



The Relationship between High School Teachers' Organizational Support Perceptions and Their Organizational Cynicism Attitudes

Necmi Gökyer ¹, İsmail Türkoğlu ²

Abstract

The objective of this research study is to determine the relationship between perceptions of organizational support and attitudes of organizational cynicism in teachers who work in high schools. The relational screening model among the general screening models was recruited in this research study. The universe of the study constitutes a total of 2805 teachers from different branches working in 47 high schools in Elazığ province during 2016-2017 academic year. According to the results of the research; perceptions of the teachers' organizational support and justice sub-dimension are in the level of high, while the teachers' perceptions of the personal and professional development sub-dimension and the whole scale are in moderate level. The teachers' perceptions of the organizational ownership sub-dimension is in the level of low. There is a high level of relationship between organizational support and justice and personal and professional development. For gender change, female teachers' perceptions of organizational ownership are more positive than male teachers. The perceptions of the teachers working in the province center on the scale and organizational support and justice and personal and professional development sub-dimensions are higher than the district centers. As for the question of 'do you think that they will leave the institution?', 64% of the teachers answered no, 18,4% responded as partially and 17,6% responded yes. The highest score that teachers receive from organizational cynicism is the cognitive cynicism attitude scores. There is a moderately negative correlation between cognitive and affective cynicism and organizational support and justice; and there is a weak negative relationship between behavioral cynicism and organizational support and justice. Together with organizational support and justice, personal and professional development and organizational ownership sub-factors present a moderate, negative and meaningful relationship with teachers' cognitive cynicism attitude scores.

Keywords

High school
Teacher
Perception of organizational support
Organizational cynicism
Cynicism

Article Info

Received: 08.01.2017
Accepted: 06.27.2018
Online Published: 10.23.2018

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2018.7440

¹ Firat University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, ngokyer@firat.edu.tr

² Firat University, Faculty of Education, Department of Education and Mathematics Education, Turkey, isturkoglu@firat.edu.tr

Introduction

Organizational cynicism can have some negative effects on organizations. decreased organizational commitment, lack of job satisfaction, low self-esteem, the increase in redundancy rates (Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Wanous, Reichers and Austin, 2000), the increase in organizational commitment, job dissatisfaction, the increase in redundancy rates, sabotage, theft, fraud, increase in dismissal rates, disobedience, increase in doubt for the organization, increase in insecurity, increased alienation of work, decreased organizational performance, increased absenteeism, increase in negative attitudes, decrease in motivation, increase in organizational humiliation, discontinuation of association with the organization, decrease in self-confidence in the occupation, reluctance in the effort shown for organizational change, feeling uninformed, lack of communication and respect, lack of respect and morale, reduced credibility of the organization, lack of communication and respect shown by the manager (Kalağan, 2009) are some of the cognitive, emotional and behavioral attitudes and behavioral examples of negative results in terms of organizations. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of organizational support perceptions on organizational cynicism, revealing the relationship between organizational support and organizational cynicism, factors that have significant effects on individual and organizational performance.

Organizational support based on the social change theory (Loi, Hang-Yue, & Foley, 2006, p. 109) and organizational support as a subject of psychological contracts (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986, p. 503; Shore & Shore, 1995, p. 151) is significant for occupations which are particularly difficult to meet demands from work and from outside of the workplace (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990, p. 56). Blau's (1964) theory of social change suggests that mutual obligations exist between employees and organizations but cannot be articulated and cause significant negative consequences when they are violated (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005, p. 777). According to the theory, organizations initiate and maintain social change as long as they invest in the happiness of their employees and ensure that they are perceived correctly by occupations (Allen, Shore, & Griffeth, 2003, p. 102; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 703). Perceived organizational support is defined by Eisenberger et al., (1986, p. 500) as an emotional attachment to the employee, involvement and perceptions about their well-being and voluntary involvement in activities that affect their employees. The organizational support is a sort of concept based on perception and it also means that the individual feels and thinks how much support the organization has given to him (Yoshimura, 2003, p. 10).

Perceived organizational support reflects the quality of the relationship between the employee and the organization. The quality of this relationship is related to the individual perceiving the organization, as an organization which puts value to the contributions of the employees and considers the well-being of the employees. (Yürür, 2005, p. 96). Perceived organizational support is significant because it specifies the universal beliefs that include the commitment of workplaces to their organizations, the valuation of the contributions of the employees, and their concern for their peacefulness (Zagenczyk, 2006, p. 13). The organizational support perceived by the employees causes them to feel safe and feel their strength behind them (Özdevicioğlu, 2003, p. 116). The organizational support means "trusting the institution to show dedication to its employees". (Schaffer and Harrison, 2001, p. 102).

The Origin and the Definition of the Concept of Cynicism

Cynicism as a form of thought and life has emerged in the ancient Greece (Brandes, 1997, p. 7). Its origins come from the "cynical" word of ancient Greek philosophical thought that emerged in

500 BC. (Mantere & Martinsuo, 2001, p. 4; Metzger, 2004, p. 24). When we analyze the concept from psychological perspective, the situation is observed as "lying, pretending and acting selfishly" (Mirvis & Kanter, 1991, p. 50-52). Cynicism is the negative views of mankind, which often show others as worthless, deceitful and selfish (Barefoot, Dodge, Peterson, Dahlstrom and Williams, 1989, p. 48).

When we examine the literature on organizational cynics, it was seen that various definitions and theoretical foundations were created. According to Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar, (1998, p. 345), the expectancy theory, the attribution theory, the attitude theory, the social change theory, the emotional incidents theory as well as the concept of organizational cynicism are the lack of integrity and honesty, the negative attitude of the individual to the organization.

The concept of organizational cynicism, by Dean et al., (1998, p. 345) also includes beliefs and emotions that tend to have "negative feelings" related to the organization, "degrading" and "critical" behaviors related to the organization. The organizational cynicism is described as harsh critics, cynical (negative) beliefs and negative emotions that are made openly or discreetly about the organization. It is observed that the concept of organizational cynicism is an attitude in the direction of Dean et al., (1998, p. 345).

The concept of the organizational cynicism is defined as "the attitudes of an individual to the employee organization which are shaped by negative beliefs, emotions and behaviors, as well as an answer to the past social and personal experiences which are open to change by the environmental factors" according to James (2005, p. 7). It is observed that the organizational cynicism is examined under two dimensions. First one is the negative attitudes due to personal mistakes and second one is the idea that the organization will improve (Brandes, 1997, p. 18). What is essential in the organizational cynicism is sincerity, truthfulness, honesty and justice. Leaders in institutions are deprived of these principles in order to bring their individual interests to the forefront. As a result, there are reasons to be based on motives and deceptions hidden in the institution (Abraham, 2000, p. 269). While the concept of organizational cynicism is defined by Andersson (1996, p. 1404) and Mirvis and Kanter (1991, p. 61), they also stated that organizations may have cynical characteristics. The characteristics of these institutional which are cynical are listed as following: based on games and abuse, one-sided communication with employees, nervous behaviors, institutions that support executives who act hypocritically to their employees and embody values selfishly.

The reasoning of the cynicism is based on personality and organizational features (Kalağan, 2009). As personality traits, the negative features such as inadequacy or laziness of the workshops are emphasized. It is expected a change in institutions to prevent negative personality traits that the employees will fulfill their responsibilities (Brandes, 1997, p. 17-18). The organizational cynicism in terms of institutional features is a part of institutions and a sort of power affecting institutions, individuals and business life (James, 2005, p. 25). There are several factors of the organizational cynicism such as increased unfair behavior in institutions, decreased organizational support, violations of psychological contracts, increased working hours, and ineffectiveness of leaders in institutions (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006, p. 201; Eaton, 2000, p. 8; James, 2005, p. 37, Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008; Öğüt, Özgener, & Kaplan, 2008; Dikmetaş, Top, Durukan, Ergin, & Yiğit, 2010; Güzel, Perçin, & Tükeltürk, 2010; Sur, 2010; Kabataş, 2010; Çalışkan & Erim, 2010; Pelit & Ayduğan, 2011; İnce & Turan, 2011; Şirin, 2011; Kalay & Oğrak, 2012; Alan & Fidanboy, 2012; Tınaztepe, 2012).

An employee who cannot perceive organizational support as a strong, may experience insecurity, frustration towards organization. In this case, it is expected that there will be a negative

relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism (Tokgöz, 2011) because the employee will develop a negative attitude towards the organization. Brandes (1997) stated that the perception that employees are not regarded by the management can reveal organizational cynicism.

1. The problem of this research was arranged in the form of "Is there a relation between the organizational support and the attitudes of organizational cynics perceived by the teachers working at the high schools?" In the research, the following questions were searched. What is the level of the teachers' perception of the organizational support?

2. Does the teachers' perceptions of the organizational support lead to a significant difference between their sub-dimensions?

3. Do the teachers' perception of the organizational support with respect to organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational commitment, change according to the variables of gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, place of work and thinking about leaving the institution?

4. What is the level of the teachers' attitudes towards the organizational cynicism?

5. Do the attitudes of teachers to institutional cynics lead to a significant difference in their sub-dimensions?

6. Do the teachers' perception of the organizational support with respect to cognitive, affective and behavioral sub-dimensions, change according to the variables of gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, place of work and thinking about leaving the institution?

7. What is the level of correlation between teachers' perceptions of organizational support and organizational cynicism attitudes?

Method

In this study, the relational scanning type research among the scanning type research methods were recruited. Scanning type of researches aim to describe past or present situations as they exist (Karasar, 2009, p. 77). As for the relational scanning researches, they aim to determine the presence or degree of interchange between two or more variables (Karasar, 2009).

Universe and Sample

The universe of the study constitutes a total of 2805 teachers working in 47 high schools located in Elazığ province center in the academic year of 2016-2017. When the sample is taken, stratified sampling management consisting of different high school types is used to determine the subgroups of the different high school types in the universe and to represent them in the sample with the proportions within the universe size. Then, 482 teachers working in 12 schools determined by random sampling method from these layers were distributed data collection tool. Only the data collection tool of 386 teachers was evaluated. The scale used by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) is used to determine the size of the sample. The sample size required for a 95% confidence level on the chart of 2800 people is 338 people (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970, p. 607). There are 42 high schools in Elazığ. 22 of them are anatolian high school, 17 of them are vocational and technical high school of different kind, 2 of them are science schools and one of them is of social sciences. 338 people were selected from each layer formed by the units with similar characteristics and distributed proportionally by simple random sampling method.

The demographic characteristics of the teachers participating in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Demographic Features of Teachers

	Demographic Features	n	%
Sex	Woman	145	37,6
	Man	241	62,4
	Total	386	100,0
Marital Status	Married	311	80,6
	Single	75	19,4
Age	21-30	76	19,7
	31-40	114	29,5
	41-50	155	40,2
	51 and above	41	10,6
Professional Seniority	1-2 year	56	14,5
	3-7 year	62	16,1
	8-12 year	91	23,6
	13-17 year	89	23,1
	18-22 year	88	22,8
Title	Candidate teacher	61	15,8
	Teacher	247	64,0
	Senior Teacher	78	20,2
Branch	Sciences	180	46,6
	Social Sciences	206	53,4
Workplace	City center	312	80,8
	District center	74	19,2
Place of duty	Anatolian High School	213	55,2
	Social Sciences High School	12	3,1
	Fen (sciences) High School	52	13,5
	Vocational Technical High School	109	28,2
Do you consider to leave the place that you work?	Yes	68	17,6
	Partially	71	18,4
	No	247	64,0

As it is seen in Table 1, 37.6% (145 people) of the teachers are female and 80.6% (233 people) are married. 40,2% (155 persons) is between the ages of 41-50. 23,1% (104 persons) occupational seniority is between 13-17 years. 64,0% (247 people) teach the title. 53,4% (206 people) are in social sciences. 80.8% (312 persons) of the teachers work in the province center. 55.2% of them are working in Anatolian High School. 64% (247 people) stated that they did not intend to leave the institution.

Data Collection Tools

Data collection tools is formed of three parts. In the first part there are 9 factual questions. In the second part, there is a perceived organizational support inventory (29 items) developed by Kalağan (2009) and adapted to the project to be implemented by the researcher. And finally, in the third part, there are 13 items developed by Brandes, Dharwadkar and Dean (1999) and the items of Organizational Cynicism Scale which are validity and reliability studies made by exploratory factor analysis by the researcher. This scale is a form of Brandes' (1997) 14 items organizational cynicism scale. One item

belonging to behavioral dimension is excluded in this form (Kalağan, 2009, p. 121). Data collection tool is classified as "I totally agree" (5), "I agree" (4), "Partially agree" (3), "I disagree" (2), "I never agree" (1). The distanced of the data collection tool is $4/5 = .80$.

Explanatory factor analysis was carried out to determine the validity of the perceived organizational support inventory. Factor analysis is a statistical technique that aims to explain the measurement by collecting variables that are the same or that measure the quality with few factors (Büyüköztürk, 2009, p. 123). The suitability of the data for factor analysis was tested by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test. The Bartlett Test = 7101,545 and the validity coefficient KMO = .952, $p = .000$. The fact that the value of KMO is greater than 0.90 indicates that the sample size is perfect (Şencan, 2005). According to these results, it was determined that data are suitable for factor analysis. The first exploratory factor analysis for the perceived organizational support inventory was subtracted from the scale (8), which has a load factor of less than 0.40 and a multiple factor of less than or equal to 10.10 (Büyüköztürk, 2009, p. 125). The scale of 29 items decreased to 28 items. Perceived organizational support inventory (ADE) is threefold. The total variance explained by the three factors is 57%. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is .932. After factoring, the first factor of the scale consists of 13 items (1, 2, 3, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28) and the Cronbach Alpha reliability value of this dimension is .945. The load values of the materials in this factor range from 0.550 to 0.764. The second factor consists of ten items (4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 20, 21, 22) and this size is the Cronbach Alpha reliability value, .906. The load values of the items in this factor range between 0.456-0.774. The third factor consists of five items (6, 23, 24, 25 and 29). The Cronbach Alpha reliability value of this dimension is .684. The load values of the substances in this factor range from 0.531 to 0.778. Factors have been tried to be named by considering the contents of the materials. The first factor is named "Organizational support and justice", the second factor is "Personal and professional development", and the third factor is "Organizational ownership".

Explanatory factor analysis was also conducted to ensure that the organizational cynicism scale is valid. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was tested by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test. The Bartlett Test = 4153,149 and the validity coefficient KMO = .923, $p = .000$. For items that do not measure the same for the organizational cynicism scale, values that are above 0.40 of the factor loadings of the items are taken into account (Hair, Anderson, Tahtam, & Black, 1998, p. 112). As a result of the analysis, it is seen that the dimensioning of the data of this study overlaps the dimension of the original form, except one item. The 10th item in the original form was included in the behavioral factor, but it was included in the affective factor in this study. Organizational cynicism scale has three factors. The variance explained by the first factor is 31.48%; The variance explained by the second factor is 28.08%; The variance explained by the third factor is 17.38%. The total variance explained by the three factors is 77%. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is .931. After factoring, the first factor of the scale consists of 5 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and the Cronbach Alpha value is .894. The load values of the substances in this factor range from 0.743 to 0.825. The second factor consists of 5 items (6, 7, 8, 9, 10), which is the Cronbach's alpha value, .950. The load values of the items in this factor range from 0.742 to 0.882. The third factor consists of 3 items (11, 12, 13). The Cronbach Alpha reliability value for this dimension is .791. The load values of the items in this factor range from 0.581 to 0.881. Factors have been tried to be named by considering the contents of the materials. The first factor is called "cognitive", the second factor is "affective", and the third factor is called "Behavioral" dimension.

Resolution of the Data

The data were analyzed in the SPSS 21 program. The frequency and percentage values of the teachers' demographic characteristics (gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, work place, place of employment and situation of leaving the institution) are calculated. Basic statistical techniques were recruited to determine teachers' organizational support perceptions and organizational cynicism attitudes. T-Test was conducted for the variables of gender, marital status, area and workplace. Additionally, for the variables of age, title, seniority, and intention to leave the institution that you are working with, one-dimension ANOVA was used to test whether there is a difference between the

groups' averages. For the non-parametric tests, the Kruskal Wallis H test was recruited (Büyüköztürk, 2009, p. 158). The Pearson Correlation Coefficient is also calculated to determine the level or amount and direction of the relationship between the variables. Simple regression analysis is also calculated to find the answer of the following question: is perceived organizational support a meaningful predictor of organizational cynicism? Significance level of the applied tests was taken as .05. The MWU test tests whether the scores from two unrelated samples differ significantly from each other. It is often used in studies where the distribution of points does not meet the assumption of normality. The Kruskal Wallis technique was used to test whether two or more unrelated sample averages differed significantly (Büyüköztürk, 2009, pp. 155-156).

Results

This section presents the findings coming from teachers.

High school teachers' perceptions of organizational support subscale and the results of analysis performed on the level of what happens in the whole scale is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Analysis Results of Teachers' Perceptions of the Organizational Support

Sub-dimensions	\bar{x}	SS
1. Organizational support and justice	3,52	,87
2. Personal and occupational development	3,14	,88
3. Organizational ownership	2,39	,83
4. All	3,18	,68

As it is seen in Table 2, the perceptions of the organizational support and justice in high school teachers ($\bar{x} = 3,52$), personal and occupational development ($\bar{x} = 3,14$) in the whole of the scale ($\bar{x} = 3,18$) are in moderate level as well as the perceptions of the subscale of organizational ownership ($\bar{x} = 2,39$) are in low level.

The results of the analysis on whether there is a significant relationship between the sub-dimensions of the organizational support perceptions of the teachers is given in Table 3.

Table 3. The Relationship between Teacher' Organizational Support Perceptions According to Sub-Dimensions

		1.	2.	3.
1. Organizational support and justice	Pearson Correlation		,799**	,131**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1	,000	,010
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Pearson Correlation			,045
	Sig. (2-tailed)		1	,378
3. Organizational Ownership	Pearson Correlation			
	Sig. (2-tailed)			1

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is seen above, there is a moderate and positive correlation between organizational support and justice and personal and occupational development with $r=0,799$, $p < 0.01$. Therefore, it can be stated that as organizational support and justice increase, personal and occupational development increases. When the coefficient of correlation ($r^2=0.64$) is taken into account, 64% of the total variance in personal and professional development comes from organizational support and justice. There is a weak and positive correlation between organizational support and justice and organizational ownership with $r=0,131$, $p < 0.01$. It can be stated that as organizational support and justice increase, organizational ownership increases. When the coefficient of correlation ($r^2 = 0.017$) is taken into consideration, 2% of the total variance in organizational ownership comes from organizational support and justice. It is seen

that there is a weak and positive correlation between personal and professional development and organizational ownership with $r = 0,045$, $p < 0.01$. According to this, it can be said that as personal and professional development increases, organizational ownership increases. When the correlation coefficient ($r^2 = 0.0020$) is taken into consideration, it can be said that 0.2% of the total variance in organizational ownership is due to personal and professional development.

The results of the analysis about whether teachers differ according to organizational support perceptions, gender, marital status, branch, work place variables are given in Table 4.

Table 4. T-Test Results on Teachers' Organizational Support Perceptions by Some Variables

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	N	\bar{x}	SS	Levene		t	p																																																																																																																																														
					F	p																																																																																																																																																
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Woman	145	3,51	,88	,126	,722	-,128	,898																																																																																																																																														
	Man	241	3,53	,86					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Woman	145	3,17	,85	,281	,596	,498	,619	Man	241	3,12	,90	3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	145	3,77	,81	,023	,880	3,211	,001*	Man	241	3,49	,83	4. All	Woman	311	3,55	,87	,059	,808	1,234	,220	Man	75	3,41	,84	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	311	3,13	,89	,726	,395	-,377	,707	Single	75	3,18	,84	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442	Single	75	3,66	,82	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Woman	145	3,17	,85	,281	,596	,498	,619																																																																																																																																														
	Man	241	3,12	,90					3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	145	3,77	,81	,023	,880	3,211	,001*	Man	241	3,49	,83	4. All	Woman	311	3,55	,87	,059	,808	1,234	,220	Man	75	3,41	,84	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	311	3,13	,89	,726	,395	-,377	,707	Single	75	3,18	,84	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442	Single	75	3,66	,82	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58							
3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	145	3,77	,81	,023	,880	3,211	,001*																																																																																																																																														
	Man	241	3,49	,83					4. All	Woman	311	3,55	,87	,059	,808	1,234	,220	Man	75	3,41	,84	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	311	3,13	,89	,726	,395	-,377	,707	Single	75	3,18	,84	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442	Single	75	3,66	,82	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																				
4. All	Woman	311	3,55	,87	,059	,808	1,234	,220																																																																																																																																														
	Man	75	3,41	,84					1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	311	3,13	,89	,726	,395	-,377	,707	Single	75	3,18	,84	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442	Single	75	3,66	,82	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																	
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	311	3,13	,89	,726	,395	-,377	,707																																																																																																																																														
	Single	75	3,18	,84					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442	Single	75	3,66	,82	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																														
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	311	3,58	,83	,247	,620	-,772	,442																																																																																																																																														
	Single	75	3,66	,82					3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422	Single	206	3,49	,88	4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																											
3. Organizational Ownership	Married	180	3,56	,85	,093	,761	,803	,422																																																																																																																																														
	Single	206	3,49	,88					4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636	Single	206	3,12	,89	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																								
4. All	Married	180	3,16	,88	,024	,878	,473	,636																																																																																																																																														
	Single	206	3,12	,89					1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																																					
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	180	3,54	,80	1,588	,208	-1,226	,221																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	206	3,65	,85					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80	3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																																																		
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	312	3,63	,85	,552	,458	5,121	,000*																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	74	3,07	,80					3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72	4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																																																															
3. Organizational Ownership	Sciences	312	3,23	,89	7,133	,008	4,312	,000*																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	74	2,75	,72					4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71		City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																																																																												
4. All	Sciences	312	3,56	,85	4,127	,043	-1,881	,062																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	74	3,74	,71																																																																																																																																																		
	City Center	74	2,81	,58																																																																																																																																																		

As seen in Table 4, there is a significant relationship between organizational ownership and sex. Female teachers' perceptions of organizational ownership ($\bar{x} = 3,77$), are more positive than male teachers ($\bar{x} = 3,49$). The calculated value of eta square is (η^2) 0.03. According to this, it can be stated that about 3% of the variance observed in organizational ownership perceptions is due to sex. The calculated Cohen d value is .34. The result shows that the difference between the mean scores of the organizational ownership subscale of male and female teachers is .34 standard deviation. Perceptions of organizational support and justice ($\bar{x} = 3,63$), and teachers in the province center ($\bar{x} = 3,07$) are more positive. This can be interpreted as the fact that the organizational support and justice behaviors of the school

administrators in the province center are more positive than the school administrators in the district center. The perceptions of the teachers working in the province center ($\bar{x} = 3,23$) are more positive than those of the district center ($\bar{x} = 2,75$). This can be interpreted as the fact that the school administrators in the provincial center support the personal and professional development of the teachers more than the school administrators in district centers. The facts that the human and financial resources of the schools in the provincial center are more and that this fact increases the possibilities of the school and that the teachers are more senior and experienced than the teachers in districts are the results of the managerial understandings of the administrators of the provincial schools and their personal characteristics affecting the school culture and climate relatively positively and the high level of morale could have led to a higher perception of managers' support.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on whether teachers think about organizational support perceptions or whether they differ from the institution you are working on differ or not are given in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA on the Variables of Teachers' Age, Title, and Thinking About Leaving the Institution

Sub-dimensions		N	\bar{x}	SS	F	P	Differentiation
Do you consider to leave the institution you work for?							
1. Organizational support and justice	Yes	68	3,14	,92	14,533	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	71	3,30	,76			
	No	247	3,69	,84			
2. Personal and occupational development	Yes	68	2,90	,94	10,910	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	71	2,84	,71			
	No	247	3,30	,87			
3. Organizational ownership	Yes	68	3,32	,73	6,252	,002	1-3
	Partially	71	3,50	,73			
	No	247	3,70	,86			
Title							
1. Organizational support and justice	Candidate Teacher	61	3,42	,87	,986	,374	non-existence
	Teacher	247	3,57	,88			
	Senior Teacher	78	3,45	,81			
2. Personal and occupational development	Candidate Teacher	61	3,07	,84	,235	,791	non-existence
	Teacher	247	3,15	,90			
	Senior Teacher	78	3,17	,86			
3. Organizational ownership	Candidate Teacher	61	3,78	,75	3,270	,039	1-3
	Teacher	247	3,61	,87			
	Senior Teacher	78	3,42	,72			

Since there is no significant difference according to age and seniority variables, no data were given. According to Table 5, teachers' perceptions of organizational support differ significantly in terms of the change in thinking about leaving the institution being studied in all sub-dimensions. According to the results of the Scheffe test to find out which groups show meaningful differences when group variants are equal, the perceptions of teachers who answer "no" ($\bar{x} = 3.69$) in the sub-dimension of organizational support and justice [$F(2, 383) = 14,533$] are higher than the perceptions of teachers who answer "yes" ($\bar{x} = 3.14$) and "partly" ($\bar{x} = 3.30$). In the personal and professional development subscale, the perceptions of the teachers who answer "no" ($\bar{x} = 3.30$) are higher than the scores of the teachers who answer "yes" ($\bar{x} = 2.90$) and "partly" ($\bar{x} = 2.84$). In the organizational ownership sub-dimension, the perceptions of the teachers who answer "yes" ($\bar{x} = 3.32$) are lower than those of the teachers who answer "no" ($\bar{x} = 3.70$). Teachers who responded "Yes" have low perceptions because they think they will leave because they are not satisfied with the school. In terms of title variables, [$F(2, 383) = 3,270$] there is a significant difference only between the perceptions of the candidate teachers and the expert teachers in the organizational ownership sub-dimension. According to Scheffe test results, the perceptions of candidate teachers ($\bar{x} = 3,78$) are higher than the perceptions of expert teachers ($\bar{x} = 3,42$). Organizational support and justice perceptions may have been higher because the candidate's teachers' professional qualifications and experience are low, school experiences are new, and school administrators feel they have received more support during the nomination process.

Teachers' perceptions of organizational support, according to the variable positions made as to whether differentiation of Kruskal-Wallis H test results are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis Results on Teachers Perceptions of Organizational Support According to the Place of Work Variable

Sub-dimension	Place of Duty	n	Rank Average	df	χ^2	p	MWU		
							U	p	Meaningful Different
Organizational support and justice	Anatolian High School	213	188,13	3	10,995	,012	4026,500	,002	1-3
	Social Sciences High School	12	178,21						
	Sciences High School	52	240,75				1979,500	,002	3-4
	Vocational and Technical High School	109	183,14						

Kruskal Wallis H test was applied in order to measure the meaningfulness of the difference between the scores of a group of a small number of subjects in the comparison of the teachers' organizational support perceptions according to the variable of duty, whereas Mann Whitney test is recruited in binary comparisons only in the organizational support and justice subscale. It was observed that the perceptions of organizational support were lower in teachers working in Anatolian high schools than the teachers working in science high schools and that the perceptions of organizational support of teachers working in science high schools were higher than teachers working in vocational and technical high schools and the differences were significant. Science schools are known as the most qualified institutions of our educational system. The most qualified students of the system also study in these schools. Therefore, it can be said that the teachers in these schools are more qualified and their occupational satisfaction is higher. It can be said that the managers who work in these schools give more importance to the organizational support in order to increase the success of the students in order to increase the work efficiency and job satisfaction.

The findings of the analysis about the levels of the teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Analysis Results of Teachers' Attitudes towards Organizational Cynicism

Sub-dimensions	\bar{x}	SS
1. Cognitive	2,19	,96
2. Affective	1,73	,95
3. Behavioral	2,17	,95
4. All	2,01	,80

When the arithmetic mean of teachers' attitudes of organizational cynicism were examined, it was found that the highest level was cognitive ($\bar{x} = 2,19$) which is followed by behavioral ($\bar{x} = 2,17$) and affective dimension ($\bar{x} = 1,73$).

The findings of the analysis about whether there is a significant relationship between the cognitive, affective and behavioral sub-dimensions of the teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes scale is given in Table 8.

Table 8. The Relationship between Teachers' Cynicism Attitudes According to Sub-Dimensions

		1.	2.	3.
1. Cognitive	Pearson Correlation		,648**	,486**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1	,000	,000
2. Affective	Pearson Correlation	,648**	1	,616**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000
3. Behavioral	Pearson Correlation	,486**	,616**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is seen in Table 8, there is a moderate and positive correlation between cognitive attitude and affective attitude with $r=0,648$, $p<0.01$. According to this, it can be said that cognitive cynicism increases the affective cynicism. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2= 0.42$) is taken into consideration, it can be said that 42% of the total variance in affective cynicism comes from cognitive cynicism. There is a moderate and positive correlation between cognitive cynicism and behavioral cynicism with $r=0,486$, $p<0.01$. Accordingly, it can be said that as cognitive cynicism increases, behavioral cynicism increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2= 0.23$) is taken into account, it can be said that 23% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism comes from cognitive cynicism. There is a moderate and positive correlation between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism $r=0,616$, $p<0.01$. According to this, it can be said that behavioral cynicism increases as affective cynicism increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.38$) is taken into account, it can be said that 38% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism comes from affective cynicism.

Organizational cynicism attitudes of teachers; The results of t-Test which is not differentiated according to gender, marital status, branch and workplace variables are given in Table 9.

Table 9. T-Test Results on Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Support

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	N	\bar{x}	SS	Levene		t	p
					F	p		
1. Cognitive	Woman	145	2,17	,94	,191	,662	-,344	,731
	Man	241	2,20	,97				

2. Affective	Woman	145	2,14	,92	1,422	,234	-,371	,711
	Man	241	2,18	,97				
3. Behavioral	Woman	145	2,14	,92	1,422	,234	-,371	,711
	Man	241	2,18	,97				
4. All	Woman	311	2,18	,94	1,829	,177	-,294	,769
	Man	75	2,22	1,04				
1. Cognitive	Married	311	2,15	,94	1,790	,182	-,670	,504
	Single	75	2,24	1,02				
2. Affective	Married	311	2,15	,94	1,790	,182	-,670	,504
	Single	75	2,24	1,02				
3. Behavioral	Married	180	2,16	,90	2,091	,149	-,658	,511
	Single	206	2,22	1,01				
4. All	Married	180	2,15	,96	,004	,952	-,279	,780
	Single	206	2,18	,95				
1. Cognitive	Sciences	180	2,15	,96	,004	,952	-,279	,780
	Social Sciences	206	2,18	,95				
2. Affective	Sciences	312	2,17	,98	3,710	,055	-,795	,428
	Social Sciences	74	2,26	,83				
3. Behavioral	Sciences	312	2,12	,96	1,840	,176	-1,968	,051
	Social Sciences	74	2,35	,88				
4. All	Sciences	312	2,12	,96	1,840	,176	-1,968	,051
	Social Sciences	74	2,35	,88				

Findings of the research are presented as follows: teachers' gender, marital status, branch and workplace variables have no effect on organizational cynicism attitudes.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on whether or not the organizational cynicism attitudes of teachers differ from the institution you are working on or whether they differ according to the variable are given in Table 10.

Table 10. Anova on the Variables of Thinking About Leaving the Institution in Which Teachers Work

Sub-dimensions		N	\bar{x}	SS	F	P	Differentiation
Do you consider to leave the institution you work for?							
1. Cognitive	Yes	68	2,53	1,02	8,975	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	71	2,39	,81			
	No	247	2,04	,95			
2. Affective	Yes	68	2,03	,99	10,538	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	71	1,99	,82			
	No	247	1,57	,95			
3. Behavioral	Yes	68	2,41	,99	6,490	,002	3-1,2
	Partially	71	2,38	,82			
	No	247	2,04	,95			

According to Table 10, in the sub-dimensions of cognitive cynicism and affective cynicism, there is a significant differentiation for the question of “do you intend to leave the institution from which you work?” relatively as follows, $F(2, 383)=8,975; 6,490; 6,490, p<.05$; A significant difference of 10,491 $p<.05$. As to the Scheffe test results suggest, in the cognitive cynicism subscale, the scores of the teachers in the no group ($\bar{x}=2,04$) are lower than the scores of the teachers of the yes ($\bar{x}=2,53$) and partially ($\bar{x}=2,39$) teachers. In the subscale of affective cognition, it is seen that the scores of the teachers in the no group ($\bar{x}=,57$) are lower than the scores of the teachers of the yes ($\bar{x}=2,03$) and partially ($\bar{x}=1,99$) teachers. Since there is no significant difference according to age and title variables, no tabulation is given.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test conducted on whether teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes differ according to the place of duty are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results on Teachers' Organizational Cynicism According to the Place of Duty

Sub-Dimensions	Place of duty	n	Range avg.	sd	χ^2	p	MWU		
							U	p	Mean Different.
Cognitive	Anatolian High School	213	202,77	3	8,671	,034	4141,500	,004	1-3
	Social Sciences High School	12	175,75						
	Sciences High School	52	153,46				2193,000	,019	3-4
	Vocational and Technical High School	109	196,43						
Affective	Anatolian High School	213	193,17	3	14,196	,003	4238,500	,006	1-3
	Social Sciences High School	12	236,08						
	Sciences High School	52	148,00				1921,000	,001	3-4
	Vocational and Technical High School	109	211,17						
Behavioral	Anatolian High School	213	191,62	3	11,782	,008	4400,000	020	1-3
	Social Sciences High School	12	196,63						
	Fen (Sciences) High School	52	152,69				1930,500	,001	3-4
	Vocational and Technical High School	109	216,30						

The Kruskal Wallis H test was used to measure the significance of the difference between the scores of a group of a small number of subjects and the Mann Whitney U test, which was used in binary comparisons, as a result of comparing the organizational cynicism attitudes of the teachers according to their task variables. The results of these tests show that the teachers who work in Anatolian high schools have higher cognitive, affective and behavioral cynic attitudes as well as the average attitudes of the teachers working in science high schools than the average attitudes of organizational cynics and the

differences are significant. In the same sub-dimensions, it was found that the average of the teachers working in science high schools was lower than the average of the teachers working in vocational and technical high schools and the differences were significant. It has been found that the attitudes of the teachers working in the social sciences high school and the average attitudes of the cynicism are higher than the average attitudes of the organizational cynics of the teachers working in science high schools and the differences are significant. According to this situation, the attitudes of organizational cynics of teachers working in Anatolian high schools, social sciences high schools and vocational and technical high schools are higher than those who work in science high schools. Teachers working in science high school are gladder to work in their school with comparison to teachers working in Anatolian, social sciences and vocational and technical high schools.

The results of the correlation analysis between the teachers' organizational support perceptions and organizational cynicism attitudes are given in Table 12.

Table 12. The Results of the Correlation Analysis of the Teachers' Opinions

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Pearson Correlation	1	,799**	,131**	-,441**	-,363**	-,173**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,010	,000	,001	,001
	N	386	386	386	386	386	386
2. Personal and Professional Development	Pearson Correlation		1	,045	-,389**	-,258**	-,155**
	Sig. (2-tailed)			,378	,000	,002	,002
	N		386	386	386	386	386
3. Organizational Ownership	Pearson Correlation			1	-,469**	-,452**	-,285**
	Sig. (2-tailed)				,000	,000	,000
	N			386	386	386	386
4. Cognitive	Pearson Correlation				1	,648**	,486**
	Sig. (2-tailed)					,000	,000
	N				386	386	386
5. Affective	Pearson Correlation					1	,616**
	Sig. (2-tailed)						,000
	N					386	386
6. Behavioral	Pearson Correlation						1
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N						386

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 12; A moderately negative linear relationship between cognitive cynicism ($r = -0.441$, $P < 0.01$) and organizational support and justice; A moderately negative linear relationship between affective cynicism ($r = -0.363$; $P < 0.01$) and organizational support and justice, and a weak negative relationship between behavioral cynicism ($r = -0.173$; $P < 0.01$) and organizational support and justice. A moderately negative linear relationship between cognitive cynicism ($r = -0.389$; $P < 0.01$) and personal and professional development; There appears to be a weak negative linear relationship between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism ($r = -0.258$; $P < 0.01$) and personal and professional development. A moderately negative linear relationship between cognitive cynicism ($r = -0.469$, $P < 0.01$) and organizational ownership; A moderately negative linear relationship between affective cynicism ($r = -0.452$, $P < 0.01$) and organizational ownership and a negative linear relationship between behavioral cynicism ($r = -0.285$, $P < 0.01$) and organizational ownership. A moderately positive linear relationship between cognitive cynicism and behavioral cynicism ($r = 0.648$; $P < 0.01$) and affective cynicism; There appears to be a moderately positive linear relationship between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism ($r = 0.616$). We can say that as affective cynicism increases, behavioral cynicism also increases.

Regression analysis of the predictions of cognitive cynicism variable according to organizational justice and organizational support, personal and professional development and organizational ownership variables are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Cynicism Cognitive Dimension

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	5,531	,223	-	24,842	,000	-	-
Organizational Support and Justice	-,273	,075	-,247	-3,635	,000	-,441	-,183
Personal and Professional Development	-,187	,073	-,172	-2,551	,011	-,389	-,129
Organizational Ownership	-,496	,047	-,429	-10,483	,000	-,469	-,473

R=0.614 R²= .377 F(3, 382)= 77,166 p= .000

When the binary and partial correlation between predictive variables and dependent (predictive, criterion) variables are examined in the Table 13, there is a moderately negative relationship between organizational support and justice and cognitive cynicism attitude ($r=-0.44$), but when the other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0.19$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.39$) between personal and professional development and cognitive cynicism, however when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.012$. There is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.47$) between organizational ownership and cognitive cynicism, however when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.56$. Together with the mentioned above variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' cognitive cynic attitude scores as $R=0.614$, $R^2=0.38$, $P<0.05$. Three variables mentioned above account for about 38% of the total variance in the prediction of cognitive cynicism. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the independent variables over cognitive cynicism is as follows; organizational ownership, organizational support and justice, and personal and professional development. When the results of the t-test on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the variables of organizational ownership and organizational support and justice have significant influence on cognitive cynicism.

According to the results of regression analysis, the regression equation for the prediction of cognitive dimension is presented below:

COGNITIVE CINISM =5,531-0.273, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE -0,187, PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT -0.496 ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP

The following is a regression analysis of estimating the affective cynicism variable according to organizational justice and organizational support, personal and professional development, and organizational ownership variables are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Multiple Regression Analysis on the Estimation of Affective Dimension of Organizational Cynicism

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	4,493	,224	-	20,025	,000	-	-
Organizational Support and Justice	-,342	,076	-,327	-4,524	,000	-,363	-,226
Personal and Professional Development	,022	,074	,021	,295	,768	-,258	,015
Organizational Ownership	-,450	,048	-,410	-9,442	,000	-,452	-,435

R=0.546 R²= .299 F (3, 382)= 54,210 p= .000

When the binary and partial correlation between the predictive variables and the dependent variable are examined in Table 14, it is seen that there is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.37$) between organizational support and justice and the attitude of affective cynicism, however when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.23$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.26$) between personal and professional development and the attitude of affective cynicism, however, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = 0.015$. There is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.45$) between organizational ownership and the attitude of affective cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.44$. Above mentioned variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with the teachers' attitude scores of affective cynicism as follows: $R=0.546$, $R^2=0.30$, $P<0.05$. These variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' attitude cynic attitude scores. These variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' attitudinal cynic attitude scores. Together, the three variables explain about 30% of the total variance in the predictive cynicism attitude. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of significance of the predictive variables on affective cynicism is as following: organizational ownership, organizational support and justice, and personal and professional development. When the results of the t-test on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is observed that the variables of organizational ownership and organizational support and justice are significant predictors of affective cynicism.

The regression equation for predicting the cognitive dimension is given below:

AFFECTIVE CYNICISM=4,493-0.342, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE +0.022 and PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT -0.450, ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP

The regression analysis for estimating the behavioral cynicism variable according to organizational support and justice, personal and professional development, and organizational ownership variables are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Multiple Regression Analysis of Organizational Cynicism Behavioral Size Estimation

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	3,857	,266		14,504	,000	-	-
Organizational Support and Justice	-,071	,090	-,064	-,790	,430	-,173	-,040
Personal and Professional Development	-,098	,088	-,091	-1,123	,262	-,155	-,057
Organizational Ownership	-,313	,056	-,272	-5,544	,000	-,285	-,273

$R=0.321$ $R^2=.103$ $F(3, 382)=14,591$ $p=.000$

When Table 15 is examined, there is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.17$) between organizational support and justice and attitude of behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.039$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.16$) between personal and professional development and attitude of behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between two variables was calculated as $r = 0.057$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.29$) between organizational ownership and behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.27$. Above mentioned variables present a meaningful and correlative correlation with teachers' behavioral cynicism attitude scores in the middle level as $R=0.321$, $R^2=0.10$, $P<0.05$. These three variables account for about 10% of the total variance in the predictive behavioral cynicism. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the estimator variables on behavioral cynicism is as following organizational ownership, personal and professional development and organizational support and justice. When the results of the T-test are

examined, it is seen that only organizational ownership variable has a significant effect on behavioral cynicism.

The regression equation for predicting the cognitive dimension is given below:

BEHAVIORAL CYNICISM=3,857-0.071, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE-0.098, PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT-0.313, ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In the research, the relationship between organizational support perceptions and organizational cynicism attitudes of the teachers working in high school was examined. Findings related to the research have been discussed and supported by the literature.

Teachers, although varying according to sub-dimensions, think that they have a low level of ownership. For gender change, female teachers' perceptions of organizational ownership are more positive than male teachers. This finding does not coincide with the findings of research conducted by Foley, Hang-Yue, and Lui, (2005, p. 247); Fuller, Hester, Barnett, Frey, and Relyea, (2006, p. 337); Tansky and Cohen (2001, p. 293); Yokuş (2006, p. 59) and Kalağan (2009). The perceptions of the teachers working in the province center on the scale and organizational support and justice and personal and professional development sub-dimensions are higher than the district centers. This shows that there is a meaningful relationship between organizational support and justice, personal and professional development and work place.

According to age and seniority variables, there is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of organizational support. Teachers perceive the organizational support of school administrators at the same level in the categories determined for these two variables in the research. As age or seniority increase, this perception does not change. Teachers' perceptions of organizational support differ significantly in terms of change in thinking about leaving the institution being studied in all sub-dimensions. Organizational support and justice, organizational support perception scores of teachers who give no response to personal and professional development and organizational ownership sub-dimensions are higher than those of yes and partly group teachers. In the sub-dimension of organizational support and justice, teachers responded at the level of agreeing to the questions and stated that they did not consider leaving school. In the personal and professional development sub-dimension, teachers responded to the questions at the level of partly agreeing that the ones they were working with were able to consider leaving school. According to the results of the research, 64% of the teachers say no and 17,6% of the teachers respond yes. According to the research results made by Kasalak and Bilgi Aksu (2014), the highest rate was obtained with "No" (50,9%) and the lowest rate with "Yes" (17,5%) in the question "Do you consider to leave the institution? The results are similar. As a result of the research carried out by Kalagan (2009), the arithmetic mean of research assistants who do not consider leaving their institution in all sub dimensions of organizational support is higher than the other groups. Findings are consistent with Yüksel's (2006) finding that organizational support perceptions of employees with a tendency to leave work are lower than those without job separation tendencies. In terms of the universe changer, only the organizational ownership sub-dimension, the candidate teachers think that the school has less ownership than the specialist teachers.

There is a meaningful relationship between the type of the school and the organizational cynicism. The perception of organizational support of teachers working in science high schools is higher than those working in high schools in Anatolia and vocational and technical high schools. Teachers working in science high schools think that they have more support in organizational justice, personal and professional development, and organizational ownership sub-dimensions. According to research findings made by Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), it has been revealed that the levels of organizational cynicism of teachers working in girls' vocational high schools are high. The results are similar in terms of vocational high schools.

Teacher of the highest scores obtained from organizational cynicism attitudes are cognitive scale scores. Behavioral and affective cynicism scores follow this. Cognitive cynicism are moderate attitude and a positive relationship between the levels of emotional attitude of cynicism. 42% of the total variance in affective cynicism stems from cognitive cynicism; there is a moderate and positive level between the attitude of cognitive cynicism and the attitude of behavioral cynicism. 23% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism originates from cognitive cynicism; there is a moderate and positive relationship between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism. 38% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism that has emerged due to the emotional cynicism. Kalagan, (2009) as a result of research conducted by, the attitudes of organizational cynicism of the research assistants, the highest cognitive, affective took place in the lowest size. The results are the same.

According to the findings of the research, there was no significant difference between teachers' attitudes of organizational cynics and gender and marital status variables. According to the results of the research conducted by Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), there was no significant relationship between teachers' gender and marital status and organizational cynicism levels. Similar research has also been reported in the literature on the absence of a significant relationship between organizational cynicism and gender (Bateman, Sakano, & Fujita, 1992; Mirvis & Kanter, 1991; Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997; Wanous et al., 2000; Anderson & Bateman, 1997; Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, & Walker, 2007; Bommer, Rich, & Rubin, 2005; Efilti, Gönen, & Öztürk, 2008; Erdost, Karacaoğlu, & Reyhanoğlu, 2007; James, 2005; Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008; Kalağan, 2009). It was observed that there was no significant difference in organizational cynicism attitudes according to marital status variable in all of the sub-dimensions. This finding of the research supports the findings of Efilti et al. (2008, p. 11) and Erdost et al. (2007, p. 522). However, in the study conducted by Kalağan, (2009, p. 157), there was a significant difference in behavioral sub-dimension except cognitive and affective cynicism sub-dimensions. However, when the literature is examined in the literature, findings on the level of organizational cynicism of single employees are high (Delken, 2004; Kalağan, 2009). There was no significant difference between teachers' attitudes of organizational cynics and their branches. According to the results of the research made by Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), the teachers whose science is branch science have a high level of organizational cynicism. The results are different. There was no significant difference between the workplace variables. According to the workplace variable, it was found that the average of the attitude scores of the teachers working in the district center was significantly higher than the ones in the province center. It can be said that the teachers working in the district center are undergoing more organizational cynicism.

In the attitudes of the organizational cynics of teachers, do you consider leaving the institution you are working with, in terms of the variable, in all the sub-dimensions, a significant difference emerged. The scores of the teachers in the no group in the cognitive cynics sub-dimension are lower than the scores of the teachers in the yes group and partly in the group. In both the cognitive cynicism and the behavioral cynicism subscales, the scores of the teachers in the no group are lower than the scores of the teachers of the yes group and partly the teachers. In the research conducted by Kalağan (2009, p. 164), the organizational cynicism attitudes of research assistants who think about departing from all institutions and partly considering leaving in all sub dimensions are higher than those who do not consider separation. The results are similar. Organizational cynicism influences the way teachers think about leaving their institutions. It may be a sign that teachers' attitudes toward their organizations are negative. This can raise the level of organizational cynicism.

There was no significant difference in organizational cynicism attitudes of teachers in terms of age and title variables in all subscales. As a result of the research conducted by Kalağan (2009), it was observed that there was not a significant difference in the organizational cynic attitudes of the research assistants in terms of age variation in all sub-dimensions. The age-related finding of the study is also parallel to the findings of various researches (Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Bernerth et al., 2007; Bommer et al., 2005; Efilti et al., 2008; Erdost et al., 2007; Fero, 2005; Kalağan & Güzeller 2010; James, 2007; Tokgoz & Yılmaz, 2008).

According to vocational seniority variable, teachers' attitudes of organizational cynics did not make sense. According to Kalagan (2009) research, organizational cynicism attitudes of researchers were significant only in the cognitive subscale according to the variable of service duration. The results are different. As a result of the research done by Nartgün and Kalay, (2014), it was determined that the service year variable did not make a meaningful difference in teachers' organizational support, organizational identification and organizational cynicism levels. According to the research result made by Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), there is a meaningful relationship between organizational cynicism and professional seniority of teachers. This is in line with the results of James (2005) and Naus (2007). Moreover, in O'Connell, Holzman, and Armandi's (1986) research, a meaningful relationship emerged between service duration and organizational cynicism.

Moderately negative between cognitive and affective cynicism and organizational support and justice; There was a weak negative relationship between behavioral cynicism and organizational support and justice. Moderate negative between cognitive cynicism and personal and professional development; there is a weak negative linear relationship between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism and personal and professional development. Moderately negative between cognitive cynicism and affective cynicism and organizational ownership; There was a negative linear relationship between behavioral cynicism and organizational ownership at a weak level. A moderately positive linear relationship emerged between cognitive cynicism and behavioral cynicism and affective cynicism. It has been achieved that teachers' cognitive, affective and behavioral cynic attitudes affect each other moderately and weakly. According to the results of the research conducted by Kalagan (2009), a moderately positive linear relationship was found between cognitive, emotional and behavioral dimensions. The results are partly similar.

According to the results of binary and partial correlation between predictive variables and dependent variable; When the standardized regression coefficient (β) is taken into account, the predictive variables are the relative importance order of cognitive cynicism, affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism attitudes; Organizational ownership, organizational support and justice, and personal and professional development. When the results of the t-test on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it has been determined that organizational ownership and organizational support and justice sub-factors have a significant or significant effect on cognitive cynicism, affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism. As a result of the research conducted by Kalağan (2009), it was determined that the dimensions that research assistants perceive as organizational support have an effect on organizational cynicism sub-dimensions. The results show similarities. As a result of the research done by Nartgün and Kalay, (2014), according to the opinions of teachers, there was no relation between organizational support scale and organizational cynicism.

Together with organizational support and justice, personal and professional development and organizational ownership sub-factors, it gives a moderate, negative and meaningful relationship with teachers' cognitive cynicism attitude scores. Together, these three factors together account for about 38% of the total variance in the prediction of cognitive cynicism. Together with organizational support and justice, personal and professional development and organizational ownership sub-factors, the teachers have a moderate, negative and meaningful relationship with the affective cynic attitude scores. The mentioned factors explain about 30% of the total variance in the estimation of the affective cynicism. Together with organizational support and justice, personal and professional development and organizational ownership sub-factors, they give a negative and meaningful relationship with the behavioral cynicism attitude scores of the teachers at a weak level. The mentioned factors explain about 10% of the total variance in the estimation of the affective cynicism. As a result of the research carried out by Kalağan (2009), it was calculated that there is a moderate negative linear relationship between organizational cynicism sub-dimensions. The results are somewhat similar. It has been found that there is a negative relationship between organizational support and organizational cynicism in literature (Brandes, 1997; Brandes, Das, & Hadeni, 2006; Byrne & Hochwarter, 2007; Cole, Bruch, & Vogel, 2006; James, 2005; Treadway et al., 2004).

According to the findings of the research, the suggestions were determined as follows:

Careful attention should be paid to ensuring that job assignments and course schedules are carried out appropriately and fairly in accordance with personal and professional qualifications. Teachers should be encouraged by the principals to conduct research and participation in academic activities to provide opportunities for improvement. Measures may be taken to increase the teachers' perceptions of organizational support by investigating with qualitative research methods, which are the reasons why teachers who think about leaving working organizations and partly think they should leave. The reasons for the teachers working in the district center undergoing more organizational cynicism than those working in the province center can be investigated. Communication channels of teachers should be strengthened, respect and love environment should be provided to increase organizational support. By investigating the causes of cynicism in teachers, new policies and practices can be developed. By investigating why the teachers' perceptions of school ownership are low, measures may be taken for the needs, expectations and problems of teachers which arise from managers or their colleagues.

References

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269-292.
- Alan, H., & Fidanboy, C. Ö. (2012). *Sinizm, tükenmişlik ve kişilik ilişkisi: bilişim sektörü çalışanları kapsamında bir inceleme*. 11. Ulusal Büro Yönetimi ve Sekreterlik Kongresi, Isparta.
- Allen, D., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29, 99-118.
- Andersson, L. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49, 1395-1418.
- Barefoot, J. C., Dodge, K. A., Peterson, B. L., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Williams, R. B. (1989). The cook-medley hostility scale: Item content and ability to predict survival. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 51, 46-57.
- Bateman, T. S., Sakano, T., & Fujita, M. (1992). Roger, me, and my attitude: Film propaganda and cynicism toward corporate leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(5), 768-771.
- Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), 303-326.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. A., & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change: Longitudinal Effects of transformational leader behaviour on employee cynicism about organizational change. *The Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 733-753.
- Brandes, P. M. (1997). *Organizational cynicism: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Cincinnati.
- Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Dean, J. W. (1999). Does organizational cynicism matter? Employee and supervisor perspectives on work outcomes. *Eastern Academy of Management Proceedings*, 150-153.
- Brandes, P., Das, D., & Hadeni, M. (2006). Organizational cynicism: A field examination using global and local social exchange relationships and workplace outcomes. In G. B. Grean & J. A. Grean (Eds.), *Sharing network leadership* (pp. 191-224). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Byrne, Z. S., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2007). Perceived organizational support and performance relationships across levels of organizational cynicism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23(1), 54-72. doi:10.1108/02683940810849666
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (4. ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The Challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 199-208.
- Cole, M. S., Brunch, H., & Vogel, B. (2006). Emotion as mediators of the relations between perceived supervision support and psychological hardiness on employee cynicism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 463-484. doi:10.1002/job.381
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange relationships: Examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 774-781.
- Çalışkan, S., & Erim, A. (2010). Pozitif örgütsel davranış değişkenleri ile yeni model kurma arayışları: POD'nin örgütsel sinizm, tükenmişlik ve işe adanmışlık üzerindeki etkileri. In 18. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi* (pp. 658-670). Adana.
- Dean Jr, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 341-352.
- Delken, M. (2004). *Organizational cynicism: A study among call centers* (Unpublished master's thesis). Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Maastricht, Maastricht.

- Dikmetaş, E., Top, M., Durukan, S., Ergin, G., & Yiğit, V. (2010). Hastane personelinde örgütsel sinizizm. In *8th International Knowledge, Economy & Management Congress* (pp. 28-31). İstanbul.
- Eaton, J. A. (2000). *A social motivation approach to organizational cynicism* (Unpublished master's thesis). Faculty of Graduate Studies, York University, Toronto.
- Efilti, S., Gönen, Y., & Öztürk, F. (2008). Örgütsel sinizm: Akdeniz üniversitesinde görev yapan yönetici sekreterler üzerinde bir alan araştırması. In *7. Ulusal Büro Yönetimi ve Sekreterlik Kongresi* (pp. 1-14). Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington R., Hutchison S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 51-59.
- Erdost, H. E., Karacaoğlu, K., & Reyhanoğlu, M. (2007). Örgütsel sinizm kavramı ve ilgili ölçeklerin Türkiye'deki bir firmada test edilmesi. In *15. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı* (pp. 514-524). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sakarya.
- Fero, H. C. (2005). *Flow and cynicism in the workplace* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California.
- Foley, S., Hang-Yue, N., & Lui, S. (2005). The effects of work stressors, perceived organizational support, and gender on work-family conflict in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 22*(3), 237-256.
- Fuller, J. B., Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: Predicting organizational attachment for university faculty, staff and administration. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 146*(3), 327-347.
- Güzel, B., Perçin, N., & Tükeltürk, Ş. (2010). *Algılanan örgütsel desteğin, örgütsel sinizm ile ilişkisi ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkileri üzerine bir araştırma: 4-5 yıldızlı otel işletmeleri*. 18. Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Adana.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tahtam R. L., & Black W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Upper Saddle River.
- İnce, M., & Turan, Ş. (2011). Organizational cynicism as a factor that affects the organizational change in the process of globalization and an application in Karaman's public institutions. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 37*, 104-121.
- James, M. S. L. (2005). *Antecedents And consequences of cynicism in organizations: An examination of the potential positive and negative effects on school systems* (Doctoral dissertation). The Florida State University. Retrieved from <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/islandora/object/fsu:181909/datastream/PDF/view>
- Kabataş, A. (2010). *Örgütsel sinizm ile örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi ve bir araştırma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Science, Kocaeli.
- Kalağan, G. (2009). *Araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel destek algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Science, Antalya.
- Kalağan, G., & Güzeller, C. O. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*, 83-97.
- Kalay, F., & Oğrak, A. (2012). *Örgütsel sessizlik, mobbing ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisi: Örnek bir uygulama*. 20. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, İzmir.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler* (4th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın.
- Kasalak, G., & Bilgi Aksu, M. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism of research assistants, educational sciences. *Theory & Practice, 14*(1), 125-133.

- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Loi, R., Hang-Yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees' justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 101-120.
- Mantere, S., & Martinsuo, M. (2001, July). *Adopting and questioning strategy: Exploring the roles of cynicism and dissent*. Paper presented at 17th EGOS - European Group for Organisation Studies, Colloquium, Lyon, France.
- Metzger, M. D. (2004). *A qualitative inquiry into the formation of beliefs in a police organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3126199).
- Mirvis, P. H., & Kanter, D. L. (1991). Beyond demography: A psychographic profile of the workforce. *Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 45-68.
- Nartgün, Ş. S., & Kalay, M. (2014). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek, örgütsel özdeşleşme ile örgütsel sinizm düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri. *Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(2), 1361-1376.
- Naus, A. J. A. M. (2007). *Organizational cynicism on the nature, antecedents, and consequences of employee cynicism toward the employing organization* (Doctoral dissertation). Maastricht University. Retrieved from <https://cris.maastrichtuniversity.nl/portal/en/publications/organizational-cynicism-on-the-nature-antecedents-and-consequences-of-employee-cynicism-toward-the-employing-organization>
- O'Connell B. J., Holzman H., & Armandi B. R. (1986). Police cynicism and the modes of adaptation. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*, 14(4), 307-313.
- Öğüt, A., Özgener, Ş., & Kaplan, M. (2008). *The interaction between organizational cynicism and psychological contract violation in terms of strategic human resource management*. 4. International Strategic Management Conference, Sarajevo, Bosnia Herzegovina.
- Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). Algılanan örgütsel destek ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkilerin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 113-130.
- Pelit, E., & Ayduğan, N. (2011). Otel işletmeleri işgörenlerinin örgütsel sinizm tutumları üzerine bir araştırma. In 12. *Ulusal Turizm Kongresi* (pp. 286-302), Akçakoca. Retrieved from http://isarder.org/isardercom/2012vol4Issue2/Vol.4_Issue.2-06_full_text.pdf
- Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 48-59.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Schaffer, M. A., & Harrison, D. A. (2001). Struggling for balance amid turbulence on international assignments: Work-family conflict, support, and commitment. *Journal of Management*, 27(1), 99-121.
- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived organizational support and organizational justice. In R. S. Cropanzano & K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing the Social Climate of the Workplace* (pp. 149-164). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Sur, Ö. (2010). *Örgütsel sinizm: Büro çalışanları üzerine bir alan araştırması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve davranışsal ölçümlerde geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik*. Ankara: Seçkin Matbaası.
- Şirin, E. (2011). *İlköğretim okullarındaki öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki (İstanbul ili, Esenyurt ilçesi örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yeditepe University, Institute of Social Science, İstanbul.

- Tansky, W., & Cohen, D. J. (2001). The relationship between organizational support, employee development, and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(3), 285-300.
- Tınaztepe, C. (2012). Örgüt İçi etkin iletişimin örgütsel sinizme etkisi. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 53-63.
- Tokgöz, N. (2011). Örgütsel sinizizm, örgütsel destek ve örgütsel adalet ilişkisi: Elektrik dağıtım işletmesi çalışanları örneği. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(2), 363-387.
- Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Leader political skill and employee reactions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(4), 493-513. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.05.004
- Wanous, J.P, Reichers, A.E, and Austin, J.T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change: Measurement, antecedent and correlates. *Group and Organizational Management*, 25(2), 132-153.
- Yokuş, İ. (2006). *Erkek Egemen işlerde çalışanların örgütsel destek algıları ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Science, Ankara.
- Yoshimura, K. E. (2003). *Employee traits, perceived organizational support, supervisory communication, affective commitment, and intent to leave: group differences* (Unpublished master's thesis). North Carolina State University. Retrieved from <https://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/bitstream/handle/1840.16/2916/etd.pdf?sequence=1>
- Yüksel, İ. (2006). Örgütsel destek algısı ve belirleyicilerinin işten ayrılma eğilim ile ilişkisi. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(1), 7-32.
- Yürür, S. (2005). *Ödüllendirme sistemleri ile örgütsel adalet arasındaki ilişkilerin analizi ve bir uygulama* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Bursa Uludağ University, Institute of Social Science, Bursa.
- Zagenczyk, T. J. (2006). *Social influence analysis of perceived organizational support* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, The Katz Graduate School of Business. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/129750066.pdf>