8
	2001 TL ≥				Golf	43	6,8
Status	Internship	263	41,3		Technical	21	3,3
	Permanent employee	133	20,9	Employment duration	1 year and less	380	59,7
	Temporary/Season Employee	241	37,8		2-5 years	177	27,8
					6 and more	80	12,6

Participants' opinions on organizational cynicism and organizational citizenship behavior sub-dimensions have been evaluated in relation to "Correlation Analysis (Pearson Correlation Coefficient)" in Table 4. The associations determined at the significance level of 0,001 and 0,05 in the table are as follows:

A moderate association was determined between the attitude of cognitive cynicism out of the sub-dimensions of organizational cynicism (r=0,577) while a strong association was determined between behavioral (r=0,606) and a strongly positive and significant association was determined between general organizational cynicism attitude (r = 0.852). Furthermore, a negative and very weak association was determined between cognitive cynicism attitude and altruism (r=-0,099), conscience (r=-0,131), courtesy (r=-0,147), gentlemanly (r=-0,161), civil virtue (r=-0,156) dimensions and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=-0,165). A strong significant association was determined between cognitive cynicism attitude and behavioral (r=0,626) while a very strong positive association was determined between general organizational cynicism attitude (r=0,870).

Furthermore, a very weak association was determined between cognitive cynicism attitude and conscience (r=-0,154) and gentlemanly (r=-0,192) while a negative and weak association was determined between altruism (r=-0,233), courtesy (r=-0,251), civil virtue (r=-0,249) dimensions and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=-0,269). While a significant association could not be determined between cognitive cynicism attitude and conscience, courtesy and gentlemanly, a positive and extremely strong significant association was determined with the relevant general organizational cynicism (r=0,847). Furthermore, a negative and very weak association was determined between behavioral cynicism attitude and altruism (r=-0,107), civil virtue (r=-0,130) dimensions and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=-0,114). A very weak association was determined between general organizational cynicism and altruism (r=-0,176), conscience (r=-0,137), courtesy (r=-0,184) and gentlemanly dimensions (r=-0,172) while a negative and weak association was determined between

Table 4. *Correlation Analysis, Pearson Correlation Coefficients*

Organizational Cynicism / Organizational Citizenship Behavior		Cognitive	Affective	Behavioral	General Organizational Cynicism	Altruism	Conscience	Courtesy	Gentlemanly	Civil Virtue	General Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Cognitive	r	1	0,577	0,606	0,852	-0,099	-0,131	-0,147	-0,161	-0,156	-0,165
	p		0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,013*	0,001**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Affective	r	0,577	1	0,626	0,870	-0,233	-0,154	-0,251	-0,192	-0,156	-0,269
	p	0,000**		0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Behavioral	r	0,606	0,626	1	0,847	-0,107	-0,055	-0,051	-0,75	-0,130	-0,114
	p	0,000**	0,000**		0,000**	0,007**	0,166	0,203	0,060	0,001**	0,004**
Cynicism General	r	0,852	0,870	0,847	1	-0,176	-0,137	-0,184	-0,172	-0,213	-0,220
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**		0,000**	0,001**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Altruism	r	-0,099	-0,233	-0,107	-0,176	1	0,556	0,649	0,621	0,607	0,857
	p	0,013*	0,000**	0,007**	0,000**		0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Conscience	r	-0,131	-0,154	-0,055	-0,137	0,556	1	0,574	0,685	0,622	0,798
	p	0,001**	0,000**	0,166	0,001**	0,000**		0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Courtesy	r	-0,147	-0,251	-0,051	-0,184	0,649	0,574	1	0,660	0,559	0,796
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,203	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**		0,000**	0,000**	0,000**
Gentlemanly	r	-0,161	-0,192	-0,075	-0,172	0,621	0,685	0,660	1	0,647	0,850
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,060	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**		0,000**	0,000**
Civil Virtue	r	-0,156	-0,249	-0,130	-0,213	0,607	0,622	0,559	0,647	1	0,842
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,001**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000**		0,000**
General Organizational Citizenship Behavior	r	-0,165	-0,269	-0,114	-0,220	0,857	0,798	0,796**	0,850	0,842	1
	p	0,000**	0,000**	0,004**	0,000**	0,000**	0,000	0,000	0,000**	0,000**	

civil virtue dimension (r=-0,213) and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=-0,220).

A medium level association was determined between altruism, a sub-dimension of organizational citizenship behavior and conscience (r=0,556) whereas a strong association was determined between courtesy (r=0,649), gentlemanly (r=0,621), civil virtue (r=0,607) dimensions and a very strong positive significant association was determined between general organizational citizenship behavior (r=0,857). A medium level association was determined between conscience sub-dimension and courtesy (r=0,574) while a strong, positive and significant association was determined between gentlemanly (r=0,685), civil virtue (r=0,622) dimensions and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=0,798). A medium level association was determined between courtesy sub-dimension and civil virtue (r=0,559) whereas a strong positive significant association was found between gentlemanly dimension (r=0,660) and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=0,796). A positive strong association was determined between gentlemanly sub-dimension and civil virtue dimension (r=0,647) while a positive and very strong association was found between general

organizational behavior (r=0,850). A positive and very strong significant association was determined between the civil virtue dimension and general organizational citizenship behavior (r=0,842). In conclusion it has been determined that there is a negative weak association between general organizational cynicism attitude and general organizational citizenship behavior.

5. Conclusion

It is very important for those working in the tourism sector to be affiliated with their organization and feel like a citizen of that organization and refrain from displaying cynical attitudes to enable correct and appropriate human resources management in the organization as well as ensure smooth communication with customers and coordination among employees.

From this point of view this study was carried out to determine the association between Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior and it has been concluded that there is a significant and negative association between the sub-dimensions of Cynicism namely Cognitive, Affective and General Cynicism attitudes with all Organizational Citizenship Behavior sub-dimensions (Altruism, Conscience, Courtesy, Gentlemanly, Civil Virtue and General Organizational Citizenship Behavior). Apart from Conscience, Courtesy and Gentlemanly, a significant negative association has emerged in all Behavioral sub-dimensions of Organizational Citizenship behavior. However, while the sub-dimensions of Organizational Cynicism display a positive medium and strong association among themselves, the sub-dimensions of Organizational Cynicism display a positive and medium, strong and very strong association among themselves. Under the circumstances it would be appropriate to state that employees who display a high level of Organizational Cynicism attitude may decrease their degree of feeling they have of themselves as Organizational citizens. However, while the cynical attitudes of survey respondents exhibit a positive association with each other in Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral terms, actually each of the cynical attitudes trigger one another which leads to the formation of a Behavior. It is also possible to determine positive associations ranging from medium to strong among the sub-dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Therefore, when Organizational Citizenship Behavior is established in employees this behavior can trigger all the sub-dimensions of Organizational Behavior in a positive and strong way and enhance this feeling.

In conclusion, a negative association between the cynical attitudes of sector employees and Organizational Citizenship behavior has been determined in this study in which the objective was to associate the Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior levels of tourism sector employees. This result indicates that the cynical attitudes of employees must be eliminated to enable them to display Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Otherwise cynical employees cannot adopt Organizational Citizenship Behavior which means that the manifestation of

problems with the other employees of the enterprise as well as problems between the enterprise and customers is inevitable. Furthermore, the results scale indicates that this will be paralleled with rapid labor turnover and employees will change jobs often because they do not feel a loyalty to the organization. Recommendations based on the results acquired in this study are listed as follows:

•   The working conditions of individuals manifesting cynical attitudes working in the tourism sector where guest communication is on a maximum level must be reviewed because the attitude of employees will have a direct impact on customers. Since individuals displaying cynical attitudes do not feel an affiliation with the organization their communication with guests may be problematic.

•   Managers in the sector must be aware of their responsibilities toward their employees from the salaries they pay to the training seminars that are implemented. Continuous monitoring of employee behavior and eliminating their deficiencies with in-service training courses, aligning expectations with change in working life will reduce cynicism and contribute to the development of Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

•   The implementation of tests using relevant scales to determine cynical attitudes during recruitment as well as implementing these tests to currently employed staff later will contribute in the monitoring of the employee profile of the organization structure. Thus, problems that may arise in the future can be prevented.

•   The study indicated that trainees, employees with low wages and limited work experiences displayed more cynical behavior. In parallel with this conclusion, the cynical employee profile in the sector can be reduced if management values their trainees or temporary employees like permanent staff, if their personal rights are improved and a more livable salary policy is adopted in particular and applications are carried out to enhance sectoral experience and encourage them to work in the sector. Thus, Organizational Citizenship Behavior will be employed with more advanced employees.

•   Because human psychology is based on very delicate balances, sector employees and managers are recommended to follow up studies, especially on psychology and behavioral sciences.

It should not be forgotten that the most important raw material of the tourism sector is human power. Well trained human resources play a key role in achieving the goals of an enterprise. Therefore, it is necessary for the employees to be affiliated with their organizations, to feel like a citizen of the organization and to fulfill their duties by eliminating themselves from various negative thoughts. The main responsibility for this situation lies with the managers. Managers must monitor their employees, endeavor to eliminate any deficiencies they may have, generate formulas for the development of employees, update the personal benefits of employees according to the current status and even be able to empathize. If this atmosphere is captured, it can be ensured that the organizations are successful and have a self-sacrificing, hardworking human resource profile that cannot be achieved and imitated.

References:

Abraham, R. 2000. Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences. Genetic, Social and Geberal Psychology Monographs, 126(3), 269-292.

Altınöz, M., Çöp, S. and Kervancı, F. 2010. Perceived Organizational Justice and Organizational Cynicism. A Research on 4 and 5 Star Hotel Operations in Ankara, 11th National Tourism Congress, Kuşadası, 379-397.

Aslan, S. 2009. Charismatic Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Relation: The Role of the Year and Salary Variables in the Institution. International Journal of Human Sciences, 6(1), 256-275.

Atalay, C.G. 2010. Human Resources Management in the Context of Personnel Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Ankara, Detay Publishing.

Ayduğan, N. 2012. Mobbingin Organizational Cynicism Impact: An Application in Five Star Hotel Establishments, Afyonkarahisar: Afyon Kocatepe University Social Sciences Institute Unpublished Master Thesis.

Basım, H.N. and Şeşen, H. 2006. Adaptation and Comparison Study of Organizational Citizenship Behavioral Scale. Ankara University Political Science Journal, 61(4), 83-102.

Bommer, W.H., Rich, G.A. and Rubin, R.S. 2005. Changing Attitudes About Change: Longitudinal Effects of Transformational Leader Behavior on Employee Cynicism About Organizational Change. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26(7), 733-753.

Brandes, P. 1997. Organizational Cynicism: Its Nature Antecedents and Consequences, Ohio, University Of Cincinnati Dissertatian of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dean, W.J., Brandes, P. and Dharwadkar, R. 1998. Organizational Cynicism. Academy of Management Review, 23(2), 341-352.

Deloria, J.E. 2001. A Comparative Study of Employee Commitment: Core and Contract Employees in a Federal Agency. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Erdost, H.E., Karacaoğlu, K. and Reyhanoğlu, M. 2007. The concept of Organizational Cynicism and Testing of Related scale in a company in Turkey, 15th National Management and Organization Congress, Sakarya, 514-524.

Fındık, M. and Eryeşil, K. 2012. A Research on Determining the Effect of Organizational Cynicism on Organizational Commitment. International Iron and Steel Symposium, Karabük, 1250-1255.

Greenberg, J. and Baron, R.A. 2000. Behavior in Organizations, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Gündüz, Ş. 2014. The Relationship Between Spiritual Leadership and Organizational Cynicism: The Tool Effect of Emotional Intelligence, Istanbul: Marmara University Social Sciences Institute Unpublished Doctoral Thesis.

James, M.S.L. and Baker, R. 2008. Unionization as a Consequence of Cynicism: The Relationship Between Social-Exchange, Cynicism and Unionization. IABR & TLC Conference Proceedings, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1-7.

James, M.S.L. 2005. Antecedents and Consequences of Cynicism in Organizations: An Examınatıon of The Potential Positive and Negative Effects on School Systems, USA, Florida State University Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Kalağan, G. 2009. The Relationship between Organizational Support Perceptions of Research Assistants and Organizational Cynics Attitudes, Antalya: Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute Unpublished Master Thesis.

Kanter, D.L. and Mirvis, P.H. 1989. The cynical Americans: Living and Working in An Age of Discontent and Disillusionment, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Lucyzvyek, D.R. 2007. Can Personality Buffer Cynicism? Moderating Effetcs of Extraversion And Neuroticism in Response to Workplace, California, Hassles Alliant International University Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Organ, D.W. 1988. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. England, Lexington Book.

Özdamar, K. 2001. Biostatistics with SPSS (4th edition). Eskisehir, Kaan Bookstore.

Pelit, E. and Ayduğan, N. 2011. A Research on Organizational Cynics Attitudes of Hotel Employees, 12th National Tourism Congress, Akçakoca, 286-302.

Raub, S. 2008. Does Bureaucracy Kill Individual Initiative? The Impact of Structure on Organizational Citizenship Behavior in The Hospitality Industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 27(2), 179-186.

Sağır, T. and Oğuz, E. 2012. Development of Organizational Cynicism Scale for Teachers. International Journal of Human Sciences, 9(2), 1094-1106.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. and Near, J.P. 1983. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents. Journal of Applied Phsychology, 68(4), 653-663.

Sur, Ö. 2010. Organizational Cynicism: A Field Research on Eskişehir Local Office Employees, Ankara, Gazi University Educational Sciences Institute Unpublished Master Thesis.

Tokgöz, N. and Yılmaz, H. 2008. Organizational Cynicism: An Application in Hotel Establishments in Eskişehir and Alanya. Anadolu University Social Sciences Magazine, 8(2), 283-305.