A Study on Measuring Public and Private Hospital Employees' Organizational Commitment and Organizational Cynicism Levels: The Case of Konya

İlknur ÇEVİK TEKİN[1], Aykut BEDÜK[2]

[1]*Selcuk University, Vocational School of Social Sciences*
[2]*Selcuk University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences*

ABSTRACT

In today's businesses, where knowledge is an important power, human resources are seen as an important investment asset for the efficiency and effectiveness of businesses instead of cost elements. It is obvious that watching organizational goals will be very easy with employees who come to work on time, avoid absenteeism and have adopted the organization they work for. On the other hand, employees who cherish negative feelings towards their workplace, do not trust their directors and think they are being exploited contribute negatively or very little to the organization. In this study, organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels of health employees working at public and private hospitals in the province of Konya will be investigated and the relationships between these two variables will be explored. To this end, the scale developed by Dean et al. (1998) for organizational cynicism, and the scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) for organizational commitment were used. The scales were dealt with in three dimensions. In the scale developed by Allen and Meyer, the commitments of employees will be investigated as affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment whereas in the cynicism scale developed by Dean et al. (1998), cynical attitudes of employees will be examined as cognitive, affective and behavioral attitudes. In the first part of the study, definitions of organizational commitment and organizational cynicism were made, their conceptual frameworks were drawn in detail and then findings about the study were used. The population of the study was determined as employees working at hospitals in Konya and the study sample was identified as 270 people. Questionnaire forms were sent to hospital employees using the random sampling method. "5-point likert type" questionnaire method was used in collecting research data. In the responses given to the questionnaire questions, 1 means "I totally disagree", whereas 5 means "I totally agree". When the questionnaire procedure was completed, 255 questionnaire forms had been returned. 8 questionnaires were excluded from evaluation because responses were not complete. The responses in the returned questionnaire forms were encoded and analyzed in accordance with the statistical analysis program "SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences)/Windows 15.0 Version". Factor Analysis, reliability test, frequency analysis, one-way variance analysis (anova test) Mann Whitney U Test and Pearson correlation analysis were used to analyze the data.

Keywords: Organizational Commitment, Organizational Cynicism, Hospitals

INTRODUCTION

Today, when developments in the fields of competition and management are increasing steadily, one of the issues that have become as important as customer satisfaction is to ensure commitment of employees to the organization. A prerequisite for organizations to continue their activities in an effective and efficient manner is to work with individuals who are committed to the organization. Employees with high levels of organizational commitment adopt the goals and values of their organizations, spend a huge effort for their organizations and have a greater desire to stay with the organization. In this way, the organization reaches its goals much more easily with committed employees. Organization commitment has become the subject matter of many researches as independent variable or dependent variable (Meyer and Allen, 1997). One of these variables is "Organizational Cynicism". In a general sense, organizational cynicism is the negative attitude of individuals towards the organization where they work and its procedures, processes and management; in other words, it is based on the assumption on the part of employees that these elements deprive the employees of their interests (Wilkerson et al. 2008: 2274). It was argued in many studies conducted

on organizational cynicism that cynicism has a negative, significant and constant effect on individual and organizational efficiency. For example, organizational cynicism is associated with a reduction in organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation and an intention to create changes. Therefore, it is seen as being related to a certain level of deterioration in organizational circles (Rubin et al., 2009: 680).

THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

The ties established between the organization and employees enable employees, who are the most important assets of organizations, to work towards common goals, common values, and common production and help them experience the feeling of belonging to a place, which is an important phenomenon for human beings. If individuals do not leave the organization, are not absent from work, and work at full capacity and dedication, then this means that their organization commitment is strong. On the other hand, what constitutes organization commitment is that employees perform the aforementioned voluntarily. Situations such as attendance and not quitting the workplace, which are performed obligatorily, do not express emotional commitment in its true sense. Commitment to the organization is important when people do this out of their own accord. In this way, individuals spend an effort in accordance with the goals of the organization and demonstrate their commitment (Erdoğan, 2009: 5). Commitment reflects dedication to the whole of the organization, not some parts of it (Sagie, 1998: 159).

Organizational commitment refers to the strength of the attachment which employees feel towards the organization where they work. Organizational commitment is believed to affect organizational performance positively and in this framework it is argued that organizational commitment reduces undesirable consequences such as coming to work late, absenteeism and quitting job, and in addition, contributes positively to product or service quality. (Çakır, 2007: 6). The organization tries to prevent employees from leaving the organization in order to survive. It offers incentives such as increasing the pay, providing opportunities for promotion and other motivational elements (Çetin, 2004: 90).

There are many different definitions of organizational commitment in the relevant literature. It is the process where the goals of the organization and the goals of the individual converge or become harmonious (Hall et al., 1970: 176). It involves employees' wanting to stay as a member of the organization, make a huge effort in the name of the organization and adopt and believe in the goals and values of the organization (Dubin et al., 1975: 414). It is the whole of the normative pressures that have been internalized to act in a way to meet organizational interests (Wiener, 1982: 418). It is the process of identification with various components such as the senior management, clients, unions and majority of the society in line with the goals of an organization (Reichers, 1985: 465). It is a situation where individuals wish to continue their membership to the organization in order to fulfill the goals of the organization (Blau et al., 1987: 290). Organizational commitment involves, in order attaining the goals and interests of the organization, individuals' psychological commitment to the organization including loyalty and belief in organizational values (Ölçüm Çetin, 2004: 90). It is an obvious desire on the part of individuals to like and appreciate what has been done even if there is no reward or punishment by sticking to a certain manner of behavior (İnce Gül, 2005:5). Salancik investigated commitment from a psychological perspective and explained commitment from a behavioral point of view as a confinement of individuals by their behaviors and their belief in continuing their commitment through these behaviors (Salancik, 1977: 62). According to Yüksel (2000), organizational commitment is defined not only as a process of commitment to the employer but at the same time as a process where those involved in the organization express their opinions and make an effort for the good and continuous success of the organization (Bayram, 2005: 128). Commitment, which is expressed as the loyalty felt towards the organization, making sacrifices for it, dedicating the self and being a member to it is acknowledged as a factor that adds value to the business circle and has positive effects on the organization (Dean et al.., 1998: 348). According to a definition that is most widely accepted, organizational commitment refers to those who remain in the organization whoever the employer may be, attend their job regularly, use a full work day or more, protect the assets of the organization and share the goals and mission of the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997: 3).

There are three indicators of organizational commitment (Mowday, 1998: 389).

1. Adopting the goals and values of the organization and adhering strictly to these goals,

2. Making a great effort for the organization to reach its goals,

3. Having a strong desire to maintain membership to the organization

Becker and Billings (1993) argued in their study that individuals experienced four sources (focuses) of organizational commitment. These are;

- Those who are locally committed: Employees who are committed to their supervisors and colleagues fall in this category.

- Those who are globally committed: Employees who are committed to senior management and the organization fall in this category.

- Those who are committed: Employees who are committed to both local and global sources fall in this group.

- Those who are uncommitted: Employees who are committed to neither local nor global sources fall in this group (Balay, 2000: 31).

Organization commitment is important in terms of both the survival of the organization and the personnel are being more harmonious and productive. At the same time, organizational commitment should not be perceived as a level of loyalty only towards the employer or the organization. This concept also involves identification of those working for the success of the organization with their organization and their active participation in administrative processes (Sığrı, 2007:262).

Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that there are many classification made in regard to commitment, but in our study, Meyer and Allen's model or classification, which still maintains its validity and is suitable for our study, will be used. According to Meyer and Allen, organizational commitment three dimensions, namely affective, continuance and normative commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997: 11).

Affective Commitment

It is an emotional state where individuals identify themselves with their organization, interact with their organization and are happy about being members of their organization (Mowday, 1998: 389). It is closely related to emotional reactions to business environment and is concerned with more dedication to work, and satisfaction with the colleagues, their workplace and the profession (Balay, 2000: 73). It refers to employees' integration into their organizations. Those who have strong affective commitment become a member of the organization not because they need it but because they regard themselves as part of the organization and have adopted its goals. Employees who feel this kind of commitment demonstrate high fidelity to their organizations and volunteer to make more effort when need arises. Employees develop commitment to their work as long as they adopt the goals and targets of the organization (Bayram, 2005:132).

All kinds of commitment in fact bind employees to the organization but the most effective commitment is the one that has an effective dimension. Affective commitment, which leads to a positive attitude and behavior towards the organization, is the best form of employee commitment to organization (Brown, 2003: 41). For, employees with high levels of affective commitment remain in the organization because they want to do so and make huge efforts towards the goals of the organization. These employees are loyal employees who have devoted themselves to the organization. When necessary, they volunteer to assume additional responsibilities and display a positive attitude towards their job and their coworkers (Doğan and Demiral, 2009:61). Employees who have affective commitment stay with the organization because they want it (Meyer and Allen, 1997: 11).

Factors that influence affective commitment are as follows (Meyer and Allen, 1990:17).

1) Difficulty of the job: The job which the employee does in the organization is challenging and requires struggle.

2) Clarity of the role: What the organization expects of the employee has been expressed clearly.

3) Clarity of the goal: Employees have a clear idea about the tasks and duties they perform in the organization.

4) The management's openness to suggestions: People from the senior management are open to all kinds of suggestions from their minors.

5) Commitment to friends: There are close and sincere relationships among the employees in the organization.

6) Equality and justice: Organizational and duties and resources are distributed equally and justly.

7) Personal significance: The administration tries to strengthen the feeling that the job performed by the employee contributes significantly to the goals of the organization.

8) Participation: Employees are enabled to participate in all issues and decisions regarding the organization and the job.

9) Feedback: Constant feedback is provided to employees about their performance

Continuance Commitment

Continuance commitment involves a situation where employees believe that they will lose the investments they possess if they leave their jobs, so they do not want to endure the consequences and costs that will arise and therefore they continue to work there out of obligation because job alternatives are limited (Meyer, Allen and Smith, 1993: 539). It refers to the fact that employees make more investments in the organization in the course of time and exhibit more commitment due to the possibility that they may lose them if they quit (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972: 556). Individuals will continue to stay with the organization even if they do not want to because the cost of quitting the organization will be high for them (Allen and Meyer, 1990: 3). Continuance commitment arises when employees in an organization attach a huge importance to investments such as seniority, career and other opportunities (İnce and Gül, 2005: 40). This contributes very little to the positive attitudes and behaviors of employees within the organization or contributes negatively to them (Powell and Meyer, 2004: 159). It involves awareness on the part of employees of the costs of their quitting the organization. Employees with continuance commitment continue their memberships to the organization because they need to stay there (Meyer and Allen, 1991). According to Becker (1960), organizational commitment matures when employees combine their interests with activities that are compatible with them by gaining side bets. Side bet can be anything that is valuable in the eyes of employees such as pensions, promotion, holiday, money and organizational friendship (Bozkurt, 2007: 13). It was claimed that employees continued to remain in their organization thinking that the investments they had made in their organization would be wasted and at the same time they wanted their interests (side benefits) to continue and therefore demonstrated commitment (Becker, 1960: 32). This kind of commitment creates economic foundations and individuals feel obliged to be committed to the organization because they believe that quitting the organization will cost them dearly financially, socially and psychologically. As the number and amount of economic costs increase, the commitment of employees to the organization also increases and they avoid behaviors that might endanger their membership to the organization (İnce and Gül, 2005: 53). In other words, Becker's definition is continuance commitment (Powell and Meyer, 2004: 159).

Normative Commitment

This dimension of organizational dimension is a type of commitment that is based on the fact that employees feel forced to stay with the organization and therefore believe they have a responsibility (Wasti, 2002: 526). This form of commitment arises out of a feeling of "obligation" on the part of employees towards their organization. Investments which organizations make in their employees expecting nothing in return cause employees to feel indebted to their organizations. Employees think that they are obliged to pay their debts to their organization and their colleagues by continuing to work. Employees believe that quitting the organization is something that is ethically wrong (Meyer and Allen, 1991: 72).

In conclusion, employees with strong affective commitment remain in the organization because they want to stay there; employees who have a strong normative commitment remain in the organization because they need to remain in the organization; and employees who have a strong continuance commitment remain in the organization because they need this.

THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM

The historical past of cynicism dates back to the Cynic school in the 4th century B.C. Cynicism, which represented a lifestyle and a school of thought in ancient Greece, is based on the ideas of Diogenes. Antisthenes's student, Diogenes of Sinope responded to the question why he was carrying a lantern in daylight saying that he was looking for an honest man (Dean et al., 1998: 342). We also know that

Diogenes met Alexander the Great while he was sitting in his barrel and when Alexander asked him if he could do anything for him, he replied: "Please do not block my sunlight; I would not like anything else″ (Ernst Von Aster, 2005: 184). These examples indicate that cynicism can go as far back as the 4th century B.C. What lies at the heart of cynicism is distrust in people's actions and beliefs (Eisinger, 2000: 55).

Many definitions of cynicism have been made. In simplest terms, cynicism is defined as "not liking the others and not trusting the others" (Brandes et al., 2008: 235). On the other hand, the concept of Cynic is defined in Oxford English Dictionary as (1989 "a person who tends not to believe in the sincerity and good-will of the drives and actions that motivate people, who is mocking and has turned it into a habit to emphasize this with his/her smile, who denigrates others and is a fault finder".(Tokgöz, 2008: 285).This is a belief that exists in some employees who believe that organizations are deprived of moral integrity and that principles such as justice, honesty and sincerity are sacrificed for the sake of organizational interests (Bernerth et al., 2007: 313). When this belief combines with a strong negative emotional reaction, it leads to disreputable and critical behaviors (Abraham, 2000: 269). It involves negative and dishonest attitudes towards authority and institutions (Bateman et al, 1992: 768). According to Dean et al, (1998), organizational cynicism is a negative attitude on the part of individuals towards the organization for which they work. It contains three dimensions. (1) a belief that the organization lacks integrity, (2) negative affect towards the organization and (3) tendencies to disparaging and critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and affect (Naus, 2007: 25). In addition to being both a general and a specific attitude that involves frustration, desperation and disillusionment, it also covers negative emotions and distrust towards a person, a group or a purpose (Andersson, 1996: 1398). Negative emotions about the organization like being unjust and insincere are associated with organizational cynicism (Naus, 2007: 26). Employees at a workplace who have a cynical attitude do not trust their leaders' impulses and believe that when they find an opportunity, their employers will exploit their labor, that organizational rewards are not distributed fairly and that there is no openness, honesty and sincerity in organizational activities. Organizational cynics are people who believe that problems at the workplace are at least identifiable but due to the shortcomings of the very nature of the system, attempts at change and improvement are futile (Arslan, 2012: 15). Cynicism can be defined as a mindset characterized by hopelessness and disillusionment and is also associated with repulsion and denigration. Emotions such as honesty, justice and sincerity have been sacrificed for the sake of individual interests (James, 2005: 1).

The Dilbert Comic Character and Cynicism

The concept of organizational cynicism has recently been identified with the famous comic strip character Dilbert. The Dilbert principle is a book that deals humorously with the organizational events in the daily life of Dilbert, a character created by Scott Adams, and in the business world in which he is involved. "Dilbert Principle", which was described by the Washington Post newspaper as the best management of the century, was published in 1996 and topped the best selling books list for more than 40 weeks (Akın, 2002: 71). In the book, where the main character, Dilbert, works as "an engineer/technical staff member" in giant technology firm, concepts such as management consultants, total quality management, team work, strategic planning and reengineering, which are favorite tools and methods of the new public management are analyzed via the relationships among the other employees and directors. The conclusion that is arrived at is that directors are inefficient and even ill-intentioned while the tools and methods used in improving organizations can be considered totally useless. In this world, where team work and organizational culture are thought to be a huge lie, the fundamental concern of all employees is to resort to ways, some of which are evidently unethical and illegal (lying, gossiping, usurping the organization's property, doing an extra job during office hours etc.) in order to suffer, as far as possible, the least from the new management techniques/trends and consultants. Scott Adams, referring, at the same time, to Peter's Principle, created the "Dilbert's Principle", which is described as "promoting the most incompetent employees to managerial positions where they can do the least harm to organizations" (Yıldız, 2010). The fact that this comic strip hero created by Scott Adams has become a huge success in recent years emphasizes a phenomenon that is clearly obvious in the business world. This phenomenon is that many employees behave quite cynically as far as the efficiency of the management is concerned and are disdainful of bureaucratic organizations and feel scorn for them. In recent studies that have been conducted regarding the attitudes of employees towards management, 49 % of the employees think that if they were given the

opportunity, the management would begin to make profits whereas 39 % believe "The management never allows the employees to know the true reasons behind the decisions made ". On the other hand, 59 % of the employees do not know who they should trust (Feldman, 2000: 1286).

Dimensions of Organizational Cynicism

Employees, who have a cynical attitude at the workplace do not trust their leaders, believe that their employers will exploit their labor, that organizational rewards are not distributed justly and that there is no openness, honesty and sincerity in their organizational activities. There are various dimensions of organizational cynicism. Dean et al. (1998) classified it as cognitive, affective and behavioral. *Cognitive Dimension;* It is believed that the organization lacks honesty (Dean, 1998:348). This belief appears with negative emotions such as fury, scorn and denunciation. In this respect, cynicism is a tendency towards lack of belief in the good and sincerity of actions and human motives. Cynical employees believe that their organizations "betray" them due to a lack of principles such as justice, honesty and sincerity (Özgener et al, 2008: 56). *Affective Dimension;* It is a dimension that involves employees' strong negative feelings towards the organization like insult, indignation and embarrassment (Abraham, 2000: 269). *Behavioral Dimension;* It involves verbal and non-verbal cynical behaviors. While employees' strong statements, criticisms and predictions regarding the fact that their organization lacks honesty cover verbal cynical behaviors, some non-verbal behaviors (employees' meaningful looks at each other, their derisive laughter) may involve cynical attitudes (Dean, 1998; 346). The most obvious of the cynical attitudes towards the organization involves strong critical discourses targeting the organization. Although these discourses may be in different forms, their clearest manifestation expresses the belief that the organization lacks honesty and sincerity and includes sarcastic humor used in parallel with that of the Greek Cynics (Kutaniş and Çetinel, 2010: 189).

The Reasons for the Emergence of Organizational Cynicism

It is stated that cynicism is in a positive relationship with especially low leadership potential, over-suspiciousness, heightened worry, introversion and an abusive belief system (Özgener et al, 2008;56). It is argued that organizational cynicism can be a reaction to various factors such as violations of psychological contracts, imbalanced power distribution, procedural injustices, traditional business values, extremely long working hours, intimidation, inefficient leadership and management, recession and re-organization, and dismissal of directors. It is an undeniable truth that psychological contract violation is the most important factor in the emergence of organizational cynicism. Organizational cynicism can also be defined as an attitude, where as a partner to the psychological contract, an individual refuses the organization for which he/she works. Psychological contract violation is an emotional indication of the organizational cynicism behavior. Psychological contract violation is associated with employees' reduced confidence in employers and their refusal to get into relationship with them (Özgener et al., 2008; 57). Frustration (Brandes et al., 2008: 235), problems connected with career, structural tensions and social change violations are regarded as other causes of organizational cynicism (Özgener et al., 2008: 57-58).

Various studies have been conducted suggesting that organizational cynicism has increased recently. Kanter and Mirvis (1989) found that 43 % of the employees in America are cynics, whereas according to Reichers, Wanous and Austin (1997), 48% of the American employees are cynics (Bommer, 2005: 736).

Measures to Avoid the Effects of Organizational Cynicism

According to Özgener, Öğüt and Kaplan (2008), organizations can take certain measures to get rid of the effects of organizational cynicism. These measures are as follows;

1. Participation of employees in decisions
2. Rewarding directors' behaviors that lead to two-way communication
3. Providing consultancy services to employees
4. A just and continuous disciplinary system
5. Management of competition
6. Informing employees of changes

7. Enhancing temporal efficiency

8. Adopting an empathetic approach

9. Increasing reliability

10. Taking lessons from the past

11. Viewing the change from the employees' perspective

12. Providing employees with new opportunities

According to Kotter (2002), leaders should change their organizations in order to overcome cynicism in organizations. Change is important to defeat cynicism despite failure. The prospects of attaining success for cynicism in initiatives that undergo constant change are less (Bommer et al., 2005: 737). Moreover, according to studies, employees exhibiting cynical behaviors demonstrate less commitment, have less job satisfaction and get motivated with more difficulty. Cynics do not believe that those who are not cynics earn a lot of money as a result of performing well (Reichers, 1997: 52).

A STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND CYNICISM IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOSPITALS IN THE PROVINCE OF KONYA

In this part of the study, information is given about the purpose and method of the study, which was conducted "to reveal the relationship between organizational commitment and cynicism", and then the statistical analyses made and the results obtained are presented.

The Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to "reveal the organizational commitment and cynicism levels of the staff members working at private and public hospitals". The sub-goals identified in the light of this main purpose can be listed as follows.

- To reveal organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels according to gender
- To reveal organizational commitment and cynicism levels according to the type of institution
- To reveal organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels according to educational level
- To reveal organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels according to the positions of the employees

The Research Method and the Sample

Within the scope of the study, "The Organizational Cynicism Scale", which was developed by Dean et al. (1998), was used for organizational cynicism while "The Organizational Commitment Scale", which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1990), was used for organizational commitment. Since the study was conducted on employees working at public and private hospitals operating in the province of Konya, the scope of the study was limited to the hospital employees in the province of Konya. The research had been identified as 270 individuals but 247 questionnaire forms were accepted for evaluations for various reasons. The questionnaire data were encoded in the SPSS 15.0 program.

Research Findings and Their Evaluation

The employees who participated in the study were doctors, nurses, health officers, administrative personnel and technical staff members. When the job durations of the employees were examined, it was found that the one who worked the shortest had been working for 1 year whereas the one with the longest duration was one who had been working in the institution for 31 years, and that the average job duration was 5.5 years.

As can be seen in Table 1, 164 of the sample group members (66.4 %) were female whereas 83 of them (33.6 %) were male; 120 of them (48,6 %) worked at public hospitals, whereas 127 of them (51,4 %) worked at private hospitals; 40 of them (16,2 %) were aged 18-25, 111 (44,9 %) were aged 26-35, 65 (26,3 %) were aged 36-42, and 31 (12,6 %) were aged 43-50; 9 of them (3,6 %) had primary education, 47 (19,0 %) had secondary education, 38 (15,4 %) had associate degree, 102 (41,3 %) had graduate bachelor's degree, 33 (13,4 %) had master's degree, and 18 (7,3 %) had doctorate

degree; 53 of them (21,5 %) were doctors, 96 of them (38,9 %) were nurses,11 (4,5 %) were ward masters, 25 (10,5 %) were administrative personnel, and 36 (14,6 %) were technical staff members; 146 of them (50,2 %) had been working in their institutions for 1-5 years, 70 (28,4 %) for 5-10 years, and 31 (21,4 %) for up to 31 years.

Table1. *Frequency Distribution of the Participants*

Gender	Female	164	66,4
	Male	23	33,6
Age	18-25	40	16,2
	26-35	111	44,9
	36-42	65	26,3
	43-50	31	12,6
Education	Primary	9	3,6
	High School	47	19
	AssociateDegree	38	15,4
	Bachelor'sDegree	102	41,3
	Master's	33	13,4
	Doctorate	18	7,3
SootInstutution	Publicinstitutions	120	48,6
	Privateinstitutions	127	51,4
Job	Doctor	53	21,4
	Nurse	96	38,9
	Caregivers	11	4,5
	Healthofficer	25	10,1
	Administrativestaf	26	10,5
	Technical staff	36	14,6
JobDuration	1-5 years	146	50,2
	5-10 years	70	28,4
	11-31 years	31	21,4

When the Organizational Cynicism scale in Table 2 is analyzed, it is seen that the dimension with the highest score is the cognitive dimension (average: 12, 82 standard dev.: 4, 67). This indicates that most of the employees cannot convert their cynical attitudes into a behavioral dimension and that their attitudes remain only at the belief level.

Table2. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale Overall Evaluation*

Organizational Cynicism	Average	Std. Dev.
Cognitive Dimension Total	12,82	4,67
Affective Dimension Total	8,92	4,03
Behavioral Dimension Total	9,94	3,89
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total [*]	31,67	11,06

Notes: *(i) n=247, (ii) in the scale, 1 means I totally disagree whereas 5 means I totally agree. (iii) According to Friedman two-way Anova test χ2=593,865; p<0,001 the results are statistically significant*

Table3. *The Organizational Commitment Scale Overall Evaluation*

Organizational Commitment	Average	Std. Dev.
Emotional Commitment Total	30,82	4,02
Continuance Commitment Total	32,56	4,02
Normative Commitment Total	31,74	3,35
Organizational Commitment Overall Total[*]	95,12	9,74

Notes: *(i) n=247, (ii) in the scale, 1 means I totally disagree whereas 5 means I totally agree. (iii) According to Friedman two-way Anova test χ^2=481,869; p<0,001 the results are statistically significant.*

---

[*] Before the scores from the variables in the scale were added up, the Cronbach Alpha values of the variables were considered and it was seen that this value for Organizational Cynicism was 0,935. According to this information, Cronbach Alpha value indicates that it is possible to use the total score in analyses by adding up the item scores of the variables.

[*] Before the scores from the variables in the scale were added up, the Cronbach Alpha values of the variables were considered and it was seen that this value for Organizational Commitment was 0,898. According to this information, Cronbach Alpha value indicates that it is possible to use the total score in analyses by adding up the item scores of the variables.

We see in Table 3 that of the types of commitment, the participants feel "Continuance Commitment" the most (average.: 32,56 s:4,02). In other words, employees demonstrate commitment to the organization because they calculate the cost of leaving the organization and conclude that staying with it will be more beneficial for them. "Normative Commitment" comes second (average: 31,74 s:3,35). They exhibit commitment to the organization because they feel an obligation or indebtedness towards the organization. We see that "Emotional Commitment" comes last (average.:30, 82 s:4,02). Although it is the most desired type of commitment, it is the kind of commitment exhibited the least by the employees in the sample. For, individuals who demonstrate commitment do this because they are happy with the organization and want to stay with the organization.

Whether or not there was a difference among the scores that the participants received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale according to their genders was also investigated. The results are as follows.

Table4. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale According to Gender*

Organizational Cynicism	Gender				Mann Whitney *U* Test	
	Female (n=164)		Male (n=83)			
	Average	S.D.	Average	S.D.	z	P
Cognitive Dimension Total	12,45	4,12	13,54	5,55	-1,13	0,259
Affective Dimension Total	8,61	3,67	9,52	4,63	-1,022	0,307
Behavioral Dimension Total	9,54	3,56	10,72	4,39	-1,903	0,057
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total	30,60	9,73	33,78	13,12	-1,56	0,119

Table5. *The Organizational Commitment Scale According to Gender*

Organizational Commitment	Gender				Mann Whitney *U* Test	
	Female (n=164)		Male (n=83)			
	Average	S.D.	Average	S.D.	Z	P
Emotional Commitment Total	30,95	3,72	30,55	4,57	-0,235	0,814
Continuance Commitment Total	32,71	3,81	32,27	4,42	-0,308	0,758
Normative Commitment Total	31,95	3,22	31,34	3,58	-1,31	0,19
Organizational Commitment Overall Total	95,61	8,78	94,16	11,40	-0,46	0,645

When Table 4 and Table 5 are examined, it is seen that there is not a significant difference in employees among the dimensions of the Organizational Cynicism Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale in terms of gender.

Below are the scores obtained from the organizational cynicism and organizational commitment scales according to place of work.

Table6. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale According to Place of Work*

Organizational Cynicism	Institution				Mann Whitney *U* Test	
	Public (n=120)		Private (n=127)			
	Average	S.D.	Average	S.D.	z	P
Cognitive Dimension Total	13,21	4,54	12,45	4,78	-1,43	0,153
Affective Dimension Total	9,55	4,15	8,32	3,83	-2,545	**<0,05**
Behavioral Dimension Total	10,24	3,96	9,65	3,82	-1,256	0,209
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total	33,00	11,24	30,41	10,79	-1,734	0,083

Table7. *The Organizational Commitment Scale According to Place of Work*

Organizational Commitment	Institution				Mann Whitney *U* Test	
	Public (n=120)		Private (n=127)			
	Average	S.D.	Average	S.D.	z	P
Emotional Commitment Total	31,11	3,94	30,54	4,10	-1,286	0,198
Continuance Commitment Total	32,72	3,98	32,41	4,07	-0,324	0,746
Normative Commitment Total	31,82	3,32	31,68	3,39	-0,259	0,795
Organizational Commitment Overall Total	95,64	9,65	94,63	9,83	-0,509	0,611

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that although there is a significant difference in the "Affective Dimension" among the scores that the groups formed according to the type of institution received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale, when the scale is evaluated as a whole, it is observed that there is not a statistically significant difference among the groups. It is seen in Table 7 that there is not

a statistically significant difference among the scores which the groups formed according to the type of institution received from the Organizational Commitment Scale.

Below, in Table 8, are differences in the scores received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale according to age groups whereas in Table 9 are the differences in the scores received from the Organizational Commitment Scale according to age groups.

Table8. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale According to Age Groups*

| Organizational Cynicism | Age Groups | | | | | | | | Anova Test | |
| | 18-25 (n=40) | | 26-35 (n=111) | | 36-42 (n=65) | | 43-50 (n=31) | | | |
	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	F	P
Cognitive Dimension Total	13,48	5,17	12,80	4,40	12,88	4,88	11,90	4,55	0,662	0,576
Affective Dimension Total	9,33	4,02	8,96	4,06	9,18	4,29	7,68	3,22	1,216	0,304
Behavioral Dimension Total	10,33	3,11	10,27	3,91	9,62	4,29	8,90	3,80	1,287	0,279
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total	33,13	10,15	32,03	10,72	31,68	12,39	28,48	10,33	1,128	0,338

It is seen in Table 8 that, according to the Anova Test, there is not a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to age groups received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale.

Table9. *The Organizational Commitment Scale According to Age Groups*

| Organizational Commitment | Age Groups | | | | | | | | Anova Test | |
| | 18-25 (n=40) | | 26-35 (n=111) | | 36-42 (n=65) | | 43-50 (n=31) | | | |
	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	F	P
Emotional Commitment Total	32,20	3,11	30,14	4,03	31,09	4,50	30,90	3,63	2,804	<0,05
Continuance Commitment Total	33,58	2,85	32,06	4,33	32,62	4,10	32,90	3,89	1,502	0,215
Normative Commitment Total	32,48	3,17	31,23	3,36	31,58	3,53	32,97	2,77	2,992	<0,05
Organizational Commitment Overall Total	98,25	6,74	93,43	10,26	95,29	10,58	96,77	8,20	2,855	<0,05

It is seen in Table 9 that, according to the Anova Test, there is a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to age groups received from the Organizational Commitment Scale. The difference among the groups for the Organizational Commitment overall total scale results from those who are in the 26-35 age group according to the scheffe test. When the values in the Table are examined, the overall total of this group is the lowest among the groups.

In Table 10 and Table 11, whether or not there was a difference among the scores which the participants received from the Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Commitment Scales according to their levels of education was investigated. The results are given below.

Table10. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale According to Level of Education*

| Organizational Cynicism | Level of Education | | | | | | | | | | | | Anova Test | |
| | Primary Education (n= 9) | | High School (n= 47) | | Associate Degree (n= 38) | | Bachelor's Degree (n= 102) | | Master's (n= 33) | | Doctorate (n= 18) | | | |
	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.S.	F	P
Cognitive Dimension Total	16,67	4,30	13,30	4,80	14,37	5,28	12,36	4,22	11,00	4,02	12,28	5,05	3,585	<0,05
Affective Dimension Total	12,22	5,29	8,89	4,70	9,50	4,34	8,85	3,72	8,15	3,44	7,83	2,81	1,908	<0,05
Behavioral Dimension Total	14,56	4,36	10,00	3,57	10,45	3,81	9,76	3,99	9,03	3,32	9,00	3,76	3,442	<0,05
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total	43,44	13,49	32,19	10,69	34,32	11,18	30,98	10,79	28,18	9,81	29,11	10,41	3,604	<0,05

It is seen in Table 10 that, according to the Anova Test, there is a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to level of education received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale. The difference among the groups for the Organizational Cynicism overall scale results from the group that has the primary level of education according to the scheffe test. When the values in the table are examined, the overall total average of this group is the highest among the groups.

Table11. *The Organizational Commitment Scale According to Level of Education*

Organizational Commitment	Level of Education												Anova Test	
	Primary Education (n= 9)		High School (n= 47)		Associate Degree (n= 38)		Bachelor's Degree (n= 102)		Mater's Degree (n= 33)		Doctorate (n= 18)			
	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	F	P
Emotional Commitment Total	31,22	3,99	31,04	3,22	31,21	4,66	30,76	3,96	29,39	4,64	32,11	3,41	1,331	0,252
Continuance Commitment Total	33,78	3,15	33,66	2,88	32,53	4,10	32,27	4,19	31,24	5,03	33,17	3,22	1,789	0,116
Normative Commitment Total	30,89	3,10	31,87	3,25	32,03	3,32	31,86	3,39	30,76	3,79	32,39	2,62	0,915	0,472
Organizational Commitment Overall Total	95,89	9,05	96,57	7,09	95,76	10,88	94,90	9,79	91,39	12,09	97,67	7,44	1,491	0,193

It is seen in Table 11 that, according to the Anova Test, there is not a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to level of education received from the Organizational Commitment.

Table12. *The Organizational Cynicism Scale according to the Position of Employment*

Organizational Cynicism	Position of Employment												Anova Test	
	doctor (n= 53)		nurse (n= 96)		Caregiver (n= 11)		Health officer (n= 25)		Administrative Personnel (n= 26)		Technical personnel (n= 36)			
	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	F	P
Cognitive DimensionTotal	11,40	4,25	11,67	4,13	16,73	4,13	14,56	4,58	14,08	5,15	14,67	4,85	6,567	**<0,05**
Affective Dimension Total	8,23	3,24	8,32	3,27	12,91	4,55	9,60	4,49	8,23	4,38	10,31	5,18	4,308	**<0,05**
Behavioral Dimension Total	9,34	3,68	8,78	3,14	14,82	3,40	11,00	3,71	10,00	4,17	11,61	4,34	8,155	**<0,05**
Organizational Cynicism Overall Total	28,96	10,18	28,77	9,41	44,45	11,34	35,16	11,50	32,31	11,55	36,58	11,14	7,766	**<0,05**

In Table 12, the organizational cynicism scale according to the position of employment is given whereas in Table 13, the organizational commitment scale according to the position of employment is given.

When Table 12 is examined, it is seen that, according to the Anova Test, there is a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to position of employment received from the Organizational Cynicism Scale. The difference among the groups for the Organizational Cynicism overall total scale results from the caregivers and technical personnel groups according to the scheffe test. When the values in the Table are examined, it is observed that the overall total average of these groups is the highest among the groups.

Table13. *The Organizational Commitment Scale according to the Position of Employment*

Organizational Commitment	Position of Employment												Anova Test	
	doctor (n= 53)		nurse (n= 96)		Caregiver (n= 11)		Health officer (n= 25)		Administrative personnel (n= 26)		Technical personnel (n= 36)			
	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D.	Ave.	S.D	F	P
Emotional Commitment	30,57	4,42	30,71	4,05	30,36	4,39	30,88	4,88	31,96	2,78	30,75	3,43	0,502	0,775

Total														
Continuance Commitment Total	31,94	4,53	32,46	4,30	33,00	3,87	31,60	4,03	34,00	2,70	33,22	3,02	1,447	0,208
Normative Commitment Total	31,43	3,48	31,94	3,52	31,00	3,29	31,16	3,44	32,46	3,30	31,81	2,69	0,652	0,66
Organizational Commitment Overall Total	93,94	11,09	95,10	10,19	94,36	10,57	93,64	11,08	98,42	6,47	95,78	6,65	0,913	0,473

Table 13 shows that, according to the Anova Test, there is not a statistically significant difference among the scores that the groups formed according to position of employment received from the Organizational Commitment Scale.

One of the purposes of this study is to investigate whether or not there is a relationship between the Organizational Cynicism Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale. In this context, the relationship between the Organizational Cynicism Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale was calculated using the Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Table14. *The Matrix of the Organizational Cynicism Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale*

	Organizational Cynicism	**Organizational Commitment**
Organizational Cynicism	1	
Organizational Commitment	-0.0,28[*]	1

Note: [*]*p=0,657.*

When the correlation matrix in Table 14 is examined, it is seen that although there is not a statistically significant relationship between the Organizational Cynicism Scale and the Organizational Commitment Scale (p<.001), it can be concluded, taking into account the fact that the value in the matrix is negative, that organizational cynicism may decrease in institutions where organizational commitment increases.

CONCLUSION AND EVALUATION

As a result of our study, which we conducted to measure the organizational commitment and organizational cynicism levels in public and private hospitals in the province of Konya, we see that organizational cynicism is predominantly in the cognitive dimension and that employees are not able to put it into practice. Continuance commitment ranks first among the types of commitment whereas emotional commitment, which is the kind of commitment most desired by organizations, ranks the lowest. For, employees who are committed to their organizations emotionally adopt their organizations and exhibit commitment to be of use to it. On the other hand, employees with a high level of continuance commitment exhibit commitment because job opportunities are few and they have to endure financial costs if they quit their jobs.

It has been seen that organizational commitment is lower in the 26-35 age group. In addition to this, it has also been observed that in the initial years of their careers (18-25 age group), individuals' commitment to their organizations is at its peak. It can be argued that the high level of commitment in the initial years of employees' working life may be due to their idealism. On the other hand, it can be said that the organizational commitment of employees aged 26-35 decreases because it may require reorganization in their social lives. A statistically significant difference is observed in organizational cynicism in terms of educational level. The organizational cynicism levels of employees who have primary education are the highest. The reason for high levels of organizational cynicism in employees with lower educational level may be low wages and difficulty in getting a promotion. Moreover, it is seen that among the professional groups, caregivers and technical personnel have the highest levels of organizational cynicism. The reason for this may be that the working conditions of these jobs are harder than the other jobs in our study.

There is no statistically significant difference between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment scales. Taking into consideration the fact that the relationship is negative, we can say that employees who are committed to their organizations may exhibit less cynical attitudes. However,

it is hard to say that they are totally different opposite. Indeed, such a result was not obtained in our study. Dean et al. (1998) compared and contrasted organizational commitment and organizational cynicism and found several differences between them. *The first* is that cognitively cynical employees believe that the practices of the organization where they work lack honesty and integrity whereas in commitment employees make an evaluation about whether their values and goals bear similarity to those of the organization. *The second* is that behaviorally cynical employees are interested in whether or not they should accept the idea of leaving their organization, whereas commitment involves employees' intention to stay in the organization. *The third* is that affectively cynical employees may have experiences such as defeat and scorn, whereas employees who do not feel commitment may experience lack of commitment to the organization as well as a lack of pride. In plain words, cynicism is quite different from a lack of commitment is a far extreme state (Dean et al, 1998: 348).

Increasing organizational commitment and preventing cynical attitudes is a very important desirable situation for organizations. To this end, issues such as ensuring equality in pay, increasing promotion opportunities, improving working conditions, equalizing promotion opportunities through in-service training, and strengthening employer-employee communication bear huge significance.

REFERENCES

Abraham, R. (2000). *Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences, Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, Vol: 126, No: 3, 269-292, 2000.

Akın, H. Bahadır, (2002). Administration and Humor: Organizations and A Humorous Look at Bureaucracy, Çizgi Kitabevi, Konya, 2002.

Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990). "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63, No. 1, pp.1-18.

Andersson, L. (1996). Employee Cynicism: an Examination Using a Contract Violation Framework, *Human Relations*, No. 49, 1395-1418.

Arslan, E.T. (2012). "General and Organizational Cynicism Levels of the Academic Personnel at Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences". Journal of Doğuş University, 13:1, 12-27.

Aster, Ernst von, (2005). History of Philosophy of Ancient and Medieval Ages, İm Yayın Tasarım / Düşüncebil-im Kitapları Dizisi 417 p. İstanbul, 3rd Ed..

Balay, R. (2000). Organizational Commitment in Administrators and Teachers, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Bateman, T.S., Sakano, T., Fujita, M. (1992). Roger, me, and my attitude: Film propaganda and cynicism toward corporate leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(5), 768-771.

Bayram, L., (2005). "A New Paradigm in Administration: Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Court of Accounts,* October-December 2005, No.:59, pp.:125-139, Ankara.

Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment, *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.

Bernerth, J.B., Armenakıs, A.A., Feild, H.S., Walker, J. (September 2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 43 (3), 303-326. pp.

Blau, G.J. and Boal, K.B. (1987). "Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism" *Academy of Management Review,* Vol.12, No.2, 288–300.

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

Bozkurt, F., (2007). A Study on the Relationship between Demographic Features of Shipmen Working in the Maritime Sector and Organizational Commitment, Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Perceived Organizational Support Level, Unpublished Master's Thesis at Celal Bayar University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Manisa.

Brandes Pamela et al. (2008). "The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff", *Journal of Leadership& Organizational Studies*, S.3, s.233-247.

Brown B. B., Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors' Relation-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Unpublished Dissertation, Falls Church, Virginia.

Çakır, A. (2007). *A Study on the Relationship between the Organizational Commitment Levels and Perceptions of School Culture of Teachers Employed at Primary Education Schools*, Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul University Graduate School of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

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

Doğan, S. Demiral, Ö. (2009). "A Study on the Effect of Personnel Strengthening and Psychological Contract on Organizational Commitment",*Erciyes University Economic and Administrative Sciences Faculty Journal,* January-June, 47-80.

Dubın, R., Champoux, J.E. and Porter, L.W. (1975). "Central Life Interests and Organizational Commitment of Blue-Collar and Clerical Workers", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 20, ss.411-421.

Eisinger, Robert M. (2000). "Questioning Cynicism", Society, 37:5, 55-60.

Erdoğan, D. (2009). *A Study on the Organizational Commitment Levels of Form Teachers at Public Primary Education).* Beykent University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal), İstanbul.

Feldman, D. (2000, May). The Dilbert syndrome: How employee cynicism about ineffective management is changing the nature of careers in organizations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 1286-1301.

Hall, D.T., Schneider, B. and Nygren, H.T. (1970). "Personal Factors in Organizational Identification", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 15, pp.176-190.

Hrebiniak, L.G., and Alutto, J.A. (1972). "Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, (17:4), Dec. pp. 555-572.

İnce, M. and Gül, H. (2005). *A New Paradigm in Administration: Organizational Coomitment,* İleri Giden Ofset, Ankara.

James, Matrecia Shalonda Long. *Antecedents and consequences of cynicism in organizations: An examination of the potential positive and negative effects on school systems*. 2005. PhD Thesis.

Kutaniş, R.Ö. and Çetinel, E. (2010). "Does A Perception of Injustice Trigger Cynicism? A Case Study, *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Dumlupınar University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal*, 1:26, 186-195.

Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1991). "A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment", *Human Resources Management Review,* Vol.: 1, 61–89.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J.P, Allen, N.J and Smith, C. (1993). "Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-component Conceptualization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78, pp. 538-551.

Mowday, R.T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 8(4), 387-401.

Naus, A.J.A.M. (2007), *Organizational Cynicism on The Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences of Employee Cynicism Toward The Employing Organization*, Dissertation of Doctoral Dissertation, Maastricht University, Maastricht.

Ölçüm Ç.M. (2004). Organizational Culture and Organizational Commitment, Ankara: Nobel Publications.

Özgener, Ş., Öğüt, A. and Kaplan, M. (2008). A New Paradigm in Employee-Employer Relations: organizational Cynicism. Selected Topics in Organizational Behavior, (Edt. Mahmut Özdevecioğlu and Himmet Kaplan), G. Ü. V. İlke Yayınevi, Ankara.

Powell, D.M. and Meyer, J. P. (2004). "Side-bet Theory and The Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment", Journal Of Vocational Behavior, 65:157-177.

Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J.P. and Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and Managing Cynicism About Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11 (1), pp. 48-59.

Reichers, A.E. (1985). "A Review and Reconceptualization of Organizational Commitment". *Academy of Management Review* 10 (3): 465–476.

Rubin, R.S., Dierdorff, E. C., Bommer, W.H., Baldwin, T.T. (2009). Do leaders reap what they sow? Leader and employee outcomes of leader organizational cynicism about change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 680-688. Pp.

Sagie, A., (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, V. 52, p. 156-171.

Salancik, G.R. (1977). *Commitment is too easy*. Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 6(1), 62-80.

Sığrı, U. (2007). "An Analysis of Organizational Commitments of Employees Using Meyer and Allen Typology: A Comparative Study in Public and Private Sectors, Anadolu Universitesi.

Tokgöz, N., Yılmaz, H. (2008). "Organizational Cynicism: An Application in Hotels in Eskişehir and Alanya", Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences Journal) Vol.:8, No.:2, 283-305.

Wasti, S.A.. (2002). "Affective and Continuance Commitment To The Organization: Test of An Integrated Model in The Turkısh Context", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* Vol:26, 525–550.

Wılkerson, J.M., Evans, W.R., Davıs, W.D. (2008). A test of coworkers' influence on organizational cynicism, badmouthing, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2273-2292. ss.

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations. A normative view. *Academy of Management Review.* 7(3). 418-428

Yıldız, M. (2010). *For Prof.Dr. Kurthan Fişek: On Management*, Ankara: Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences Publications, p. 363-37