

## The Relationship Between the Leadership Styles of School Managers and Organizational Cynicism According to the Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers\*

\*  
Eray Demirçelik\* - Mehmet Korkmaz\*\*

\* Uzm. Çetin Şen Bilim ve Sanat Merkezi, Melikgazi / Kayseri / Türkiye

E-Posta: eraydemircelik@gmail.com ORCID: 0000-0002-3165-7211

\*\* Prof. Dr., Siirt Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi / Siirt/ Türkiye

E-Posta: m.korkmaz@mail.com.tr ORCID: 0000-0001-7600-5121

### Abstract

*The purpose of this research is to determine the relationship between leadership styles perceived by teachers of school principals and the organizational cynics. In the research, it has been tried to investigate how much of organizational cynicism can be attributed to leadership styles. The study was conducted according to the relational screening model. The study group selected by the purposeful sampling method consists of a total of 142 teachers working in five secondary schools in Kayseri. The Organizational Cynicism Scale was used to determine organizational cynicism. The Multicultural Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x-short) was used to determine the leadership styles of school managers. Correlation coefficients were calculated for the relationship between variables, whether the variables influence each other and what the power of explanation is revealed by multiple regression analysis. According to research findings, school principals mostly exhibit transformative leadership behaviours. There is a negative relationship between the transformational leadership dimension and the cognitive and behavioural dimensions of organizational cynicism. As a result of the regression analysis performed, transformational leader's influence on cognitive and behavioural dimensions of organizational cynicism is significant.*

**Keywords:** Leadership styles, Organizational cynicism, School manager, Teacher, Secondary school

---

\* This study was presented as oral presentation at 10<sup>th</sup> National Education Management Congress.

## Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Algılarına Göre Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri İle Örgütsel Sinizm Arasındaki İliřki

\*

### Öz

*Bu arařtırmanın amacı okul yöneticilerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan liderlik stilleri ile örgütsel sinizm arasındaki iliřkiyi belirlemektir. Arařtırmada örgütsel sinizmin ne kadarının liderlik stillerine bağlanabileceđi irdelenmeye çalışılmıřtır. Arařtırma iliřkisel tarama modeline göre yapılmıřtır. Arařtırmanın çalışma grubu, amaçlı örnekleme yöntemi ile seçilen ve Kayseri’de bulunan beř ortaokulda çalışan toplam 142 öğretmenden oluřmaktadır. Örgütsel sinizmi belirleyebilmek için, Örgütsel Sinizm Ölçeđi, okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerini belirlemek amacıyla Çok Faktörlü Liderlik Anketi (MLQ 5x-short) kullanılmıřtır. Deđiřkenler arasındaki iliřki için korelasyon katsayıları hesaplanmış, deđiřkenlerin birbirlerini etkileyip etkilemediđini ve açıklama gücünün ne olduđu ise çoklu regresyon analizi ile ortaya konmuřtur. Arařtırma bulgularına göre, okul yöneticileri çođunlukla dönüřümcü liderlik davranıřlarını sergilemektedir. Dönüřümsel liderlik boyutu ile örgütsel sinizmin, biliřsel ve davranıřsal boyutları arasında ters yönlü anlamlı bir iliřki bulunmaktadır. Yapılan regresyon analizi sonucunda, dönüřümcü liderliđin örgütsel sinizmin biliřsel ve davranıřsal boyutları üzerinde etkisi anlamlıdır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Liderlik stilleri, Örgütsel sinizm, Okul yöneticisi, Öğretmen, Ortaokul*

## Introduction

One of the important factors affecting the success of educational institutions today is the skills and abilities that the managers have. The leadership behaviors of school administrators in school play an effective role in achieving the organizational goals of the school (Başaran, 1991, 45). Leadership skills of the school administrator are one of the important factors affecting the quality of education in the school (Korkmaz, 2005). According to organizational behaviour scientists leadership occurs in the role of the individual in the group and in the interaction of this role during the process of shaping the expectations of the other group members (Korkmaz, 2006). Behaviours in an organizational environment where a large part of an individual's life is spent are closely related to many variables. Research on the conditions and behaviors of the individuals in the organizations shows that variables such as organizational culture (Robbins and Judge, 2013; Shein, 2004), leader-member interaction (Schriesheim, Neider and Scandura, 1998; Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997) leadership (Bass, 1997; Bass and Avolio, 1990; Hoy and Miskel, 2012; Yukl, 1989) are effective in the behavior of individuals in the organizational environment. When studies of school administrators' leadership styles are examined in our country it is seen that there are many researches that reveal the transformational leadership capacity (Karip, 1998), relationship between leadership characteristics and transformational leadership behaviours, teacher performance of leadership styles, executive personality traits, organizational health and relationship with learning organization (Korkmaz, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008), effect of teachers on organizational citizenship behaviour (Çetin, Korkmaz and Çakmakçı, 2012), relationship between leadership styles and mobbing (Cemaloğlu, 2007), relationship between leadership styles and organizational commitment of school administrators (Buluç, 2009).

Today's schools need administrators that are well trained in all respects. Adoption to a constantly evolving and changing environment could be provided by admins having advanced leadership features (Çınar and Bozgeyikli, 2015). Leadership is the ability to cope with change. A school administrator is an educational leader who develops vision for all the stakeholders in the school for the agreed goals and increases school

success in line with that vision (Sashkin, 1986). In recent definitions of leadership it is accepted as an interaction process in which motivation is used instead of power or authority to achieve organizational objectives. Thus the importance of influence is emphasized and formal authority is being left in the background. For this reason, transformational leadership is widely accepted in the literature (Nourthouse, 2010; Vigoda-Gadot, 2006).

The transformational leadership developed by Bass, which was announced by Burns in 1978 (Korkmaz, 2006), unleashes the talents found in his followers, provides positive motivation and aims to make effective change moves. According to Bass and Avolio (1990), the transformational leadership behaviour has four dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual support. The idealized influence is the formation of a strong influence on followers' admiration, trust and likeness towards the leader. Inspirational motivation; transformational leaders creates environments that will improve the sense of common aims for their followers and boost their morale. They give encouraging and enthusing speeches for the followers. Intellectual stimulation refers to the ability of the leader to motivate employees to develop their talents and problem-solving abilities. Individual support means providing new opportunities for the improvements of the employees regarding their different needs (Bass and Avolio, 1995).

Transactional leaders are the ones that determines the employee's behaviours towards their roles and tasks, leads or motivates them towards organizational goals (Howell and Avolio, 1993). Interactional leadership has three dimensions; conditional award, management by exceptions, and laissez-faire leadership behaviour (Bass, 1997). Conditional award: Leaders reveal their expectations from their followers and what they will achieve if these expectations are met. Management by exceptions is applied in two forms, active and passive. Active managers follow the performance of their staff, warn and correct their mistakes. Passive managers wait until the mistake occurs, and do not take any corrective action (Bass, 1997). In Laissez-faire leadership behavior, the leader doesn't seem much, refrains taking responsibility. He is indecisive and reluctant.

According to employees' evaluations, the transformational leadership has three main influences, extra effort, efficiency and satisfaction (Bass and Avolio, 1995). In organizations transformational leadership behaviors of the leaders lead to increased extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction (Karip, 1998).

Individuals are able to react differently to any negative situation they encounter in their institution. The density of activities related to organizational life, organizational competition, various disagreements, the efforts to prove themselves, the situations in which the expectations are at the upper levels negatively affect the individual's thoughts about the institution they are working with (Cemaloğlu, 2007). Cognitive workers who feed suspicious, sceptical, insecure, pessimistic feelings against the institution they work for can be found in every organization (Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar, 1998). Cynicism is a very broad concept with individual and organizational dimensions. In the studies of organizational cynicism and different variables (Çakıcı and Doğan, 2014; DeCelles, Tesluk and Taxman, 2013; Kabataş, 2010; Kalağan, 2009; Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan, 2012; Pelit and Pelit, 2014; Üçok and Torun, 2014), the relationship between leadership and the organizational cynicism (Bommer, Rich and Rubin, 2005; Davis and Gardner, 2004; Neves, 2012) individual and organizational dimensions of cynicism have been tried to be expressed through different variables in different contexts. Research in educational organizations found a significant relationship between organizational cynicism and school culture and school achievement (Karadağ, Kılıçoğlu and Yılmaz, 2014), between leadership behaviors and cynicism (Polatcan and Titrek, 2014), between the level of organizational cynicism of teachers and their branch, occupational seniority, educational status, school type and reasons of choosing teaching (Kalağan and Güzeller, 2010).

Cynicism is a multidimensional concept that can be associated with many disciplines based on philosophical foundations, According to the Turkish Language Institution's (TDK) Contemporary Turkish Dictionary it is described as 'Antisthenes teaching which claims that one can self-access virtue and happiness without being bound by any value' (TDK, 2014). According to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) *cynic* is defined as 'A person who believes that people are motivated purely by self-interest ra-

ther than acting for honourable or unselfish reasons' (OED, 2014). Cynicism has close meanings with insecurity, scepticism, pessimism, and lack of faith. It is an attitude that is shaped by disappointment, negative emotions and distrust that people feel against another person, a group or an organization (Andersson, 1996). The main factors that constitute cynicism are due to individual or organizational reasons. Individual reasons are usually related to personality traits. Inequalities in organizations and the failure to meet occupational expectations are among the reasons for organizational cynicism (Peng and Zhou, 2009). Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly (2003) reported in their research that they have found that cynicism in organizations stems from organizational injustice and indifference.

Organizational cynicism whose theoretical bases rely on expectancy theory, attribution theory, attitude theory, social change theory, emotional events theory and social motivation theory is defined as the notion that an institution is lack of integrity and honesty and the negative attitude of the individual to the organization and is examined in three dimensions (Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar, 1998). In these dimensions, the first one is the belief that organization is devoid of honesty, which arises with negative feelings such as rage, contempt and condemnation. The second dimension is the emotional reactions that emerge as a result of negative feelings towards the organization. The last dimension involves humiliation and critical behaviour tendencies via strong criticism, cynical humour and pessimistic predictions (Özgener, Ögüt and Kaplan, 2008).

While organizational cynicism reduces effectiveness and productivity in organizations, it can cause material and moral losses. In this sense, factors such as decrease in organizational commitment, increase in quitting work, dissatisfaction in work, alienation to work and decrease in organizational performance can be shown among organizational cynicism results (Andersson, 1996; Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003; Neves, 2012; Peng and Zhou, 2009).

In general, although the leadership behavior of school administrators is considered to be influential among the causes of organizational cynicism in educational organizations, empirical research on the field is limited. How much of the organizational cynicism that teachers experience can be related to the school administrator. What are the effects of school

administrators' leadership styles on teachers' cynical attitude? It seems that there aren't enough studies in the field to for these questions. This research aims to examine the leadership style influence of the school manager as an effective variable in the cynical attitude of the teachers. For this purpose, the answers to the following questions will be sought. How teachers perceive school administrators' leadership styles? Is there a relationship between leadership styles of school administrators and organizational cynicism?

## Method

This research is in the relational screening model. Relational search models are a research model used to determine the presence and / or the degree of co-exchange between two or more variables (Karasar, 2007, 81).

## Participants

The population of the research is formed by the secondary state school teachers working in Kayseri province. The sample of the research consists of 142 teachers who work in five selected secondary schools. In the determination of the schools in the survey, the criterion sampling technique was used. For this purpose, the criteria that 'the school administrator must be at least six months old at the same school' was selected as the criterion in the sample selection of the research.

When the demographic characteristics of teachers participating in the research are examined; 31.7% were female, 68.3% were male, 88% were married 12% were single, 86.6% were bachelor and 13.4% were masters degree graduates. When the distribution of age variable is examined; 58.5% are in the age group of 31-39, 23.9% are in the age group of 22-30 and 17.6% are in the age group of 40-48. When the distribution according to seniority in the teaching profession is examined; the teachers in the seniority group for 11-20 years (57.7%) were higher than the seniority groups for 1-10 years (31%) and 21 years and over (11.3%). When the distribution of working time in the school where the teachers are located is examined; 1-5 years (41.5%), 6-10 years (30.3%), less than 1 year (21.8%) and 11 years or more (6.3%) respectively.

## Data Collection Tools

In the study, two different measuring instruments were used. The required permissions were taken to use of the surveying instruments employed in the research.

**Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ):** The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 5X Short (MLQ) Turkish version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (1995) was used to determine the leadership styles of school administrators. MLQ is a five-point Likert-type measure. The survey consists of a total of 45 items, including 20 determining the transformational leadership, 16 determining the transactional leadership, and nine determining the results of the leadership behaviours. Transformational leadership consist of idealized affect (behaviour), idealized effect (attributed), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual support sub-dimensions, whereas transactional leadership consists of conditional compensation, exceptional management (passive), exceptional management (active), Laissez-Faire leadership sub-dimensions. The results of leadership behaviours consist of three dimensions: extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction. Bass and Avolio (1995) found that the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the scale are in the dimension of transformational leadership 0.86 for idealized effect (attributed), 0.87 for idealized effect (behaviour), 0.91 for inspirational motivation, 0.91 for intellectual stimulation, and 0.90 for individual support. In terms of processor leadership, the conditional prize was found as 0.87, exceptional management (active) 0.74, exceptional management (passive) 0.82, laissez-faire leadership 0.83.

The following Table 1 gives information about result of leadership styles factor analysis. From the following table we find out that sample sufficiency index KMO by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin, which compares the sizes of the observed correlation coefficients to the sizes of the partial correlation coefficients for the sum of analysis variables is 85.8%, and it is reliable because it overcomes 70% by far. In addition, supposition test of sphericity by the Bartlett test is rejected on a level of statistical significance  $p < 0.0005$

for approx. ChiSquare= 9131,549. As a result, both acceptances for the conduct of factor analysis are satisfied and we can proceed to it.

*Table 1. Result of leadership styles factor analysis*

Factors of MLQ	Factor Loading			Item-rest correlation
	Transfor- mational leadership	Transactional leadership	Laissez Faire	
L1		.657		.809
L2	.804			.779
L3			.867	.898
L4		.772		.758
L5			.761	.784
L6	.881			.904
L7			.627	.802
L8	.796			.764
L9	.820			.855
L10	.806			.938
L11		.827		.855
L12			.851	.903
L13	.759			.827
L14	.512			.689
L15	.622			.721
L16		.888		.879
L17			.855	.822
L18	.709			.763
L19	.857			.761
L20		.863		.888
L21	.803			.915
L22		.726		.862
L23	.819			.898
L24		.848		.737
L25	.787			.839
L26	.875			.899
L27		.736		.889
L28			.683	.821
L29	.595			.821
L30	.849			.894
L31	.756			.884
L32	.800			.898

L33			.528	.729
L34	.816			.891
L35		.887		.858
L36	.809			.886
Eigen values	18.168	3.081	6.175	
Variance Explained	40.629	6.847	13.723	
Cronbach's Alfa	.96	.66	.91	
Total Variance Explained		61.199		
KMO		.858		
Bartlett's Test		9131.549		

Varimax rotation was applied on 45 items of the leadership survey. Factor analysis revealed a structure with nine factors. Distribution of the remaining 36 items after the removal of the nine items containing the results of the leadership behaviors, the first, third, fourth, and eighth factors consisted of 20 items belong to transformational style whose item load changes between 0.51 to 0.88. The fifth, sixth, seventh and ninth factors consisted of nine items belong to transactional style whose item load changes between 0.65 to 0.88. The second factor consisted of seven items belong to Laissez-Faire whose item load changes between 0.52 to 0.86. This is 61.2% of the total variance. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of dimensions were calculated as 0.96, 0.91 and 0.66, respectively. Similar results were obtained regarding the validity and reliability of the questionnaire in the studies where the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used in Turkey conducted by Cemaloğlu (2007), Buluç (2009), Çetin, Korkmaz and Çakmakçı (2012).

**Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS):** The "Organizational Cynicism Scale" developed by Brandes, Dharwadkar and Dean (1999) and adapted to Turkish by Kalağan (2009) consists of 13 items. There are three dimensions of organizational cynicism scale: cognitive (5 items), affective (4 items) and behavioural (4 items). Brandes et al. (1999) found that the factor loadings of the cognitive dimension items ranged from 0.63 to 0.81; the factor loadings of the affective dimension items were 0.75 to 0.80 and the factor loadings of the behavioural dimension items ranged from 0.54 to

0.80. In addition, Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of dimensions were calculated as 0.86, 0.80 and 0.78, respectively.

Varimax rotation was applied on 13 items of the organizational cynicism questionnaire. Factor analysis revealed a three-factor structure. The first factor included five items that belonged to the cognitive dimension and ranged from 64 to 81 item loads. The second factor consisted of four items belonging to the affective dimension ranging from 79 to 87 item loads. The third dimension was composed of four items belonging to the behavioral dimension and ranging from 63 to 85 item loads. According to the data, the reliability level of organizational cynicism scale was found as  $\alpha=.90$ , cognitive dimension's Cronbach alpha value is  $\alpha=.85$ , affective dimension's Cronbach alpha value is  $\alpha=.89$ , behavioural dimension's Cronbach's alpha is  $\alpha=.85$ . The first factor explains the 25.15% of the total variance for the scale. The second factor explains the 24.21% of the total variance for the scale and the third factor explains the 20.61% of the total variance for the scale. This explains 69.9% of the total variance.

## Findings

In Table 2, sub dimensions of organizational cynicism scale; arithmetic average ( $\bar{x}$ ), standard deviations (ss) and reliability coefficients ( $\alpha$ ) of cognitive, emotional and behavioral cynicism and transformative, interactivity and laissez-faire leadership styles sub-dimensions are given. In Table 2, it is seen that the highest average among the leadership styles is in the transformative leadership ( $\bar{x} = 2.95$ ) sub-dimension and the lowest average is the Laissez-Faire ( $\bar{x} = 1.03$ ) sub-dimension. Within organizational cynicism scale subdimensions, the highest average belongs to cognitive dimension ( $\bar{x} = 1.28$ ), whereas the lowest average belongs to affective dimension ( $\bar{x} = 1.15$ ).

Except for the transactional leadership dimension ( $\alpha = 0.66$ ),  $\alpha$  is over 0.7 in all dimensions. The success of the scales is satisfactory. Similar results were obtained regarding the validity and reliability of the questionnaire in the studies where the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used in Turkey conducted by Karip (1998), Korkmaz (2005, 2006,

2007, 2008), Cemaloğlu (2007), Buluç (2009), Çetin, Korkmaz and Çakmakçı (2012).

**Table 2. Reliability, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of the factor groups (n = 142)**

Variables	$\bar{x}$	ss	$\alpha^a$
Cognitive dimension (5 items)	1.28 <sup>b</sup>	0.70	0.85
Affective dimension (4 items)	1.15 <sup>b</sup>	0.63	0.88
Behavioral dimension (4 items)	1.27 <sup>b</sup>	0.66	0.85
Transformational leadership (20 items)	2.95 <sup>b</sup>	0.68	0.96
Transactional leadership (9 items)	1.87 <sup>b</sup>	0.52	0.66
Laissez-Faire (7 items)	1.03 <sup>b</sup>	0.89	0.91

<sup>a</sup> Cronbach's Alpha

<sup>b</sup>Scale value: 0=never 4=always

Similar results were obtained regarding the validity and reliability of the scale in the studies where the organizational cynicism scale was used in Turkey conducted by Kalağan (2009), Özgan, Külekçi and Özkan (2012), Polatcan and Titrek (2014).

**Table 3. Teacher perceptions correlation analysis results**

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Cognitive dimension	1.00	.435(*)	.642(*)	-.613(*)	.037	.301(*)
2-Affective dimension		1.00	.416(*)	-.254(*)	.256(*)	.348(*)
3-Behavioral dimension			1.00	-.597(*)	.008	.453(*)
4-Transformational leadership				1.00	.087	-.471(*)
5-Transactional leadership					1.00	.450(*)
6- Laissez-Faire						1.00

\* p<.01

When the cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions of the organizational cynicism scale and the distribution of MLQ's transformational, interactionist and laissez faire leadership styles sub-dimensions are

examined, (as seen in table 3), there is a high degree of relationship between the transformational leadership dimension and the cognitive dimension ( $r = -.613$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and the behavioural dimensions ( $r = -.597$ ,  $p < .01$ ), but there is a low negative correlation with the transformational leadership dimension and the affective dimension ( $r = -.254$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Accordingly, as school administrators' transformational leadership behaviours increase, the tendency of teachers to show behaviour toward cognitive and behavioural dimensions which are organizational cynicism sub-dimensions will decrease. There is a significant positive correlation between all dimensions of organizational cynicism scale: between the cognitive and affective dimensions ( $r = .435$ ,  $p < .01$ ), cognitive and behavioural dimensions ( $r = .642$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and affective and behavioural dimensions ( $r = .416$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Accordingly, change in any dimension of organizational cynicism can affect other dimensions as well. It can be claimed that these dimensions influence each other in the same direction. The leadership scale has a significant negative relationship between the transformational leadership dimension and the laissez-faire dimension ( $r = -.471$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Accordingly, it can be said that as the school administrators increase the transformational leadership behaviours, they decrease the leadership behaviours of the laissez-faire dimension. There is a significant positive correlation between the transactional leadership dimension and the laissez-faire dimension ( $r = .45$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Accordingly, the increase in the school administrators' behaviours belonging to the transactional leadership dimension leads to an increase in the laissez-faire dimension.

(In Table 4), when the results of multiple regression analysis on the predictive of cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism are examined, there is a significant relationship between cognitive dimension and leadership styles ( $R = .622$ ,  $R^2 = .386$ ,  $p < .01$ ). As a result of multiple regression analysis of the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism as the predicted variable, transformational leadership seems to predict the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism to a significant extent ( $p \leq .01$ ). The score of [ $\beta = -.653$  and  $t = -7.99$ ] in the transformational leadership dimension show us the impact value in this level of significance.

**Table 4. Multiple regression analysis results regarding prediction of cognitive, affective and behavioural dimension**

Dimensions	Predictive Variables					
	B	Std. Error B	$\beta$	t	p	
Dependent Variable (Cognitive Dimension)	Transformational leadership	-.120	.015	-.653	-7.99	<.001*
	Transactional leadership	.091	.060	.122	1.50	.134
	Laissez-Faire	-.035	.051	-.062	-.677	.499
	R= .622 R <sup>2</sup> = .386 F <sub>(3-138)</sub> = 28.968					
Dependent Variable (Affective Dimension)	Transformational leadership	-.032	.016	-.191	-2.00	.047*
	Transactional leadership	.133	.064	.197	2.08	.039*
	Laissez-Faire	.086	.054	.169	1.58	.116
	R= .397 R <sup>2</sup> = .158 F <sub>(3-138)</sub> = 8.62					
Dependent Variable (Behavioural Dimension)	Transformational leadership	-.081	.014	-.466	-5.75	<.001*
	Transactional leadership	-.050	.056	-.071	-.88	.377
	Laissez-Faire	.140	.048	.265	2.93	.004*
	R= .631 R <sup>2</sup> = .398 F <sub>(3-138)</sub> = 30.355					

\*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01

In the other dimensions, no significant effect was found ( $p \leq .05$  and  $p \leq .01$ ). According to the standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ), the relative importance of the predicted variables over the cognitive dimension is; the

transformational leadership, the transactional leadership and laissez-faire. Together, transformationalist, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership variables account for approximately 39% of the total variance for the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism.

When the results of multiple regression analysis on the prediction of the affective dimension of organizational cynicism are examined, it is seen that the leadership style transformational leadership and transactional leadership sub-dimensions do have a significant effect on the affective dimension of organizational cynicism ( $R=.397$ ,  $R^2=.158$ ,  $p<.05$ ). While there is a negative relationship between transformational leadership and the affective dimension of organizational cynicism ( $\beta=-.191$ ,  $t=-2.00$ ,  $p<.05$ ), transactional leadership affects the affective dimension of organizational cynicism positively ( $\beta=.197$ ,  $t=2.08$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Together, transformationalist, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership variables account for about 16% of the total variance for the affective dimension of organizational cynicism. According to the standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ), the relative importance of the predicted variables over the cognitive dimension is in this order; the transactional leadership, the transformational leadership, and laissez-faire.

When the results of multiple regression analysis for predicting the behavioural dimension of organizational cynicism are examined, there is a significant relationship between the behavioural dimension of organizational cynicism and the leadership styles of transformationalist and laissez-faire ( $R=.631$ ,  $R^2=.398$ ,  $p<.01$ ). The score of transformative leadership dimension  $\beta= -.466$  ve  $t= -5.756$  and laissez-faire dimension  $\beta= .265$  ve  $t= 2.933$  show us the impact value of this significance. Together, transformationalist, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership variables account for about 40% of the total variance for the behavioural dimension of organizational cynicism. According to the standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ), the order of the relative importance of the predicted variables over the behavioural dimension is; the transformational leadership, laissez-faire and the transactional leadership.

According to the results of the regression analysis, the regression equations for the prediction of cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions are as follows. Cognitive dimension=  $15.094 -.120$  transformational

leadership +.091 transactional leadership -.035 laissez-faire. Affective dimension= 4,417-.032 transformational leadership +.133 transactional leadership +.086 laissez-faire. Behavioural dimension= 11,620-.081 transformational leadership -.050 transactional leadership +.140 laissez-faire.

## Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

For the purpose of this study, the relationship between organizational cynicism and the leadership styles of school managers according to the perceptions of secondary school teachers was determined. The findings of this study show that teachers participating in the research perceive their school principals as transformational leaders and exhibit low cynic behaviour. It was determined that among the sub dimensions of organizational cynicism scale, cognitive dimension has the highest and the affective dimension has the lowest mean. Teachers assessed the leadership behaviours of school administrators at the highest level in terms of transformational leadership. This result supports the research results of Buluç (2009), Karip (1998) and Korkmaz (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008).

The most important finding of this study is that there is a negative correlation between the transformational leadership behaviours of the school principals and the cognitive and behavioural dimensions of organizational cynicism. The fact that school principals showing transformational leadership behaviours can help working staff to show positive attitudes and behaviours towards the school (Neves, 2012; Jung, Chow and Wu, 2003) and therefore also reduce cynical behaviour tendencies. This finding is similar to the results of Polatcan and Titrek (2014), which tests the relationship between the transformational leadership style of school principals and the level of organizational cynicism in their research. Wu, Neubert and Yi (2007) found that there was a negative relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and organizational cynicism in their study. The presence of a negative but low relationship in terms of emotional dimension suggests that school administrators need to make the teachers morale increasing discourses and behaviours more often. Criticizing the institution they work for and having negative attitudes and behaviours towards the institution (Dean et al., 1998) have been identified

as characteristics of individuals with a high level of cynicism. When the concepts of organizational cynicism and transformational leadership are examined theoretically, it can be said that there is a negative relationship between the two concepts.

Cynicism is a notable concept in recent years in the literature of educational administration. Investigating the concept of cynicism that reflects negative attitudes and working to solve it, is important for the organizations. The fact that the school principals are in a transformational approach in educational organizations causes teachers to give positive reactions. School principals should be aware of the teacher's tendencies and determine an active management style. It is important to consider these trends and scientific criteria in the election of school administrators. Teachers' feelings of belonging to the school can be improved, and in-service trainings can be given to teachers about situations that will cause cynicism.

## References

- Andersson, L. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49, 1395-1418.
- Başaran, E. (1991). *Turkey education system*. Ankara: Gül.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Personal selling and transactional/ transformational leadership. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 17(3), 19-28.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Developing transformational leadership:1992 and beyond. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 14(5), 21-27.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *MLQ-Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. California: Mind Garden.
- Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. A. & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change:Longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(7), 733-753.

- Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R. & Dean, J. W. (1999). Does organizational cynicism matter? Employee and supervisor perspectives on work outcomes. *Eastern Academy of Management Proceedings*, 150-153. Outstanding Empirical Paper Award.
- Buluç, B. (2009). The relationships between organizational commitment and leadership styles of principals based on elementary school teacher's perceptions. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 15(57), 5-34.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). The relationship between the leadership styles of school administrators and mobbing. *Journal of Hacettepe University Education Faculty*, 33, 77-87.
- Çakıcı, A. & Doğan, S. (2014). The impact of organizational cynicism on business performance: A research in vocational colleges. *Journal of Doğuş University*, 15(1), 79-89.
- Çetin, Ş., Korkmaz, M. & Çakmakçı, C. (2012). Effects of transformational and transactional leadership and leader-member exchange on teachers' organizational citizenship behaviors, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 18(1), 7-36.
- Çınar, A. & Bozgeyikli, H. (2015). Perceptions of distributed leadership in the secondary school institutions. *OPUS - International Journal of Society Researches*, 5(9), 42-60.
- Dawis, W. D. & Gardner, W. L. (2004). Perceptions of politics and organizational cynicism: An attributional and leader-member exchange perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 439-465.
- Dean Jr, J. W., Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2(23), 341-352.
- DeCelles, K. A., Tesluk, P. E. & Taxman, F. S. (2013). A field investigation of multilevel cynicism toward change. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 154-171.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Education management theory, research and application* (Trs. S.Turan). Ankara: Nobel.
- Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.

- Jung, D. I., Chow, C. & Wu, A. (2003). The role transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 525-544.
- Johnson, J. L. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 627-647.
- Kabataş, A. (2010). *An examination of the relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational citizenship behavior and a research*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Science, Kocaeli, Turkey.
- Kalağan, G. (2009). *The relationship between research assistants' perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism* (Unpublished master's thesis). Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Science, Antalya, Turkey.
- Kalağan, G. & Güzeller, C. O. (2010). The organizational cynicism levels of the teachers. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education*, 27, 83-97.
- Karadağ, E., Kılıçoğlu, G. & Yılmaz, D. (2014). Organizational cynicism, school culture, and academic achievement: The study of structural equation modeling. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 14(1), 89-113.
- Karasar, N. (2007). *Scientific research method*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Karip, E. (1998). Transformational leadership. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 16, 443-465.
- Korkmaz, M. (2005). Effects of leadership styles and emotions on teachers' performance. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 43, 401-422.
- Kokmaz, M. (2006). The relationship between the personality characters of school managers and their leadership styles. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 46, 199-226.
- Kokmaz, M. (2007). Effects of leadership styles on organizational health. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 49, 57-91.
- Kokmaz, M. (2008). A study of relationship between leadership styles on the characteristics of learning organizations in Turkish public schools. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 53, 75-98.

- Neves, P. (2012). Organizational cynicism: Spillover effects on supervisor-subordinate relationships and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 965–976.
- Nourthouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. NY: Sage.
- OED. (2014). Oxford English Dictionary. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/>,
- Özgan, H., Külekçi, E. & Özkan, M. (2012). Analyzing of the relationships between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment of teaching staff. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4(1), 196-205.
- Özgener, Ş., Öğüt, A. & Kaplan, M. (2008). A new paradigm in occupational-employer relations: Organizational cynicism, selected topics in organizational behavior. Mahmut Özdevecioğlu ve Himmet Kaplan (Ed.), Ankara: İlke.
- Peng, Z. & Zhou, F. (2009). The moderating effect of supervisory conscientiousness on the relationship between employee's social cynicism and perceived interpersonal justice. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(6), 863-864.
- Pelit, E. & Pelit, N. (2014). Two primary cancer-causing factors in organizations: Mobbing and organizational cynicism. Ankara: Detay.
- Polatcan, M. & Titrek, O. (2014). The relationship between leadership behaviors of school principals and their organizational cynicism attitudes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 1291 – 1303.
- Robbins, S. & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. (Trs. İ. Erdem). Ankara: Nobel.
- Sashkin, M. (1986). Participative management remains an ethical imperative. *Organizational Dynamics*, 14(4), 62–75
- Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L. & Scandura, T. A. (1998). Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 41(3), 298-318.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, 3th Edition, Jossey-Bass.
- TDK. (2013). Turkish Language Institute Current Turkish Dictionary. Retrieved from [www.tdk.gov.tr](http://www.tdk.gov.tr),

- Üçok, D. & Torun, A. (2014). The effects of negative attitudes and expectations on burnout: a study on cynical attitudes and perceived psychological contract breach. *Atatürk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 28(1), 231-250.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E. (2006). Leadership style, organizational politics, and employees performance: An empirical examination of two competing models. *Personnel Review*, 36(5), 661-683.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Wu, C., Neubert, M. J. & Yi, X. (2007). Transformational leadership, cohesion perceptions, and employee cynicism about organizational change: the mediating role of justice perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 43(3), 327-351.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.

**Kaynakça Bilgisi / Citation Information**

Demirçelik, E. & Korkmaz, M. (2017). The Relationship Between the Leadership Styles of School Managers and Organizational Cynicism According to the Perceptions of Secondary School Teachers, *OPUS – International Journal of Society Researches*, 7(12), 33-53.