



THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENTⁱ

Hilmiye Yüksel¹

Semiha Şahinⁱⁱ

¹Teacher, Minister of Education, Manisa, Turkey

²Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir, Turkey

Abstract:

The main purpose of this study was to determine the levels of organizational cynicism and commitment of the primary and secondary school teachers, the relationship between both variables and the effect of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment. Two-scale questionnaires were used and applied to a population of 316 teachers who work in Akhisar in Manisa. According to research results: the perception of teachers, are at medium level for “cognitive” and “behavioral” dimensions of organizational cynicism and general scale, and at low level for “affective” dimension in their schools. Organizational commitment is at medium level for all scale and on identification and internalization dimensions, and it is low on adaptation dimension. In addition, there was medium-leveled negative relationship between organizational commitment and cynicism. It is also observed that cognitive and affective dimensions of organizational cynicism predict all dimensions of the organizational commitment.

Keywords: organizational cynicism, organizational commitment, primary school, secondary school, teacher

1. Introduction

Today the motivation, job satisfaction, confidence and the levels of commitment of the employees become more important to increase productivity. In this sense, expectations of the employees on whole these dimensions are changing, too. According to Senge

ⁱ This manuscript was obtained from a Master thesis done with the advising of the second author.

ⁱⁱ Correspondence: email semiha.sahin@deu.edu.tr

(1993), the variables such as self-knowledge, self-realization, showing skills, succeeding and being appreciated make people happy (Tok, 2007). For that reason, the changes on workplace cause the increase of expectations of the employees. But when these expectations are not fulfilled, this situation causes some issues on employees' personal experiences and health (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006) and also it leads them to take a negative even hostile attitude towards their organizations. On literature, such attitudes and behaviors naming as organizational cynicism can be significant variables which determine the commitment to organization.

Organizations can have sufficient structural, physical and economic conditions for efficiency. However, the system is not expected to work efficiently if people who are responsible for the process of the system and their necessities and expectations are ignored (Celep, 2000). Cynicism and lack of confidence are not surprising when employers expect from employees more than they can give in return giving nothing more than just working (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006).

The basis of cynicism is based on Cynics School, which is a school of a life style and thought founded by Antisthenes (M.Ö. 444-368) in Ancient Greece. The ones who adopt this philosophy called "cynic" (Hançerlioğlu, 2008). The main idea of cynicism is based on the human itself. According to this philosophy, wise man is the one who is virtuous in other words, who becomes self-sufficient. Cynics assume themselves as free in the society and are deaf to what society says, are not stuck on habits and rules of the society (Gökberk, 2002). On the historical process, new cynics are known not like the ones two thousand five hundred years ago. According to Mantere and Martinsuo (2001) while earlier cynics were known as merciless critics, today the notion stands in the meaning of pessimism and lack of confidence (Kalağan, 2009). Cynics are also known as the ones who despise their organizations. Furthermore, they use humor as an exclusive and powerful weapon in order to achieve their personal and professional goals and are famous for drawing caricatures of their colleagues by which they make them speak dramatically and obscenely (Dean et al., 1998).

Cynicism is a multidimensional notion. As it is understood from the word root, cynicism is based on philosophical basis as well as it is mentioned on different disciplines of social sciences like religion, policy sciences, sociology, administration and psychology researches (Kalağan and Güzeller, 2010). "Cynic" is explained as the person who believes that people look out for just their own interests and who regard people as self-seeker, and the idea which is trying to express that is called "cynicism" (Erdost et al., 2007). Tokgöz and Yılmaz (2008) identifies cynicism as a pessimistic attitude towards event explanation based on disappointment about humans especially secret and undeclared goals, and tendency to manipulation and paying attention to others only as a tool in order to protect and increase own interests. According to Abraham

(2000), cynicism activates strong negative feelings such as scorn, anger, shame and nuisance (Abraham, 2000). Besides that in modern interpretation the meaning of “captious, picky, critic” of the individual is more dominant although cynicism is homonym with “skepticism”, “suspiciousness”, “distrustfulness”, “disbelief”, “pessimism”, “negative” (Erdost, Karacaoğlu and Reyhanoğlu, 2007).

Organizational cynicism is composed by general or specific attitudes, characterized by disappointment, anger, hopelessness and tendency to distrustfulness of person, group, ideology, social skills or organizations (Andersson, 1996). According to another definition, organizational cynicism is being deprived of integrity and honesty in organization, and negative attitudes of the employee towards the organization. It has three dimensions such as belief not being honest to organization, negative belief and feelings and tendency to behaving derogative and critically to organization (Dean et al., 1998). Yet, another definition is that organizational cynicism is *“believes about lack of moral integrity in organization and is that principles like fairness, honesty and sincerity are sacrificed in support of organizational benefits”* (Kutunis and Dikili, 2010). It is also described as suspicions shared by many individuals (Brandes, 1997).

Therefore, main principles in organizational cynicism are being lack of truth, honesty, fairness, sincerity and frankness. Leaders in organizations can be destitute of main principles of the organizational cynicism and cause hidden motivation and trick in the organization in order to protect own interests (Abraham, 2000). According to Eaton (2000), cynics emphasize that management in the organization is lack of honesty, other organizational members will take advantage of them and they will not be behaved equally in the organization (Kalağan, 2009). From this point of cynicism is tendency to disbelief about sincerity and favour in human motives and movements. For that reason, cynics believe in “betraying” themselves by applications of their organization due to lack of principles like fairness, honesty and sincerity (Dean et al., 1998).

Organizational cynicism bases on many theories, especially motivation subject. There are “expectation theory” (Robbins, 2000), “Attribution Theory” (Kalağan, 2009), “Attitude Theory” (Dean et al., 1998), “Social Change Theory” (Sabuncuoğlu and Tüz 2001), “Affective Events Theory” basis on emotion like disappointment and frustration and “Social Motivation Theory” among them (Brown and Cregan 2008; Eaton, 2000). Organizational cynicism is analyzed in five groups in terms of its types: these are “Personality Cynicism” based on ruthless, scorn and disrespect, “Social Cynicism” (Abraham, 2000) which is retiring from social and economic institutions regard as the source of the problem, “Organizational Change Cynicism” (Abraham, 2000; Brown and Cregan 2008; Nafei 2013; Wanous, Reichers and Austin, 2000) dedicated to unsuccessful change efforts in the past in the context of laziness and inability, “Professional Cynicism” identified by Kanter and Mirvis as emotional deadness, rupturing

occupation, stolidity and indifference (Abraham, 2000), “Employee Cynicism” shaped with disappointment and hopelessness accompanied by scorn and distrustfulness situation against individual, group, ideology, social tradition and organization (Andersson, 1996). Organizational factors having significant effect in organizational cynicism are stated as psychological breach of contract, organizational justice, decrease of organizational support, increase of working hours and leaders’ not behaving effectively in organizations (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006: 201; Cole, Bruch and Vogel, 2006; Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly, 2003).

Organizational cynicism is expressed as negative attitudes to the organization of the individual (Dean et al., 1998). As to Ajzen (2001), the attitude represents a short evaluation of the psychological objects determined by special dimensions like good-bad, useful-harmful, likable-unlikable (Kalağan, 2009). These attitudes are constituted by the mainframe of this research; “cognitive items” include knowledge about attitude object, “affective items” represent the belief of lack of honesty and negative emotional reactions, observable all behaviors especially critical and pejorative behaviors against attitude item (Dean et al., 1998).

Cognitive item, the first dimension of the organizational cynicism, includes all manner of knowledge, experiment, belief and thoughts (İnceoğlu, 2004) and it is the belief in deprivation of honesty in the organization according to institutional state of affairs (Dean et al., 1998). In cognitive dimension individuals focus on believes; deprivation of principle, getting short shift of their solemn declaration, possibility of contradictoriness and insecurity, lie and trick, sacrifice of value judgments such as sincerity for interest, frankness, honesty and truth, possibility of behaving remorselessly and indecently. This belief causes negative emotions such as anger, underrating and condemnation (Brandes, 1997; Dean et al., 1998).

In this sense, cynics act not only with believes but also with emotions (Dean et al. 1998). Emotional items, second dimension of the organizational cynicism, are emotional experiments qualified as positive or negative by individual. Emotional items consist of strong emotional reactions such as pride and anxiety (Özkalp and Kirel, 2004), disrespect, anger, distress and embarrassment (Abraham, 2000), self-concern, insecurity and disappointment (Dean et al., 1998).

Behavioral items, the last dimension of the organizational cynicism, are identified as observable behaviors formed by the attitude. Employees adopt common purposes, attitudes, believes and rules of the organization (Güner, 2007) and pursuant thereto they direct their behaviors. Accordingly cynic employees are able to act pessimistic, negative and mostly for humiliation (Dean et al., 1998), and also they are able to mock at objectives of the organization, rewrite duty statements and make interpretation mordaciously (Brandes, 1997).

When expectations of the employee spending most of his time in the organization are not satisfied, he assumes negative emotions and behaviours against the organization. This situation causes decreasing effect on organizational commitment, confidence, motivation, job satisfaction and performance whereas it increases exhaustion and alienation (Abraham, 2000; Brandes, 1997; Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan, 2012; Yıldız, 2012).

The relationship between organizational cynicisms is highly connected by notions mentioned and organizational commitment is object of interest. Philosophical change in administration policy from control to commitment in last 1980's and in the beginning of 1990's provides a basis to the foundation of the organizational commitment (İnce and Gül, 2005). According to Guetzkov, who study on commitment notion firstly, commitment is a psychological situation which makes person ready for a certain though, person or group, (Yazıcıoğlu and Topaloğlu, 2009) and which characterizes the organizational communication and which has effect on continuity of organizational membership (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

Grusky, one of the researchers who firstly defined the organizational commitment, identifies organizational commitment as *"the power of commitment of the individual to organization"* (Wahn, 1998: 256). To Porter (1973), organizational commitment is identification with the organization and the degree of willingness to remaining in organization. According to these definitions, it is possible to describe organizational commitment as coalescing with organization, feeling like a part of the organization, adopting objectives of the organization and the level of identification with the organization. Consequently, if employee adopts the objectives and values of the organization and makes an effort and he does this just for the organization, it means that he shows commitment to his organization on internalization level (Balay, 2000b).

The personal factors which effect organizational cynicism are age (Balay, 2000; Ertürk, 2014; Balıkçioğlu, 2013; İllez, 2012), gender (Balay, 2000; Ertürk, 2014; İllez, 2012), educational level (Kılıç, 2011; Balıkçioğlu, 2013, Balay, 2000) of the organization (Başyigit, 2006; Demirel, 2009; Karadağ Kılıçoğlu and Yılmaz, 2014; Yilmazer and Eroğlu, 2012), magnitude (Kılıç, 2011; Çetin, 2006; Bakan, 2011), policy (Altıntaş, 2007), nature of the work (Atay, 2006; Cengiz, 2008), leadership (Serin, 2011; Terzi and Kurt 2005; Balay, 2000), organizational justice (İnce and Gül, 2005), prizes (Çelebi, 2009; Atay, 2006), income (Çakır, 2001; Balay, 2000), relationships among colleague (Cengiz, 2008; Balay, 2000) and job satisfaction (Ertürk, 2014; Akar and Yıldırım, 2008).

Devoted employees deeply believe in objectives and values of the organization and obey the orders and expectations voluntarily. Also, these members strive more than least expectations to realize the objectives and reveal determination on remaining in the organization (Balay, 2000b). According to Katz and Kahn, commitment to

organizational objectives is not only reducing absenteeism and business cycle by doing undertaken duty successfully but also it is directing the individual to volunteering actions for organizational existence and system achievement on the top level (Bayram, 2005).

Etzioni classifies organizational commitment as negative-alienated at the most negative point, neutral-cheeseparating in the middle and positive- moral commitment at the most affirmative point (Balay, 2000b), Wiener (1982) classifies commitment as instrumental commitment which represents cheeseparating, utilitarian, giving on to own interest and benefit and normative-moral commitment based on value or moral. Meyer and Allen (1997) categorizes commitment as affective, continuance and normative while Buchanan (1974) sorts by Identification, Involvement and Loyalty. Mowday classifies it as attitudinal and behavioral commitment (Çöl, 2004).

As to O'Reily and Chatman (1986), interpret organizational commitment as self-psychological commitment to organization and discuss commitment to organization on three dimensions: *Adaptation commitment*: commitment is formed not for shared values but for winning certain prizes. At that commitment attractiveness of the prize or negative sense of the penalty are the points in question. *Identification commitment*: commitment occurs to establish relationship or maintain it. Thus, the individual is proud of being a member of a group. *Internalization commitment*: commitment is completely based on adaptation between personal and organizational values. Attitude and behaviors about this dimension come true when individuals harmonize own inner world with others value system (Bayram, 2005). These three dimensions underlie this study in the context of relationship with organizational cynicism.

As being predicated on literature, it is possible to talk about foundations of this relationship. Commitment to organization occurs on period of change between the individual and the organization and individuals are dedicated to the organization in exchange for certain prizes or outputs. In another words, individual expects certain prizes or outputs by this exchange in return for commitment to the organization (Balci, 2003). There have been unreachable aims of personal cynics even in the organizations which most of the employees achieve job satisfaction. Cynics who are not able to reach own aims see the organization as enemy. However, commitment comprises of overlapping values of the organization with employees. Personal cynics become less integrated with the organization because of two reasons. Firstly, thinking themselves hung the moon and stars in terms of moral results in questioning and criticizing organizational authority. Secondly, the case of not trusting others prevents them from socializing and positive communication (Abraham, 2000).

In this sense, cynic employees who bear negative feelings against the organization and who question integrity, objectives and values of the organization

realize all negations about the organization easier and their integration in a word commitment with organization decreases (Abraham, 2000; Brandes, 1997). Indeed, the most significant results brought by cynicism are increasing of organizational sabotage, disobedience, skepticism, insecurity, exhaustion and alienation in spite of decreasing of organizational commitment, morale and performance (Kalağan, 2009).

Abraham (2000), Anderson, 1996; Balıkçioğlu (2013), Brandes (1997); Brandes, Das and Hadani (2006), Brown and Cregan (2008), Cartwright and Holmes (2006), Cole et al. (2006), Çağ (2011), Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar (1999), Eaton (2000), Erbil (2013), Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly, (2003); Kabataş (2010), Kalağan (2009), Kalay and Oğrak (2012), Karacaoğlu and İnce (2013), Kılıç (2011), Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan (2012), Pitre (2004), Polat, Meydan and Tokmak (2010), Sezgin-Nartgün and Kartal (2013), Şirin (2011), Turan (2011), Yıldırım (2012) and Yıldız (2013) research the relationship between organizational cynicism and variables such as psychological breach of contract, organizational support, organizational justice, silence and mobbing, organizational identification, confidence, intention to cease of employment, organizational commitment and alienation. Besides, in literature there have been considerable researches on the relationship between organizational commitment and variables like job satisfaction, organizational citizenship, leadership (Akyürek, Toygar and Şener, 2013; Balay, 2000a; Baysal and Paksoy 1999; Bayram, 2005; Buluç, 2009; Celep, 1996; Cohen, 2007; Çöl, 2004; Sabuncuoğlu, 2007; Sağlam, 2003; Terzi and Kurt, 2005; Yılmaz, 2009).

The relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment has been analyzed by Abraham (2000), Altınöz, Çöp and Sığındı (2011), Balıkçioğlu (2013), Brandes (1997), Brandes et al. (1999), Eaton (2000), Kılıç (2011), Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan (2012), Pitre (2004), Yavuz and Bedük (2013), Yücel and Çetinkaya, 2015) and Yıldız (2013). Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan (2012) on their study with instructors, Kılıç (2011), Okçu, Şahin and Şahin (2015) and Yıldız (2013) in schools search effects of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment. In this research, analyzing the levels of organizational cynicism and commitment in the primary and secondary schools and the effect of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment are aimed.

1.1 The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research is to analyze the effect of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment and to search the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment.

2. Method

In this research, which is on the relationship between organizational cynicism and commitment relational screening model has been used. Relational screening model is a research model that is aimed to determine the change existence or the level between two or more variables. The relationship that is found by screening cannot be interpreted as cause-result relationship; yet by giving some clues about this aspects, knowing the situation of a variable and forecasting the other can cause positive results (Karasar, 2011). In this research, that is a relational screening model, organizational cynicism has been determined as independent and organizational commitment has been determined as dependent variables.

2.1 Population and sample

The population of this research, which was made in 2014-2015 educational year, has comprised 850 primary and secondary school teachers who have worked in Akhisar in Manisa. Research's sample has been chosen stratified sampling to conclude with schools providing education at least two years and teachers working on the same school at least for two years. Participants in those groups have been obtained via random sampling method; 316 teachers working on primary and secondary schools have constituted the sample. It has been given attention that the sample has represented 10% of population.

2.2 Research Instrument

In collecting data, "Personal Data Form", "Organizational Cynicism Scale" by Brandes et al. (1999) translated and adapted into Turkish by Kalağan (2009) and "Organizational Commitment Scale" by Balay (2000a) have been used.

Organizational Cynicism Scale: "Organizational Cynicism Scale" is comprised of three dimension as "cognitive", "affective" and "behavioral" and thirteen items: "cognitive" dimension with 5 items, "affective" dimension with 4 items, "behavioral" dimension with 4 items. The scale's Cronbach's alpha coefficients were found to be .80 in "cognitive" dimension, .96 in "affective", .80 in "behavioral" dimension. Scale's general reliability has been found .89.

Organizational Commitment Scale: "Organizational Commitment Scale" is comprised of three dimension as "adaptation", "identification" and "internalization" and twenty four items: "adaptation" dimension with 8 items, "identification" dimension with 7 items, "internalization" dimension with 9 items. The scale's Cronbach's alpha coefficients were found to be .81 in "adaptation" dimension, .89 in "identification", .93 in "internalization" dimension. Scale's general reliability has been found .78.

2.3 Collecting Data

In order to conduct data collection tools, it has been got permission from Manisa Provincial Directorate for National Education and Ethical Committee. The scales have taken to the schools in which the research has made by hand with the permission paper. In schools, after meeting principals, the scales have been conducted to volunteer teachers by explaining the data collection tools. In schools, which have many teachers, in order to increase the participation, the scales have been delivered to the schools by researcher. In the end of following time, researcher has received the scales.

Scales have been applied to 350 teachers in 38 primary and secondary schools in Akhisar in Manisa. Returning 325 scales have been analyzed and 316 of them have seen to be valid and evaluated.

2.4 Analysis Procedure

To analyze the data of the research, arithmetic mean and standard deviation were checked by using SPSS 15 statistics analysis program. In order to calculate the level of prediction and relation between two variables, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) and multiple regression analysis were used. Significance level has been stated as $p < 0.05$.

3. Findings

First, the relationship between organizational cynicism and commitment has been examined. Accordingly, correlation (r) analysis between organizational cynicism and commitment has been showed in Table 1:

Table 1: Correlation between organizational cynicism and commitment

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Cognitive		.55*	.49*	.51*	-.45*	-.30*
2. Affective		1	.53*	.63*	-.50*	-.29*
3. Behavioral			1	.42*	-.37*	-.17*
4. Adaptation				1	-.49*	-.42*
5. Identification					1	.59*
6. Internalization						1

In Table 1, there is a negative, medium level and significant relationship between organizational cynicism and commitment. There is a positive, medium level and significant relationship between "adaptation" from dependent variables and "cognitive" ($r=.51$), "affective" ($r=.63$), "behavioral" ($r=.42$) from predictive variables. There is a low negative relationship between "internalization" from dependent variables and

"affective" ($r=-.29$), "behavioral" ($r=-.17$) from predictive variables. Also, there is a medium positive relationship between all other dimensions.

Second, predicted organizational commitment by cynicism has been examined. Regression analysis on the effects of organizational cynicism on "adaptation" dimension of organizational commitment has been given in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of organizational cynicism on "adaptation" dimension

Variable	B	SH _B	B	T	P	Dual r	Partial r
Stable	.58	.10		5.57	.00		
Cognitive	.15	.03	.21	4.118	.00	.51	.22
Affective	.37	.04	.48	8.98	.00	.63	.45
Behavioural	.04	.04	.05	.97	.33	.42	.05
R=.66 R ² =.44 F=82.888 p=.00							

In Table 2, there is medium level and significant relationship between "adaptation" dimension and overall dimensions of organizational cynicism ("cognitive", "affective", "behavioral") ($R=.66$, $R^2=.44$, $p<.05$). Those three dimensions have explained 82% of total variance of adaptation dimension. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), the importance degree of predictive variables on "adaptation" dimension has ranged as "affective", "cognitive" and "behavioral". According to the t-test results of regression coefficient's significance, "cognitive" ($R=.51$, $p<.05$) and "affective" ($R=.63$, $p<.05$) dimensions are found as medium level and significant predictors of "adaptation" dimension. However, it is determined from the results that "behavioral" dimension is not a predictor of "adaptation" dimension ($p=.33$). Regression analysis on the effects of "identification" dimension has been given in Table 3.

Table 3: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of organizational cynicism on "identification" dimension

Variable	B	SH _B	B	T	P	Dual r	Partial r
Stable	4.77	.16		28.617	.00		
Cognitive	-.23	.06	-.23	-3.92	.00	-.45	-.21
Affective	-.36	.06	-.33	-5.49	.00	-.50	-.29
Behavioral	-.09	.06	-.07	-1.34	.17	-.37	-.07
R=.55 R ² =.30 F=45.443 p=.00							

In Table 3, there is medium level and significant relationship between "identification" dimension and overall dimensions of organizational cynicism ("cognitive", "affective", "behavioral") ($R=.55$, $R^2=.30$, $p<.05$). Those three dimensions have explained 45% of total variance of identification dimension. According to standardized regression coefficient

(β), the importance degree of predictive variables on "identification" dimension has ranged as "affective", "cognitive" and "behavioral". According to the t-test results of regression coefficient's significance, "cognitive" ($R=-.45$, $p<.05$) and "affective" ($R=-.50$, $p<.05$) dimensions are found as significant predictors of "identification" dimension. However, it is determined from the results that "behavioral" dimension is not a predictor of "identification" dimension ($p=.17$). Regression analysis on the effects of "internalization" dimension has been given in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of regression analysis predicting scores of organizational cynicism on "internalization" dimension

Variable	B	SH _B	β	T	P	Dual r	Partial r
Stable	4.30	.15		27.757	.00		
Cognitive	-.18	.05	-.21	-3.24	.01	-.30	-.18
Affective	-.17	.06	-.19	-2.84	.005	-.29	-.15
Behavioral	.03	.06	.03	.54	.59	-.17	.03
R=.34 R ² =.11 F=13.853 p=.00							

In Table 4, there is medium level and significant relationship between "internalization" dimension and overall dimensions of organizational cynicism ("cognitive", "affective", "behavioral") ($R=.34$, $R^2=.11$, $p<.05$). Those three dimensions have explained 13% of total variance of internalization dimension. According to standardized regression coefficient (β), the importance degree of predictive variables on "internalization" dimension has ranged as "cognitive", "affective" and "behavioral". According to the t-test results of regression coefficient's significance, "cognitive" ($R=-.30$, $p<.05$) and "affective" ($R=-.29$, $p<.05$) dimensions are found as significant predictors of "internalization" dimension. However, it is determined from the results that "behavioral" dimension is not a predictor of "internalization" dimension ($p=.59$).

4. Conclusion

The perception of teachers, are at medium level for "cognitive" and "behavioral" dimensions of organizational cynicism and general scale, and at low level for "affective" dimension in their schools. Similarly, Doğan and Uğurlu (2014) and Sezgin-Nartgün and Kartal (2013) has stated on their studies that the teachers have low cynic characteristics on general scale; however, the dimensions has ranged according to averages as "behavioral", "cognitive" and "affective" cynicism. Those results indicate that teachers do not have much negative beliefs against their schools but they exhibit negative "behaviors". While talking about school, teachers are more active on meaningful eye-shooting, complaining about school and relations, talking to others and

criticizing the policy than cognitive and affective features. In other words, they externalize negative attitudes towards the organization in short cynic features as behaviors. Thus, teachers express negations, which exist cognitively, as part of social relationship rather than discussing internally or externalizing more with own feelings (like furiousness - anger). Those results show consistency with Kılıç (2011) and Kalağan's (2009) studies on which behavioral cynicism is found higher. Cynicism and lack of confidence can occur when organizations expect from employees more than they can give in return not meeting their expectations (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006). In other words, objectives, motivation, effort, expectation and prizes must be harmonized in a pool with adaptation and satisfaction.

Cognitive process, which contains factors like not being synchronous with policy, objective and applications and contradiction between discourse and application, is given importance by teachers less than behavioral reactions like complaint and meaningful looking but more than affective reactions. Among the reasons of less affective reactions of the teachers like anger, furiousness, dissatisfaction can be abstention from negative attitudes of the administrators when they directly express their feelings or willing to suppress their feelings by teachers' own Emotional Intelligence level (Durdu, 2015) in the situations with no result in order not to cause another negation. Besides, according to Weisinger individuals who have high Emotional Intelligence want to direct own behaviors (Durdu, 2015).

Perceptions of the teachers about organizational commitment are the highest on "internalization" dimension but medium throughout all scale and on "identification" dimension whereas it is the lowest on "adaptation" dimension. Those results show consistency with Erdaş (2009), Koca (2009), Okçu, Şahin and Şahin (2015), and Sezgin (2010) studies. Accordingly, it is possible to say that for school success teachers are more sensitive about making effort beyond expectation, consideration of future of the school, regarding school problems as own problems, appropriation critics about school, acting properly to benefits and expectations of the school, being happy with praise of school and making all kind of self-sacrifice for own school than other factors. In other words, the teachers who appropriate objectives, process and environment/climate of the school, might protect success, identity and dignity of the school and in the context of this might develop attitude and behaviors. At the same time that result indicates teachers' integration with own schools. Besides, according to Porter (1973) three important element of organizational commitment which is working for organization and willing adoption objectives of the organization, are adoption of objectives and values, endeavoring for that and maintenance of organizational membership (Reichers, 1985).

It is found out that there was medium-leveled negative relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism whereas there was low-leveled negative relationship between “affective” and “behavioral” dimensions of organizational cynicism and “identification” and “internalization” dimensions of organizational commitment. That result shows consistency with Polat, Meydan and Tokmak’s (2010) study. Accordingly, teachers’ adoption and commitment to organization can eliminate or fall afoul to have negative attitude and to maintain critical attitude against organization. In spite of that, there is a medium-leveled positive relationship between “adaptation” dimension of organizational commitment and all dimensions of organizational cynicism. This result shows consistency with literature and general conclusion in the consideration of statements representing “adaptation” dimension like continuing working in the school for just financial anxieties, unwillingness to work, working for labor, effort being limited with course hours, having difficulty in adaptation, obeying rules compulsorily and decreasing work enthusiasm (Brandes, 1997; Okçu, Şahin and Şahin 2015; Pitre, 2004; Yavuz and Bedük, 2016; Yücel and Çetinkaya, 2015).

All dimensions of organizational cynicism have predicted significant part (4/5) of “adaptation” dimension of organizational commitment. In other words, “adaptation” dimension is the most effected by organizational cynicism. According to this, teachers having negative believes, attitudes and behaviors against schools have been working in the schools unwillingly and effortlessly because of just financial reasons and anxieties.

All dimensions of organizational cynicism have predicted “identification” dimension of organizational commitment in medium-level. It is determined from the results that “cognitive” and “affective” dimensions of organizational cynicism are significant predictors of “identification” dimension. Those results indicate that desire to stay in schools and to adopt and realize the objectives of the teachers having cynic behaviors is decreasing (Polat and Meydan 2010; Tak, and Çiftçioğlu, 2008).

Organizational cynicism has predicted “internalization” dimension of organizational commitment in low level in the context of negative and low-leveled relationship. Accordingly, “cognitive” and “affective” dimensions of organizational cynicism have low effect on “internalization” dimension containing factors like teachers’ diligent and devoted working, being interested in school problems, disliking negative criticism but being happy with being praised, acting properly to interests and expectations of the school. In this sense, there are another factors predicting “internalization” dimension and studying on those factors will be to the point. Findings of the research show consistency with Abraham (2000), Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan (2012) and Balıkçioğlu’s (2013) studies.

According to results, organizational cynicism has predicted “adaptation” dimension in high level whereas it has predicted “identification” dimension in medium and “internalization” dimension in low level. Results indicate the meaning and significance of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment and organizational commitment is decreasing while level of organizational cynicism in schools is increasing. When organizational commitment having positive effect on employee performance, that Uysa and Yıldız (2014) have stated this effect as considerable rate like 20%, and offering opportunity to being concentrated on work by disposing of negative thoughts like resignation and absenteeism are taken into account (Bayram, 2005; Kalağan, 2009; Polat and Meydan, 2010; Güzel, Perçin and Tükeltürk, 2010), positive and effective communication between teachers and administrators must be created in order to reduce the levels of organizational cynicism in schools and its effects. Administrators should struggle for reducing of in appreciativeness of the teachers from own schools and changing critical attitudes and behaviors to positive; should appreciate teachers’ efforts, award teachers’ successes and make them feel precious for school. Besides, leadership styles reducing cynicism is determined (Doğan and Uğurlu, 2014; Mamatoğlu, 2010; Mete and Serin, 2015; Tak and Çiftçioğlu, 2008). Thus, teachers making sacrifice for objectives and future of own schools and integrating with schools can be ensured. It is important that administrators should be consistent in statements and actions and should create an atmosphere with highly reliable background in that process (Altınöz and Çöp, 2012). Teachers relying on administrators will be effective on avoiding cynical behaviors.

References

1. Abraham, R. (2000). “Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences”. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*. 126(3), 269-292.
2. Akar, C. & Yıldırım, Y. T. (2008). “The Relationships among Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Role Stressors of Managers: An Area Application in White Meat Sector with Structural Equation Model”. *Gazi University. The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*. 10(2), 97-113.
3. Akyürek, E. Ç., Toygar, Ş. A. & Şener, T. (2013). “Organizational Culture and Subculture Effect on Organizational Commitment: A Research on Health Employees”. *The Journal of Ankara Health Service* 12(2), 55-62.

4. Altınöz, M., Göral, R. & Çöp, S. (2012). "Örgütsel Güvenin Örgütsel Sinizm Üzerine Etkisi: Bir Alan Araştırması". 11. Ulusal İşletmecilik Kongresi (10-11 Mayıs), Konya.
5. Altınöz, M., S. Çöp, & Sığındı, T. (2011). "Relationship between Perceived Organizational Commitment and Organizational Cynicism: A Research on Four or Five Stars Accommodations Establishments in Ankara". *The Journal of Social and Economics Researches*, 15(21), 285-315.
6. Altıntaş F. Ç. (2007). "The Effect of Structure of Organization on Organizational Policy and Procedural Justice with Structural Equation Model". *The Journal of Anadolu University Social Science* 7(2), 151-168.
7. Andersson, L. (1996). "Employee Cynicism: An Examination Using a Contract Violation Framework", *Human Relations*. (49), 1395-1418.
8. Atay, S. (2006). "The Effect of Career Management on Organizational Commitment. Unpublished Master Dissertation. Kocatepe University, The Institute of Social Sciences, Afyon.
9. Balay, R. (2000a). *Organizational commitment of administrators and teachers in private and state high schools (the case of Ankara)*. Unpublished doctorate dissertation. Ankara University. The Institute of Social Sciences.
10. Balay, R. (2000b). *Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerde Örgütsel Bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
11. Balcı, A. (2003). *Örgütsel Sosyalleşme Kuram Strateji ve Taktikler*, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
12. Balıkçioğlu, S. (2013). *Determining the relationship between the attitudes of organizational cynicism and commitment of the employees in hospitality businesses in Antalya*. Unpublished master dissertation. Mustafa Kemal University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Hatay.
13. Başyigit, A. (2006). *The effect of organizational communication on organizational commitment*. Unpublished master dissertation. Dumlupınar University, The Institute of Social Sciences, Kütahya.
14. Bayram, L. (2005). "A New Paradigm in Administration: Organizational Commitment". *Journal of court of account*. (59), 125-139.
15. Baysal, A. C. & Paksoy, M. (1999). "Meyer-Allen Model in Multiple Research on Commitment to Occupation and Organization". *The Journal of Istanbul University Faculty of Management*. 28(1), 7-15.
16. Brandes, P., Das, D. & Hadani, M. (2006). "Organizational Cynicism. A Field Examination Using Global and Local Social Exchange Relationships and Workplace Outcomes". *Sharing Network Leadership*. 191-224.

17. Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R. & Dean, J. W. (1999). Does Organizational Change Cynicism Matter? Employee and Supervisor Perspectives on Work Outcomes. *The Annual EAM Meeting*.
18. Brandes, P. M. (1997). *Organizational Cynicism: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences* (Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy), The University of Cincinnati.
19. Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). "Organizational Change Cynicism: The Role of Employee Involvement". *Human Resource Management*. 47(4), 667-686.
20. Buchanan, B. (1974). "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work organizations". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 19(4), 533-546.
21. Buluç, B. (2009). "The Relationships between Organizational Commitment and Leadership Styles of Principles Based on Elementary School Teacher's Perceptions". *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. 15(57), 5-34.
22. Cartwright, S. & N. Holmes, N. (2006). The Meaning of Work: The Challenge of Regaining Employee Engagement and Reducing Cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*. 16(2), 199-208.
23. Celep, C. (1996). *Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Adanmışlığı*. Yayınlanmamış Araştırma, Ankara.
24. Celep, C. (2000). *Eğitimde Örgütsel Adanma ve Öğretmenler*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
25. Cengiz, S. (2008). *The effects of organizational commitment of employees on employee performance in accommodating organizations*. Unpublished master dissertation. Adnan Menderes University, Aydın.
26. Cohen, A. (2007). "Commitment Before and After: An Evaluation and Reconceptualization of Organizational Commitment". *Human Resource Management Review*. 17(3), 336-354.
27. Cole, M. S., Bruch, H. & Vogel, B. (2006). "Emotion as Mediators of the Relations between Perceived Supervisor Support and Psychological Hardiness on Employee Cynicism". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 27(4), 463-484.
28. Çağ, A. (2011). *A research on the effect of perceived organizational justice on organizational cynicism and intend to leave*. Unpublished master dissertation. Kocatepe University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Afyon.
29. Çakır, Ö. (2001). *İşe Bağlılık Olgusu ve Etkileyen Faktörler*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
30. Çelebi, M. A. (2009). *As an instrument of employee empowerment to maintain organizational commitment*. Unpublished master dissertation. Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Karaman.

31. Çetin G. G. (2006). *Organizational commitment: organizational climate's effect on organizational commitment and research of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment in Trakya University*. Unpublished master dissertation. Edirne Trakya University, Edirne.
32. Çöl, G. (2004). "Human Resources, Organizational Commitment and Relationship with Similar Notions". *The Journal of Work, Force, Industrial Works and Human Resources*. 6(2), 4-11.
33. Dean JR, J.W., Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). "Organizational Cynicism". *The Academy of Management Review*. 23(2), 341-352.
34. Demirel, Y. (2009). A conceptual approach to the relationship between organizational commitment and counter-productive behaviors. Istanbul Commerce University, *The Journal of Social Sciences*. 15(8), 115- 132.
35. Doğan, S. & Uğurlu, C. T. (2014). "The Relations between Ethical Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators and Teachers Perceptions about Organizational Cynicism". *Gazi University Journal of Education Faculty (GUJGEF)*. 34(3), 489-516.
36. Durdu, İ. (2015). *A relationship between emotional intelligence and classroom climate*. Unpublished master dissertation. Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.
37. Eaton, J. A. (2000). *A Social Motivation Approach to Organizational Cynicism* (Dissertation of Master of Arts), Faculty of Graduate Studies, York University, Toronto.
38. Erbil, S. (2013). *The relationship among organizational cynicism and job quit intention of the employees in hotels*. Unpublished master dissertation. Adnan Menderes University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Aydın.
39. Erdaş, Y. (2009). *How the organizational commitment level of the teachers who work at the primary schools within the city center of Denizli is*. Unpublished master dissertation. Pamukkale University. The Institute of Social Science, Denizli.
40. Erdost, H. E., Karacaoğlu, K. & Reyhanoğlu, M. (2007). *Örgütsel Sinizm Kavramı İle İlgili Ölçeklerin Türkiye'deki Bir Firmada Test Edilmesi*. XV. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Sakarya Üniversitesi.
41. Ertürk, R (2014). *The relationship between work motivation of teachers and their organizational commitment (the sample of Bolu)*. Unpublished master dissertation. Abant İzzet Baysal University. The Institute of Educational Sciences, Bolu.
42. Gökberk, M. (2002). *Felsefe Tarihi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
43. Güner, A. R. (2007). *Modelling the relationship between organizational commitment, job commitment and job satisfaction in health services*. Unpublished master dissertation. Akdeniz University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Antalya.

44. Güzel, B., Perçin, N. & Tükeltürk, Ş. (2010). A study on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism and effects on leave: 4-5 stars hotels. Adana. 18. Administration and Organization Congress, Adana.
45. Hançerlioğlu, O. (20089). *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Remzi Kitabevi.
46. İnceoğlu, M. (2004). *Tutum Algı İletişim*, Ankara: Elips Yayınevi.
47. İçerli, L. & Yıldırım, H. M. (2012). "The Relationship between Organization Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Research in Health Sector". *The Journal of Organization and Administration Sciences*. 4(1), 1309-8039.
48. İllez, Z. (2012). *The effect of organizational climate on organizational commitments of employees: an application in hospitality enterprises*. Unpublished master dissertation. Ankara Gazi Üniversitesi. The Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
49. İnce, M. and Gül, H. (2005). *Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık*. Ankara: Çizgi Kitabevi Yayınları.
50. Johnson, J. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). "The Effects of Psychological Contract Breach and Organizational Cynicism: Not All Social Exchange Violations Are Created Equal". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 24(5), 627- 647.
51. Kabataş. A. (2010). *A research on the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational citizenship behavior*. Unpublished master dissertation. Kocaeli University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Kocaeli.
52. Kalağan G. & Güzeller, C. O. (2010). "The Organizational Cynicism Levels of the Teachers". *The Journal of Pamukkale University Education Faculty*. (27), 83-97.
53. Kalağan, G. (2009). *The relationship between research assistants' perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism*. Unpublished master dissertation. Akdeniz University. The Institute of Educational Sciences, Antalya.
54. Kalay, F. & Oğrak, A. (2012). *Örgütsel Sessizlik, Mobbing ve Örgütsel Sinizm İlişkisi: Örnek Bir Uygulama*. 20. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, İzmir.
55. Karacaoğlu, K. & İnce, F. (2012). "Reliability and Validity of The Organizational Cynicism Scale: The Case of Organized Industrial Zone, Kayseri". *Business and Economics Research Journal*. 3(3), 77-92.
56. Karadağ, E., Kılıçoğlu, G. & Yılmaz, D. (2014). "Organizational Cynicism, School Culture, and Academic Achievement: The Study of Structural Equation Modeling". *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. 14(1), 102-11.
57. Karasar, N. (2011). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. 22. Baskı. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

58. Kılıç, Ş. (2011). *The relationship between the levels of organizational cynicism and organizational commitment of primary school teachers (example of Keçiören district)*. Unpublished master dissertation. Ankara Hacettepe University, Ankara.
59. Koca, S. (2009). *To be defined the relation between personal properties and organizational commitment of the teachers, work in secondary school*. Unpublished master dissertation. Yeditepe University. The Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
60. Kutanis R. Ö. & Dikili, A. (2010). *Değişim Boyutunda Örgütlerde Sinizm, Örgütsel Davranışta Güncel Konular içinde D. E. Özler (Ed.)*, Ekin Basım Yayın Dağıtım, Bursa, 269-285.
61. Mamatoğlu, N. (2010). "The Moderator Role of Employees' Teachers' Personality Factors between Leader Behaviour Perceptions and Dimensions of Organizational Identity". *Turkish Psychology Journal*. 25 (65), 82-97.
62. Mete, Y. A. & Serin, H. (2015). "Relationship between School Administrators' Paternalist Leadership Behaviours and Teachers' Organizational Citizenship and Organizational Cynicism Behaviours". *The journal of Hasan Ali Yücel Education Faculty*. 12-2(24), 147-159.
63. Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace - Theory, Research, and Application*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
64. Okçu, V., Şahin, H. M. & Şahin, E. (2015). "Effect of Physical Education and Sports Teachers' Perceptions about Organizational Cynicism on Organizational Commitment". *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport*. (4), 298-313.
65. Özgan, H., Külekçi, E. & Özkan, M. (2012). "Research of Relationship between Instructors' Levels of Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Commitment". *International Online Journal of Educational Science*. 4(1), 196-205.
66. Özkalp, E. & Kirel, Ç. (2005). *Örgütsel Davranış*. Eskişehir; Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim, Sağlık ve Bilimsel Araştırma Çalışmaları Vakfı Yayın No: 149.
67. Özkırış, B. (2012). *A research on the relationship between core self-evaluations and affective organizational commitment of academics*. Unpublished master dissertation. Maltepe University. The Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
68. Pitre, J. L. (2004). *Organizational Cynicism at the United States Naval Academy: An Exploratory Study*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School Monterey.
69. Polat, M., & Meydan, C. H. (2010). "An Empirical Study on Relationship of Organizational Identification with Cynicism and Intention to Leave". *The Journal of Defense Science*. 9(1), 145-172.

70. Polat, M., Meydan, C. H. & Tokmak, İ. (2010). "A research on Empowerment, Organizational Identification, and Organizational Cynicism". *The Journal of KHO Science*. 20(2), 1-22.
71. Polat, M., Meydan, C. H. & Tokmak, İ. (2010). Personel Güçlendirme-Örgütsel Sinizm İlişkisinde Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Aracılık Etkisi. 9. Ulusal İşletmecilik Kongresi, Zonguldak.
72. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M. & Boulian, P. V. (1973). *Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians*. U.S Department of Health Education and Welfare National Institute of Education, Technical Report, 16, 1-21.
73. Reichers, A. E. (1985). A Review and Reconceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Academy of Management Review*. 10(3), 465-476.
74. Sabuncuoğlu, E. T. 2007. "A research on Relationship between Education, Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave". *The Journal of Eagean Academic View*. (7), 613-628.
75. Sabuncuoğlu, Z. & Tüz, M. (2001). *Örgütsel Psikoloji*, Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi.
76. Sağlam, A. G. (2003). "Does the Trust for the Manager Increase Organizational Commitment?", *The Journal of Gazi University Commerce and Tourism Education Faculty*. (2), 17-36.
77. Serin, M. K. (2011). *The relationship between instructional leadership and organizational commitment in primary schools (a study in Konya)*. Unpublished master dissertation. Gazi University. The Institute of Education Sciences, Ankara.
78. Sezgin, F. (2010). "School Culture as a Predictor of Teachers' Organizational Commitment". *Education and Science Journal*. 35(156), 142-159.
79. Sezgin-Nartgün, Ş. & Kartal, V. 2013. "Teachers' Perceptions on Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Silence". *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*. 2(2), 47-67.
80. Şirin, E. (2011). *The Relationship between Cultural Perceptions and Organizational Cynicism of Class and Subject Teachers in Primary Schools (the Case of Istanbul-Esenyurt)*. Unpublished master dissertation. Yeditepe University. The Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
81. Tak, B. & Çiftçioğlu, B. A. (2008). The Relationship Between Occupational Commitment and Intend to Remain: an Empirical Investigation. *Ankara University journal of Faculty of Political Sciences*. 63(4), 156-178.
82. Terzi, A. R. & Kurt, T. (2005). "Effect of Administrative Behaviors of Administrators in Elementary Schools on Teachers' Organizational Commitment". *Journal of National Education Three-month Education and Social Sciences*. (33), 98-112.

83. Tok, T. N. (2007). *İlköğretim Müfettişlerinin İş Doyumu ve Örgütsel Bağlılıkları*. Ankara: Tem-Sen Yayınları.
84. Tokgöz, N. & Yılmaz, H. (2008). "Organizational Cynicism: An Investigation on Hotel Organizations in Eskişehir and Alanya". *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*. 8(2), 283-305.
85. Turan, Ş. (2011). *Organizational Cynicism as a Factor That Affects the Organizational Change in Process of Globalization and an Application in Karaman's Public Institutions*. Unpublished master dissertation. Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University. The Institute of Social Sciences, Karaman.
86. Uysa, H. T. & Yıldız, M. S. (2014). "Effect of the Work Psychology on Organizational Cynicism According to the Performance of Employees". *Journal of International Social Research*. 7(29), 835-849.
87. Wahn, J. C. (1998). "Sex Differences in the Continuance Component or Organization Commitment". *Group & Organizational Management*. 23(3), 256-268.
88. Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E. & Austin, J. T. (2000). "Cynicism about Organizational Change: Measurement Antecedent and Correlates, *Group and Organizational Management*. 25(2), 132-153.
89. Yavuz, A. & Bedük, A. (2016). "The relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment: a case study in the branches in Konya of a government bank". *Selçuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*. (35), 301-313.
90. Yazıcıoğlu, İ. & Topaloğlu, I. G. (2009). "Relationship between Organizational Justice and Commitment: A Case Study in Accommodation Establishments". *Business Research Journal*. 1(1), 3-16.
91. Yıldırım, S. (2012). "Attribution Theory in Nursing Services: A Field Study. *Journal of Hacettepe Health Administration*, 15(2). Accessed July 30, 2016. <http://www.saglikidaresidergisi.hacettepe.edu.tr/tr/menu/2012-23>
92. Yıldız K. (2012). "The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Dissent". *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turtic*. 8(6), 853-879.
93. Yılmaz, E. (2009). "Examining Organizational Commitment of Primary School Teachers Regarding to Their Job Satisfaction and Their School's Organizational Creativity". *Elementary Education Online*. 8(2), 476-484.
94. Yılmaz A. & Eroğlu, C. (2012). *Davranış Bilimleri ve Örgütsel Davranış*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
95. Yücel, İ. & Çetinkaya, B. (2015). "Relationship between Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Commitment and Moderating Effects of Age of Employees

on the Relationship". *Atatürk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*. 19(3), 247-271.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).