

EURASIAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT

<http://www.eurasianpublications.com>

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AMONG HOTEL EMPLOYEES IN SOUTHEASTERN ANATOLIA REGION OF TURKEY

Melih Aydin

Kilis 7 Aralık University, Turkey
Email: maydin@kilis.edu.tr

Gürkan Akdag

Mersin University, Turkey
Email: gurkanakdag@mersin.edu.tr

Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine whether relationship occurs between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism attitudes among employees who were employed in five and four star hotels located in Southeastern Anatolia Region of Turkey and to affirm the extent of the relationship. According to the findings, there is a significant (negative) relationship between three sub-dimensions of organizational cynicism (behavioral cynicism, affective cynicism and cognitive cynicism) and organizational commitment. Multiple regression and correlation analysis were applied to analyze data and identify the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism. According to the findings of the research, it is revealed that, as the level of organizational cynicism arises, attitudes toward organizational commitment decrease. Those results are consistent with findings of the previous studies that employees with cynical attitudes exhibited lower commitment in the organization. The results of this research showed that hotel employees mostly experience cognitive cynicism among sub-dimensions of cynicism and they rarely experience affective cynicism. In conclusion, it is possible to assert that employees were with medium level of organizational cynicism and organizational commitment.

Keywords: Organizational Commitment, Organizational Cynicism, Southeastern Anatolia, Hotels

1. Introduction

As a basic component of the organizations and business, human factor has been attracted the attention of industry professionals and scientists for many years. Organizations, employees who are actively work in the organizations, and the relationships they have developed within the organization, have affected the scientists working in the business literature last thirty years. Especially employees' commitment to the organization and inter-organizational relations are examined frequently, notably in labor intensive businesses and the numbers of studies on this

topic are expanding every year. Conceptually organizational commitment is a strong wish, desire to remain as a member of a particular organization, wish to exert high level of effort for the organization or a recognizable belief, reliance and acceptability of the values and goals of the organization (Becker *et al.* 1995). On the other hand, organizational cynicism which is expressed as “the employees' negative attitudes towards the environment in which they work or towards their own occupation” is one of the substantial topics attracting the attention of researchers in recent years. Cynicism, which is emerged as a result of diverse stress factors employees face in their work, and organizational effects of the cynicism are among the topics closely concerned to success of the company and customer satisfaction. Organizational destruction and negative organizational climate, which employees' with cynical attitudes might create, is an unacceptable situation, especially for the hospitality businesses. The aim of the study is to resolve whether relationship exists between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment attitudes among hotel employees who are employed in five and four star hotels in the Southeastern Anatolia Region of Turkey. Especially, the character of touristic activities in the geographical boundaries of the study and rare studies that maintained in the region in terms of tourism, scientifically ensure that the issue is an original theme.

2. Concept of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is the emotional bond or relations between staff and the company they work for (Meyer and Allen, 1997; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Khalili and Asmawi, 2012). Organizational commitment, which based on a different definition, is natural disposition of relationship of the individual to the system as a whole (Grusky, 1966). To state the matter differently, organizational commitment is defined as the degree to which an employee becomes identical with the organization and desires to continue actively participating in the organization (Davis and Newstrom 1989). Organizational commitment is profoundly valuable in today's modern business structures. Because, a commitment employee is engaged to organization's goals and values with an essential reliance, obeys the instructions and expectations spontaneously (Balay, 2000). In particular, it is extremely valuable for the enterprises that are operating in the modern business conditions to care about organizational commitment in order to achieve the goals.

Organizational commitment subject first began to be studied in the mid-twentieth century, then different theories on this subject has developed especially by Porter, and many different researchers well known in this area such as Mowday, Becker, Steers, Allen, Meyer, (Gul, 2002). Various scientific theories are available in the literature about organizational commitment subject but among organizational commitment theory approaches, the most well known and most frequently mentioned in the scientific literature is Allen and Meyer's organizational commitment theory approach.

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), all organizational commitment approaches are based on three basic constituent: These elements are affective commitment, perceived costs and obligation. Organizational commitment is originated by the relationship between individuals in organization and the organization itself with respect to three essential components: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Affective commitment is based on the employee involvement and attachment to the organization where s/he is employed. In the affective commitment, the organization has a great meaning and importance for the individual; therefore, committed individuals see themselves as a part of the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Continuance commitment is to remain the organization's membership status with respect to the prediction that leaving the organization would cost unforeseen results (perceptions of worse employment occasions). In this kind of commitment, for the employee, leaving the organization is not that easy because leaving the job would emerge several costs and difficulties (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Gul and Col, 2005). In this concept of commitment, organizational commitment is stated in terms of cost-reward perspective. The last dimension related to organizational commitment is the normative commitment. Normative commitment refers to working in an organization where employee considers it as a major task. In normative commitment, employee feels that to remain within the organization will be the right choice

(moral duty/obligation). Employees remain in the organization with a sense of gratitude. The reason of that is that they were employed when they cried out for the job or their value judgments say that it should be the best option at that moment to continue with their current employer. This kind of commitment is based on obligation (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Bayram, 2006).

3. Cynicism and Organizational Cynicism

Cynicism refers to an inherent, constant trait showing a generally negative sense of human behavior (Mirvis and Kanter, 1991; Andersson, 1996; Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Mautner, 1997; Eaton, 2000; Stanley *et al.* 2005; Abraham, 2000). Cynicism is close in meaning with those words: incredulity, skepticism, distrust, disbelief, pessimism, and negativeness and within the modern interpretations of cynicism; criticizing, captious, and finicking attributes of individuals are emphasized more (Erdost *et al.* 2007; Ozler *et al.* 2010). Cynicism is an attitude that consists of doubt and disappointment notions together with negative feelings. This opinion reveals that people could face cynicism almost everywhere. The reflection of such behaviors of individuals toward an organization can be explained by the organizational cynicism. Organizational cynicism, which is a negative attitude of the employee towards the organization, occurs associated with three multidimensional components (beliefs, affect and behavioral tendencies) (Dean *et al.* 1998). In another definition, Bernerth *et al.* (2007, p.313), describe organizational cynicism as “beliefs of individuals that, their organization lacks ethical integrity and that doctrines such as justice, righteousness and frankness are sacrificed for organizational expedience”.

General cynicism and organizational cynicism have different structural characteristics. In other words, general cynicism stems from an individual's personality whereas organizational cynicism takes into account organizational factors which cause cynical attitude among employees. In addition to this, there has been a consensus in the literature that, organizational cynicism is quite different from organizational commitment, organizational trust and alienation concepts regarding to organization (Dean *et al.* 1998; Stanley *et al.* 2005; Tokgoz and Yilmaz, 2008). Organizational cynicism among the employees appears as follows: Initially, a number of beliefs related to organization appear in the organizations; those beliefs firstly turn into feelings, then into behaviors towards colleagues and other stakeholders in the organization. In that respect; organizational cynicism can be investigated under three main headings. First one is the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism which stresses the belief that organization and the individuals in the organization lack frankness or integrity. Second dimension is the emotional dimension and following the first stage, it includes beliefs that turn into feelings such as ridicule, anger and hatred in the organization. Third and last dimension is the behavioral dimension and following the actual beliefs and feelings take shape at the first and second stage, those beliefs and feelings turn into criticism, disparage and complaint in behavioral dimension (Ergen, 2015).

4. Earlier Studies

There have been some researches in the literature that examine the relationship between organizational commitment and cynicism. In their research, Wanous *et al.* (2000) concluded that individuals with cynical feelings have lower organizational commitment. In the same way, employees with the high level of commitment were observed to be less likely to exhibit cynical behavior. Pitre (2004) found that there is a relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism in United States Naval Academy and also a relation between decision-making and risk-taking is documented as well. Naus (2007) concluded that employees with organizational cynicism have a decrease in organizational commitment, motivation and job satisfaction. Rubin *et al.* (2009) found negative relationship between leaders' level of cynicism towards organizational change and organizational commitment. In another study, Barnes (2010) stated that employees with cynical attitudes exhibit lower commitment and it has referred that sometimes cynicism may have a positive impact on the organizations.

Yet another research done by Altınöz *et al.* (2011), relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism, perceived by hotel employees was examined. It was stated that when organizational commitment level of employee increases, they exhibit less cynical attitudes; likewise, employees with cynical attitudes become less committed. Findik and Eryesil (2012) examined the effect of the employees' cynical attitudes towards changes on their organizational commitment. A negative relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment was documented in the research. Balıkcıoğlu (2013) investigated the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment in hospitality businesses in Antalya. Research results indicated that, employees exhibit low organizational cynicism and high organizational commitment. Ergen (2015) found similar results with previous studies and stated that organizational commitment decreases when organizational cynicism increases.

5. Methods

Quantitative research design is used to work out this research which investigates the relationship between degrees of organizational commitment and organizational cynicism of the employees in the hotel businesses. Data collection method of the study consists of 3 sections. In the first section; there are questions related to organizational commitment and questions to determine organizational commitment levels of the employees. In the second section; expressions towards organizational cynicism, and in the last section; there are given eight individual titles in order to explain the demographic characteristics. The first part of the questionnaire consists of scale which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1997), which is the most widely, used organizational commitment scale in the literature. In total, there are 20 questionnaire items asked to evaluate the questionnaire forms from strongly agreed (5) to strongly disagreed (1). The scale used in the second part of the study is related to organizational cynicism and developed by Brandes (1997). In the organizational cynicism scale, there are totally given 13 survey questions. 5 survey questions of cognitive dimension, 4 survey questions of affective dimension and 4 survey questions of behavioral dimension were submitted to participants. We applied the questionnaire model of Balıkcıoğlu (2013) in this research. However, some retouches were done to make it applicable in the hotels located in Southeastern Anatolia Region. The research data were collected between January 1 and September 10, 2015. 360 questionnaires were subjected to analysis. In order to achieve the research objectives, based on studies performed earlier in the literature, "there is a significant negative correlation between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism" hypothesis has been tested.

6. Reliability Analysis

To determine the reliability of organizational commitment and organizational cynicism scales, Cronbach's alpha coefficient is applied. Based on the study findings, Cronbach's alpha value for reliability of affective commitment is 0.901 for continuance commitment is 0.741 and for normative commitment, it is found as 0.735. Cronbach's alpha value of the organizational commitment scale, as a whole is 0.835. In organizational cynicism scale, Cronbach's alpha value of the cognitive cynicism is 0.780 affective cynicism is 0.949 and behavioral cynicism is found as 0.949. Cronbach's alpha value of the organizational cynicism scale, as a whole, is seen as 0.853.

7. Findings of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis applied to the scale of organizational commitment is seen on Table 1. As a result of factor analysis, items are categorized under 3 factors. The proportion of variance explained as a whole is found as 64.128%. Factor identifications are defined in accordance with the original scale. In this context, affective commitment is determined as the first factor and this factor is grouped under 6 items.

Table 1. Descriptive Factor Analysis Results of Organizational Commitment Scale

Factors/Statements	Factor Values			Eigenvalue	Variance (%)	Alpha	Std Deviation	Mean
	1	2	3					
Affective Commitment Scale Items				4.65	35.73	0.90		3.48
3. I feel like part of the family when I work in this hotel	0.86						1.22	3.59
5. This hotel has a great deal of personal meaning for me	0.83						1.14	3.52
4. I feel emotionally attached to this hotel	0.83						1.19	3.35
2. I really feel as if this hotel's problems are my own	0.81						1.19	3.62
6. I feel a strong sense of belonging to this hotel	0.79						1.07	3.44
1. I would feel very happy to spend the rest of my career in this hotel	0.72						1.29	3.35
Normative Commitment Scale Items				2.45	18.88	0.74		3.10
19. I would not leave from here right now, because I get a sense of obligation to people in this hotel		0.77					1.20	2.95
17. I would feel guilty if I left from the hotel now		0.73					1.20	2.93
20. I owe a great deal to the hotel that I work		0.70					1.21	3.03
18. This hotel deserves my loyalty		0.68					1.12	3.48
Continuance Commitment Scale Items				1.38	9.52	0.74		2.81
9. It would be too costly for me to leave from the hotel that I work in the near future.			0.83				1.22	2.78
8. Too much in my life would be ruined if I decided I wanted to leave from the hotel now.			0.82				1.26	2.69
10. Right now, staying with this company is a matter of necessity as much as desire.			0.75				1.26	2.95

Notes: Varimax rotated principal components analysis. Total variance explained: 64.128%. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling: 85.7%. Bartlett's Test: X^2 : 1972.328; $p \leq 0.000$. General Average: 3.127; Alpha for the whole scale: 0.835
 Answer Categories: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree

The first factor (affective commitment) in factor structure explains 35.730% of the total variance and the eigenvalue of the factor is 4.645. The average of the responses to the statements under that factor is observed as 3.480. Statements under second factor, is determined as "normative commitment" this factor is grouped under 4 items. The second factor (normative commitment) in factor structure explains 18.877% of the total variance and the eigenvalue of the factor is 2.454. Participants' average response for those statements under normative commitment factor is observed as 3.097. The last factor is determined as "continuance commitment" and this factor explains 9.521% of the total variance and the eigenvalue of the continuance commitment factor is determined as 1.238. Average value of factor dimensions of participants is 2.806.

Factor analysis results of organizational cynicism scale are given in Table 2. As a result of factor analysis, it is determined that, scale, which is consisting of 12 statements, is grouped under 3 dimensions. The scale, as a whole, explains 70.471% of the total variance.

Table 2. Descriptive Factor Analysis Results of Organizational Cynicism Scale

Factors/Statements	Factor Values			Eigenvalue	Variance (%)	Alpha	Std Deviation	Mean
	1	2	3					
Affective Dimension				4.53	37.73	0.95		2.27
27. When I think about my hotel, I experience aggravation.	0.93						1.23	2.27
28. When I think about my hotel, I experience tension.	0.91						1.24	2.29
26. When I think about my hotel, I get angry.	0.91						1.23	2.26
29. When I think about my hotel, I feel a sense of anxiety	0.86						1.22	2.28
Cognitive Dimension				2.43	20.24	0.78		2.92
22. My hotel's policies, goals, and practices seem to have little in common		0.81					1.10	2.98
23. If an application was said to be done in my hotel, I'd be more skeptical whether it would happen or not.		0.76					1.20	2.88
21. I believe that my hotel says one thing and does another		0.73					1.26	3.06
24. My hotel expects one thing of its employees, but rewards another		0.67					1.15	2.95
25. In my hotel I see very little resemblance between the events that are going to be done and the events which are done.		0.65			1.18	2.75		
Behavioral Dimension				1.50	12.50	0.82		2.78
32. I talk with others about how work is being carried out in the hotel.			0.89				1.29	2.76
33. I criticize the practices and policies of my hotel to people outside the hospital.			0.84				1.32	2.77
31. We look at each other in a meaningful way with my colleagues when my hotel and its employees are mentioned.			0.76				1.26	2.80

The first factor (affective cynicism) in factor structure consists of 4 statements and explains 37.733% of the total variance. Eigenvalue of the factor is determined as 4,528 and average response rate for survey of the participants is determined as 2.274. "Cognitive cynicism" factor consisted of 5 statements explained 20.242% of the total variance. Eigenvalue of the factor is determined as 2.429. Average response rate for survey of the participants under this factor is determined as 2.923. Last factor, which is called "Behavioral Cynicism" consists of 3 statements and explains 12.496% of the total variance. Eigenvalue of the factor is determined as 1.500 and average response rate for survey of the participants is determined as 2.775.

8. Pearson Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is used to determine the strength (low-medium-strong) and direction (positive, negative) of the linear relationship between two variables. (Pallant, 2005). As a result of correlation analysis, it is concluded that there is a significant ($r = -0.434$; $p < 0.01$) and negative correlation between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism. The results support the hypotheses of Balıkcıoğlu (2013), Altinoz *et al.* (2010) and developed in the literature. There is a negative and statistically significant relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment. It is concluded that organizational commitment level decreases when organizational cynicism level of the employees increases.

9. Results and Recommendations

In respect to the organizations, consisting of people who are acting for a common purpose, commitment has a great role. Commitment concept, which means the bond between an employee and the organization, is an issue that should not be ignored in the tough competition environment. On the other hand, cynicism concept identified with ancient Greek philosophers having a deep rooted history has begun to find its place in the literature in recent years. This study was carried out in Southeastern Anatolia region in Turkey which has many hotels with a rapidly developing industry. The study focuses on relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism degrees among hotel staff working in five and four star hotels in the Southeastern Anatolia Region in Turkey. A negative relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment is found. In other words, it is observed that organizational commitment level decreases when organizational cynicism level of the employees increases. In addition to this, level of relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism identified as medium. In terms of demographic characteristics, it can be inferred that vast majority (two-thirds) of the employees are around with minimum wage level of income. Considering the minimum living conditions in Turkey, those figures should be revised to motivate employees. In hotel businesses, where, a smiling face and tolerance is much needed, it is inevitable to communicate one-to-one with the hotel guests. Base payment policies that employees deserve should be reconsidered. Such factors that might cause cynicism and demotivate employees should be responsively evaluated. Thus, motivating employees with constructive wage policies will be possible. Therefore, creation of cynicism in the organizations that decreases or even destroys commitment could be prevented and measures could be taken before the cancer spread to the organizations.

References

- Abraham, R., 2000. Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), pp. 269–292.
- Allen N. J. and Meyer J. P., 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 63(1), pp.1-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Altinoz, M., Cop, S., and Siğindi, T., 2011. Algılanan örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisi: Ankara'daki dört ve beş yıldızlı konaklama işletmeleri üzerine bir araştırma. [Relationship between perceived organizational commitment and organizational cynicism: A research on four and five star accommodation establishments in Ankara]. *Journal of Social and Economic Research*, 11(21), pp. 285-317.
- Andersson, L. M. and Bateman, T. S., 1997. Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), pp. 449-469. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199709\)18:5<449::AID-JOB808>3.0.CO;2-O](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199709)18:5<449::AID-JOB808>3.0.CO;2-O)
- Andersson, L., 1996. Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11), pp.1395-1418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679604901102>
- Balay, R., 2000. *Yönetici ve öğretmenlerde örgütsel bağlılık. [Organizational commitment in administrators and teachers]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım [Nobel Publications].
- Balıkcioglu, S., 2013. *Antalya Bölgesi konaklama işletmeleri çalışanlarının örgütsel sinizm tutumları ile bağlılık ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma. [Determining the relationship between the attitudes of organizational cynicism and commitment of the employees in hotel businesses in Antalya]*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Hatay: Mustafa Kemal University.
- Barnes, L.L., 2010. *The effects of organizational cynicism on community colleges: Exploring concepts from positive psychology*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. California: Claremont Graduate University.

- Bayram, L., 2006. Yonetimde yeni bir paradigma: Orgutsel baglilik. [A New Paradigm in Management: Organizational Commitment]. *Sayistay Dergisi [Court of Account Journal]*, 59, pp.125-139.
- Becker, T.E., Randal, D.M., and Riegel, C.D., 1995. The multidimensional view of commitment and theory of reasoned action: A comparative evaluation. *Journal of Management*, 21(4), pp.617–638. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100402>
- Bernerth, J. B., 2007. Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), pp.303-326. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0021886306296602>
- Brandes, P., 1997. *Organizational cynicism: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Ohio: University of Cincinnati.
- Davis, K., and Newstrom, J.W., 1989. *Human behavior at work, organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Dean, J., Brandes, P., and Dharwadkar, R., 1998. Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), pp.341-352.
- Eaton, J. A., 2000. *A social motivation approach to organizational cynicism*. Dissertation of Master of Arts. Toronto, Ontario: York University.
- Erdost, H. E., Karacaooglu, K., and Reyhanoglu, M., 2007. *Orgutsel sinizm kavrami ve ilgili olceklerin Türkiye'deki bir firmada test edilmesi. [Organizational cynicism and testing related scales in a firm in Turkey]*. Sakarya: Sakarya University (XV. National Management and Organization Congress Proceedings).
- Ergen, S., 2015. *Ogretmenlerin orgutsel sinizm düzeyleri ile orgutsel baglilikleri arasindaki iliski [Relationship between teachers' organizational cynicism and organizational commitment levels]*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ankara: Gazi University.
- Findik, M. and Eryesil, K., 2012. *Orgutsel sinizmin orgutsel baglilik üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A research to determine the effects of organizational cynicism on organizational commitment]*. *Karabük International Iron and Steel Symposium*, pp.1250-1255.
- Grusky, O., 1966. Career mobility and organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10(4), pp. 488–503. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2391572>
- Gul, H., 2002. Orgutsel baglilik yaklasimlarinin mukayesesi ve degerlendirilmesi [Comparison and evaluation of organizational commitment approaches]. *Ege Academic Review*, 2(1), pp.38-56.
- Gul, H., and Col, G., 2005. Kisisel ozelliklerin orgutsel baglilik üzerine etkileri ve kamu universitelerinde bir uygulama [Impacts of personal characteristics on organizational commitment and a study in public universities]. *Atatürk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 19(1), pp.291-306.
- Khalili, A. and Asmawi, A., 2012. Appraising the impact of gender differences on organizational commitment: Empirical evidence from a private small and medium enterprises in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), pp.100-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n5p100>
- Mautner, T., 1997. *Dictionary of philosophy*. London: Penguin.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J., 1997. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. California: Thousand Oaks.
- Mirvis, P. and Kanter, D.L., 1991. Beyond demography: A psychographic profile of the workforce. *Human Resource Management*, 30(1), pp.45-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930300104>
- Naus, A.J.A.M., 2007. *Organizational cynicism: On the nature, antecedents, and consequences of employee cynicism toward the employing organization*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Maastricht: Maastricht University.
- O'Reilly, C.A., and Chatman, J., 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), pp.492-499. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>

- Ozler, D.E., Atalay, C., and Sahin, M.D., 2010. Orgutlerde sinizm guvensizlikle mi bulasir? [Does the cynicism spread in organizations with distrustfulness?] *Journal of Organization and Management Sciences*, 2(2), pp.47-57.
- Pallant, J., 2005. *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using spss for windows*. Australia: Australian Copyright.
- Pitre, J. L., 2004. *Organizational cynicism at The United States Naval academy: An exploratory study*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Monterey, California: Naval Postgraduate School.
- Rubin, S. R., Dierdoff, E. C., Bommer, W., and Baldwin, T., 2009. Do leaders reap what they sow? Leader and employee outcomes of leader organizational cynicism about change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), pp.680-688. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.06.002>
- Stanley, D., Meyer, J. and Topolnytsky, L., 2005. Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), pp.429-459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-4518-2>
- Tokgoz, N. and Yilmaz, H., 2008. Orgutsel sinisizm: Eskisehir ve Alanya'daki otel isletmelerinde bir uygulama. [Organizational Cynicism: An investigation on hotel organizations in Eskisehir and Alanya]. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), pp.283-305.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A.E., and Austin, J. T., 2000. Cynicism about organizational change: Measurement, antecedent and correlates. *Group & Organizational Management*, 25(2), pp.132-153. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601100252003>