



The Relationship between Organizational Justice and Organizational Cynicism: The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital and Employee Voice

Tülay Turgut*, Hazel Agun
Marmara University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 12.12.2016
Received in revised form
12.15.2016
Accepted 12.25.2016

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Organizational Justice,
Psychological Capital,
Employee Silence, Cynicism.

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The purpose of this study is to examine the contribution of organizational justice on organizational cynicism and to investigate the mediating roles of psychological capital and employee voice behavior.

Methods: Data were collected at one point in time through a questionnaire-based survey. Based on a convenience sample, a total of 205 employees of distinct companies from distinct industries responded the questionnaire.

Results: Regression analysis results supported the negative and significant contribution of organizational justice on organizational cynicism. However, the mediating roles of psychological capital and employee voice behavior were not supported. Yet, both of those concepts were found to be positively correlated with organizational justice and negatively correlated with organizational cynicism. Analyses on sub-dimensions of variables also revealed that sub-dimensions of organizational justice differ in contributing to psychological capital, employee voice, and organizational cynicism.

Conclusions: The findings highlighted the negative contribution of fairness on cynicism. Organizational cynicism was found as being weakly effected by individual resources, is a more direct reaction to organizational practices. The research findings suggest that ensuring justice with all types as distributive, procedural and interactional within the organization seems necessary for being able to keep employees having positive affect, cognition and behaviors toward the organization.

Örgütsel Adalet ile Örgütsel Sinizm Arasındaki İlişkide Psikolojik Sermaye ve Çalışan Sesliliğinin Ara Değişken Rolü

Tülay Turgut*, Hazel Agun
Marmara Üniversitesi

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Makale Tarihiçesi:

Başvuru 12.12.2016
Revizyon 15.12.2016
Kabul 25.12.2016

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel
adalet, psikolojik sermaye,
çalışan sesliliği, sinizm.

ÖZ

Amaç: Bu çalışmanın amacı örgütsel adalet ile örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması ve psikolojik sermaye ile çalışan sesliliğinin bu ilişkideki ara değişken rollerinin incelenmesidir.

Tasarım/Yöntem: Veri toplama aracı olarak anket yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Kolayda örnekleme yoluyla, farklı endüstri kollarındaki firmalardan toplam 205 çalışan araştırmaya katılmıştır.

Sonuçlar: Regresyon analizi sonucunda örgütsel adaletin örgütsel sinizm üzerinde negatif ve anlamlı katkısı bulunmuştur. Psikolojik sermaye ve çalışan sesliliğinin ise ara değişken rolü desteklenmemiştir. Bununla birlikte her iki değişkenin örgütsel adalet ile pozitif, örgütsel sinizm ile negatif ilişkili olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Değişkenlerin alt boyutları için uygulanan analizler sonucunda; örgütsel adalet alt boyutlarının psikolojik sermaye, çalışan sesliliği ve örgütsel sinizm üzerindeki katkılarının farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur.

Özgün Değer: Araştırma sonucu adalet algısının sinizm üzerinde olumsuz katkısı olduğunu göstermektedir. Dolayısıyla, örgütsel sinizmin bireysel kaynaklardan zayıf etkilendiğini, daha çok örgütsel uygulamalara kuvvetli tepki olarak geliştiğini göstermektedir. Bu çalışma, örgüt içerisinde adaletin tüm boyutlarının; dağıtım, işlemsel ve etkileşim, sağlanmasıyla çalışanların örgütlerinden duygusal, bilişsel ve davranışsal olarak pozitif etkilenebileceğine dair farkındalığı artırmaya katkı sağlayabilir.

* E-mail: tturgut@marmara.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Global competition and rapidly evolving environment in work life shape organizational practices. Procedures, rules and processes of organizations influence employees' attitudes in work groups. Within organizational behavior context, there are various concepts that are related to organizational outcomes in the positive and negative way. Organizational justice is one of the factors which impacts on the perception of employees and their behavior in the organization. High organizational justice perceptions increase positive organizational gains such as job satisfaction (Bennett, 2006), commitment (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999) and positive psychological resources (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). When the perceived fairness is low, on the other hand, some negative organizational attitudes and behaviors are observed such as increased turnover intentions and interpersonal deviance (Cohen & Spector, 2001). The low organizational justice makes individuals distrust to the organization and leads also them to behave cynically in the organization (Dean, Brandes, & Dharwadkar, 1998).

Therefore, some cynical attitudes rooted from policies, processes, interpersonal relations and on, of the organization (Dean et al., 1998; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003). On the other hand, some positive antecedents such as positive individual resources or/and having the voice in procedures in the organization with the fair treatment in the organization are observed negatively related with organizational cynicism (Dean et al., 1998; Greenberg, 1993; Ng, Feldman, & Butts, 2014).

Within this context, this study aims to find out the impact of organizational justice on organizational cynicism linking through psychological capital and employee voice behavior in Turkish business context. The results of the study might contribute to conceptual insights and provide information for effective management practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Organizational Justice

Organizational justice is related to the work environment. According to Greenberg (1993), organizational justice is about the perceived fairness of procedures in organizations. The perception of organizational justice is the way that employees determine whether rewards and penalties are distributed fairly or not, and also the way in how those distributions are taken into decision in the organization (Greenberg, 1990; Moorman, 1991). The theoretical framework of organizational justice is based on The Equity Theory by Adams (1965). As to this theory, the degree of individuals' job satisfaction and work success relate with the perception of equal treatment in work environment (Leventhal, Michaels, & Sanford, 1972). Employees compare the rate of their inputs and outcomes with those of other employees who do the same job. Three conditions occur as a result of this comparison. If there is no difference between the two employees' rates, the equality is current. If employee's rate of input-output is lower than the compared employee's rate of input-output, inequality is current. The perception of impaired balance makes the person reduce the amount of inputs. And, if employee's rate of input-output is higher than the compared employee's rate, there is again a problem. As a result, the theory suggests that when employees perceive equilibrium between job rewards and job contributions as comparison to others', they perceive balance interaction with rules and norms in the organization (Greenberg, 1993).

Organizational justice involves three dimensions (Greenberg, 1993; Moorman, 1991). Firstly, the origin of the distributive justice is based on Equity Theory. It consists sharing of gainings between employees, such as effort, benefits, role, opportunities, goods, rewards, penalties, and wages (Brockner, 2002; Cohen, 1987). Distributive justice is the perception of fairness which is related to organizational outcomes. So, employees evaluate the results they received from the organization (Cohen, 1987). In the studies of organizational justice focus is largely on distributive justice, however, it is not explained individual feelings about fairness in work areas (Colquitt, Conlon, Porter, Wesson, & Ng, 2001). It should also implement the allocation of justice within informational and interpersonal treatment. Therefore secondly, Niehoff and Moorman (1993) defined the concept of procedural justice. Issues of procedural justice occur when employees have the right to participate in decision-making processes that affect

themselves and their work outcomes (Bies & Shapiro, 1988). Procedural justice is about the evaluation of employees' right of choice and right of voice. As to Leventhal (1980), procedures are based on the representativeness of all employees' concern, ethical standards, impartiality, correctability of an unfair decision, consistency of application and accuracy of information (Cohen & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). As a result, the right of expression of opinions in decision-making processes in the organization enables employees to perceive fairness (Bies & Shapiro, 1988). Beside, interpersonal treatment in the organization and the relationship between employee-management are also issues for organizational justice concept. Therefore, thirdly interactional justice is the term used to describe the human aspect of organizational processes. Interactional justice focuses on respect, accuracy, and kindness in interpersonal relations. And also, it focuses on the fair treatment within those relationships (Greenberg, 1993; Moorman, 1991).

Consequently, organizational justice is concerned with organizational variables that related to work outcomes (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Previous studies have displayed that organizational justice is positively associated with job satisfaction (Bennett, 2006), commitment (Pillai et al., 1999), psychological capital (Avey et al., 2011), and negatively associated with turnover intentions, interpersonal deviance (Cohen & Spector, 2001).

2.2. Organizational Cynicism

Cynicism is a term of disposition to disbelieve, disappointment and underestimation towards individuals, groups, society or organization (Andersson, 1996). It has gained importance in organization studies since 1990's. Cynicism is described as the disposition of being negative about others, and also seem to be viewed as some sort of psychological defect (Dean et al., 1998; Fleming & Spicer, 2003).

According to personality approaches, researchers generally discuss cynicism as an outlook on human nature. Cook and Mendley (1954)'s finding indicates that individuals who have high cynicism score see others as selfish, uncaring and untrusting in relationships (cited by Andersson, 1996). Beside personality based approaches, societal/institutional focus studies suggest that concept of cynicism is not just about human nature. People's cynical disposition about something may change in time. It may also be belief learned through experiences in society or organization (Dean et al., 1998; Vance, Brooks, Tesluck, & Howard, 1999). Thus, the organization can be the target of an attitude. As to attitude theory, people have negative and positive attitudes against the objects. The effect of attitude on behavior, according to Ajzen (1991)'s reasoned-action theory is either because of trait-state or because of environmental conditions (Dean et al., 1998). Thus, the reason employees having some cynical attitudes against their organizations might be the behavior of the people in the organization. Some of these cynical attitudes may root from policies, processes, interpersonal relations and on of the organization (Dean et al., 1998; Johnson & O'Leary-Kelly, 2003).

Organizational cynicism is employees' belief that the organization is lack of honesty, justice, and morality. Cynical employees have negative attitudes such as anger, disappointment, distrust and hopelessness against the organization, work group or colleagues. Therefore, cynical employees believe that the organization is self-interested and people working in the organization are self-centered (Andersson, 1996; Barefoot et al., 1989). Organizational cynicism has three dimensions; belief, affect, and behavior (Dean et al., 1998). Belief or cognitive dimension of cynicism is the belief that organization is lack of integrity and fairness. Cynical employees may believe that policies and procedures in the organization are sacrificed to the self-interest of others. Affective dimension is about negative affect toward the organization such as shame, irritation, tension, anxiety, pessimism and disgust (Andersson, 1996; Dean et al., 1998). The behavioral dimension of cynicism includes negative behaviors such as criticizing, contempting and making fun of the organization with colleagues or friends outside the job (Wilkerson, Evans, & Davis, 2008). Studies on organizational cynicism provide that various factors can influence organizational cynicism and can be trigger of cynical behavior. For example, failure policies of organizational change, high compensation of manager, workload, low organizational support, high turnover rates are some of the antecedents of cynicism (Vance et al., 1999; Wilkerson et al., 2008).

Organizational injustice is also found as one of the important factors that affects cynicism. If employees feel that procedures and treatment in the organization are unfair with biased decisions, they will be angry, disappointed and offended to their organization. Perceived unfairness in organization makes individuals distrust to the firm and also occurs sceptical behavior in organization (Bernerth et al., 2007; Fitzgerald, 2002) Therefore, the first hypothesis of this study is;

Hypothesis 1. Organizational justice has a negative impact on organizational cynicism.

2.3. Psychological Capital and Employee Voice as Mediator

Psychological Capital (PsyCap) is the term of using in positive psychology literature (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). In positive psychology, the broaden-built theory is root for PsyCap (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998). According to broaden-built theory, people are affected in a positive and negative way. Negativity makes people focus on narrow details and negative actions. However, positivity, on theory base, makes people focus on broader actions (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998; Luthans, 2002). When problems occur, people who regularly experience positivity, have built up psychological resources; broadening of thought-action tendencies make people be more innovative, more productive and produce more solution with the abilities of their thoughts and ideas (Luthans, 2002).

Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) clarified PsyCap that is composed of four components; hope, self-efficacy, resilience and optimism. Synder et al. (1991) define hope as a positive motivational state that involves energy and pathways to lead the sense of success. Hopeful individuals are able to have a goal-directed agency to get their goals and alternative plans to meet their goals. As a result, individuals with high hope determine their way to feel success. Having the sense of success makes individuals be more confident about the future (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007; Synder, 2002). Self- efficacy is based on cognitive resources and self-motivation that people shape their lives and put more effort to accomplish issues. It is related with believing in oneself (Luthans, 2002). As to Bandura (1977), people with high self-efficacy have more confidence to their performance, recover more quickly, have commitment their task and make more effort to apply their goals (Luthans et al., 2007). Seligman (1998) defines optimism as making internal, stable and global causal attributions of positive events and external, unstable and specific attributions of negative events. Therefore, optimism is not just about expecting good things to happen, but also put effort even when setbacks occur (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Resilience is the term of the reactive capacity of people. As a positive adaptation for the person handling difficult situations. It is the power of act against positive and negative circumstances; and the reactive capacity of the person facing with adversity, more than that proactive thinking to find alternative ways and goals in life (Luthans, 2002; Luthans et al., 2007).

According to broaden built theory, positive experiences lead to positive psychological resources (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998). Since, organizational justice is a positive experience and PsyCap is a positive psychological resource, in the light of this theory we expect that the perceived fairness in the organization allows positive cognition that individuals enlarge and use their PsyCap. Contrary, organizational injustice causes negative emotions, which built negative cognitive aspects make negative organizational outcomes (Fredrickson & Levenson, 1998; Greenberg, 1993). Moreover, previous studies reveal that there is significant negative relationship between PsyCap and organizational cynicism; as the PsyCap increases, organizational cynicism decreases (Avey, Luthans, & Jensen, 2009; Luthans et al., 2007). When employee perceives fairness, dignity, accuracy and the right to participate in decision-making process, her/his PsyCap resources, which are affected by work/organizational environment, augment, then this augmented resources decrease organizational cynicism (Avey, Wernsing, & F. Luthans, 2008; Chiaburu et al., 2013; Nafei, 2015; Çalışkan, 2014; Lather & Kaur, 2015). Thus, based on broaden-built theory and empirical findings, it is suggested that perceived organizational justice influences psychological capital, which in turn impacts cynicism. In another word, we argue that organizational justice decreases organizational cynicism, by mediating effect of PsyCap.

Hypothesis 2: Organizational justice has a negative impact on organizational cynicism via psychological capital.

Voice has been defined in various ways in management literature. Previous studies defined voice as grieving, complaining and external protest (Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). As to classical study of voice at 1970, Hirschman defined the term in the exit-voice-loyalty framework which is related with dissatisfaction in work environment. According to Hirschman's perspective, voice can be described as an attempt to change, rather than escape from the issue. Voice as individual dissatisfaction perspective can be focused on a specific problem, but another perspective of voice can be the expression of a collective organization like union membership creates official voice to eliminate dissatisfaction (Budd, Paul, & Adrian, 2010; Dundon, Wilkinson, Marchington, & Ackers, 2004).

However, changing business environment, increased globalization, decline in unionization create direct employee voice behavior in organizational problems rather than the exit-voice framework (Dundon et al., 2004). Morrison (2011) defines new conceptualisation of employee voice as including suggestions, concerns, and ideas about work related issues, contribution to management decision-making and concern with organizational functioning.

According to Van Dyne, Soon and Botero (2003) voice has two main suggestions; participation in decision-making process, and making ideas for change in a proactive way. So, the most recent definition of voice in literature expose the term as constructive speaking behavior. Van Dyne and Le Pine (1998) studied voice as called in extra role behavior. Extra-role behaviors are not determined with formal descriptions, not rewarded when performed and not punished when things are not done. They built voice as a form of extra role behavior that something promotes challenging behavior. Promotive voice behavior is about speaking up and challenge constant thing to improve the situation (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998).

Employee voice behavior is based on three motivators; self-protective, other-oriented and disengaged. Moreover, there are three forms of voice; defensive voice, acquiescent voice and prosocial voice (Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Since the recent studies of voice behavior are based on positive intentions such as prosocial voice, the other two forms of voice make differentiate this form of behavior. The defensive voice is about to express work related ideas to protect self from unpleasant consequences. The acquiescent voice is about to express work related ideas with low self-efficacy makes to support the ideas by others instead of supporting the own view. Defensive and acquiescent voice involves less proactive behavior compared with prosocial behavior. Prosocial behavior is to express work related ideas that beneficial for others in the organization or prevent issues in work groups (Morrison, 2011; Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998; Van Dyne et al., 2003).

As to studies of voice behavior, it has to say that voice behavior is neither complaining about dissatisfaction nor just providing solutions to problems which are supported by organizational formal procedure and descriptions (Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003; Van Dyne & Le Pine, 1998). Therefore, employee voice behavior focuses on speaking up workplace issues and challenging the ideas to improve alternative solutions for issues in work environment (Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003).

According to the researches, voice behavior is affected by individual differences, organizational procedures and interpersonal relations and managerial behaviors (Morrison, 2011). Individual differences such as big five personality traits, self-esteem, and self-efficacy have been examined as predictors of voice (Budd et al., 2010). Top management support for openness, trust in supervisor cause willing to speak up (Landau, 2009). Organizational formal and informal mechanism such as justice treatment also important to the presence of voice. Boroff and Lewin (1997) shows that unfair treatment in the organization is associated with low levels of voice which make employees, especially loyal employees, suffer from silence. If employees perceive fairness in work related issues, they will be motivated to speak up for issues, otherwise, they feel fear of consequences in organizational outcomes (Landau, 2009). Fair treatment in the organization creates a positive environment for employees. It may support to make employee voice to change or improve on work related goals and issues, which also affect them to develop a positive attitude toward organization (Abraham, 2000; Brotheridge, 2003; Ng et al., 2014). That is why one can say that the perceived justice in the organization leads to express ideas and opinions on issues, which in turn decreases cynical behavior against organization or others. Employees may feel no anger or irritation about their organization because they feel

safe to speak up things that related with job or organization in a fair environment. So, the third hypothesis of the study is formed as;

Hypothesis 3. Organizational justice has a negative impact on organizational cynicism through employee voice behavior.



Figure 1. The theoretical model of the study

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample

A total of 205 employees of distinct companies from distinct industries in Istanbul participated in this research. 55.1% (N = 113) of the participants were female and 44.9% (N = 92) were male. Participants ranged in age from 21 to 55 (mean = 31.06, SD = 5.96), organizational tenure from 2 to 396 months (mean = 58.9, SD = 73.7), tenure at present job from 2 to 396 months (mean = 89, SD = 77.7). Moreover, among the participants 51.2% (N = 105) had bachelor degree, 37.7% had post-graduate degree (N = 67), 10.7% had doctorate degree, and 4.9% had have high school degree.

3.2. Procedure

Data of this study were collected using an online survey by convenience sampling method. The link of the questionnaire was sent to 400 employees and within three weeks 205 employees completed the questionnaire. Thereby, the response rate was 51.25 per cent. Participants were informed about the purpose of the research and confidentiality of the responses.

3.3. Measures

Organizational Justice Scale was composed of three sub-scales measuring distributive (6 item), procedural (6 item) and interactional justice (9 item). To measure distributive justice the scale developed by Price and Muller (1986) and translated into Turkish by Çalışkan (2006) was used. To measure procedural and interactional justice the scales developed by Nieoff and Moorman (1993) and translated into Turkish by Yıldırım (2007) were used. Items were rated on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*definitely disagree*) to 6 (*definitely agree*).

Factor analysis by using the method of principle component yielded three factors with the explaining power of 79.74% of total variation (KMO = .94, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 4658.50, df = 190, $p < .001$). Yet, one item was excluded because of its low loading. Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis yielded high alpha coefficients for each justice dimension (for distributive justice $\alpha = .95$, for procedural justice $\alpha = .91$, and for interactional justice $\alpha = .96$).

Psychological Capital was measured by Luthans et al. (2007)'s 24-item PsyCap Questionnaire that was translated into Turkish by Saruhan (2013). Originally, PsyCap scale has four factors, which are Hope (6 item), Self-efficacy (6 item), Resiliency (6 item) and Optimism (6 item). Items were rated on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*always*).

Factor analysis by using the method of principle component yielded three factors with the explaining power of 70.17% of total variation (KMO = .92, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 2861.77, $df = 153$, $p < .001$). All items of "hope" were discarded due to either low loadings or loading more than one factor. Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis yielded high alpha coefficients for each dimension (for optimism $\alpha = .88$, for self-efficacy $\alpha = .91$, and for resiliency justice $\alpha = .92$).

Employee voice was measured by the 6-item scale of Van Dyne and LePine (1998) which was translated into Turkish by Arslan and Yener (2016). Items were rated on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*definitely disagree*) to 6 (*definitely agree*). As a result of factor analysis, 66.75% of the total variance explained by one factor (KMO = .86, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 726.94, $df = 15$, $p < .001$). In addition, Cronbach's alpha value of voice is .89.

Organizational cynicism was measured by the 13-item scale of Dean et al., (1998) which was translated into Turkish by Karacaoğlu and İnce (2012). Originally cynicism scale has three factors, as affective cynicism (4 item), cognitive cynicism (5 item) and behavioral cynicism (4 item). As a result of the factor analysis, 79.36 % of the total variance explained by three factors (KMO = .91, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 2548.17, $df = 78$, $p < .001$). In addition, Cronbach's alpha value of each factor was found to be satisfactorily high (for affective cynicism $\alpha = .96$, for cognitive cynicism $\alpha = .92$, for behavioral cynicism $\alpha = .84$).

4. Findings

To test the study hypotheses, correlation and regression analyses as reported in Tables 1, 2 and 3 were carried out. Organizational cynicism was correlated with organizational justice negatively and moderately, and also with PsyCap and Employee voice negatively and weakly. Organizational Justice was positively and weakly correlated with both PsyCap and employee voice. Lastly, PsyCap and employee voice were positively and moderately correlated.

Table 1.

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations among Study Variables

	Mean	SD	(1)	(2)	(3)
(1) Organizational Cynicism	3.26	1.13			
(2) Organizational Justice	3.64	1.07	-.61**		
(3) Psychological Capital	4.63	.71	-.20**	.29**	
(4) Employee Voice	4.87	.74	-.18**	.22**	.62**

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Simple regression analysis which was applied to test the first hypothesis revealed that organizational justice has negative effect on organizational cynicism ($\beta = -.61$, $p < .001$; $R^2 = .38$, $F(1, 203) = 122.12$, $p < .001$). Thereby, first hypothesis (H1) was supported.

In order to test the mediating role of psychological capital on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism, Baron and Kenny (1986)'s suggestion of three-step regression model were applied. According to Baron and Kenny to establish mediation effect, the following conditions must hold: (a) independent variable must significantly contribute to mediator in the first equation; (b) independent variable must significantly contribute to dependent variable in the second equation; (c) significant contribution of independent variable to dependent variable which is obtained in the second equation must decrease or disappear in the third equation where the effect of the mediator is controlled. According to the results (Table 2), organizational justice has significant contribution on both PsyCap ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$) and organizational cynicism ($\beta = -.61$, $p < .001$). Hence, the first two conditions were met. However, in the third equation, on organizational cynicism, PsyCap (the mediator) lost its significant contribution while organizational justice kept the amount of its contribution. That is, there is no mediation

effect of PsyCap in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism. *Hypothesis 2 was not supported.*

Table 2.*The Mediating Role of PsyCap*

	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	R ²	Adj R ²	F	p	β	t	p
1st equation	PsyCap	Organizational Justice	.09	.08	19.77	.000	.30	4.45	.000
2nd equation	Organizational Cynicism	Organizational Justice	.38	.37	122.12	.000	-.61	-11.05	.000
3rd equation	Organizational Cynicism	Organizational Justice PsyCap	.38	.37	60.88	.000	-.61 -.02	-10.41 -0.38	.000 .702

In order to test mediating role of employee voice in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism, again the same method was used which was indicated above. According to the results (Table 3), the variations in employee voice ($\beta = .23, p < .001$) and organizational cynicism ($\beta = -.61, p < .001$) were explained by the variations in organizational justice. Hence, the first two conditions were met. However, in the third equation, on organizational cynicism, the amount of contribution of organizational justice did not change, while that of employee voice (mediator) disappeared. *Hypothesis 3 was not supported.*

Table 3.*The Mediating Role of Employee Voice*

	Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	R ²	Adj R ²	F	p	β	t	p
1st equation	Employee voice	Organizational Justice	.05	.05	10.85	.001	.23	3.29	.001
2nd equation	Organizational Cynicism	Organizational Justice	.38	.37	122.12	.000	-.61	-11.05	.000
3rd equation	Organizational Cynicism	Organizational Justice Employee Voice	.38	.37	61.28	.000	-.60 -.05	-10.58 -0.81	.000 .420

Moreover, in order to test the mediation effect of PsyCap dimensions and employee voice in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism dimensions a series of regression analyses with forward inclusion were applied to determine the sub-dimensions satisfying the first to conditions suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986).

Regression analyses with forward inclusion applied to determine the impacts of organizational justice dimensions on each organizational cynicism dimension indicated the significance of distributive and interactional justice. Accordingly, on affective cynicism the significant contributions of distributive justice ($\beta = -.32, p < .001$) and interactional justice ($\beta = -.37, p < .001$) were found to be in almost same strength ($R^2 = .36, F(2, 202) = 57.73, p < .001$); on cognitive cynicism, the contribution of interactional justice ($\beta = -.38, p < .001$) were found to be slightly stronger than the contribution of distributive justice ($\beta = -.29, p < .001; R^2 = .35, F(2, 202) = 55.23, p < .001$); on behavioral cynicism, conversely, the contribution of distributive justice ($\beta = -.33, p < .001$) was found to be much more stronger than the contribution of interactional justice ($\beta = -.18, p < .05; R^2 = .21, F(2, 202) = 26.27, p < .001$). Procedural justice was found be effective on none of organizational cynicism dimensions.

Regression analyses with forward inclusion applied to determine the impacts of organizational justice dimensions on each PsyCap dimension and employee voice indicated that only procedural justice has a significant contribution

on self-efficacy ($\beta = .71, p < .001; R^2 = .50, F(1, 203) = 200.65, p < .001$); on resilience ($\beta = .76, p < .001; R^2 = .58, F(1, 203) = 279.60, p < .001$); on optimism ($\beta = .71, p < .001; R^2 = .50, F(1, 203) = 206.47, p < .001$); and on employee voice ($\beta = .48, p < .001; R^2 = .23, F(1, 203) = 62.18, p < .001$).

However, testing of mediation effect of employee voice and each PsyCap dimension revealed that none of them has a mediating effect on the relationships between organizational justice and organizational cynicism dimensions.

5. Conclusion, Discussions And Suggestions

The hypotheses regarding with mediation roles of PsyCap and employee voice in the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism were not supported. This finding is not in line with the argument based on broaden-built theory and previous findings (e.g., Chiaburu et al., 2013; Nafei, 2015) stating that perceiving fairness, dignity, accuracy and the right to participate in decision-making processes decrease cynicism as increasing employees' psychological resources.

On the other hand, the hypothesis regarding the negative contribution of organizational justice on organizational cynicism was supported. This finding is in line with previous findings (Bernerth et al., 2007; Fitzgerald, 2002) on the relationship between fairness and cynicism. It is found out that the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism is far stronger than the relationships of those two concepts with both PsyCap and employee voice. As both PsyCap and employee voice are individual level concepts it is interesting to detect that these concepts weakly explain the variances in the organizational cynicism which is also an individual level concept. It is understood that organizational cynicism, as being weakly affected by individual resources, is a more direct reaction to organizational practices. In this regard, we can suggest managers should especially ensure justice with all types as distributive, procedural and interactional within the organization, for being able to keep employees having positive affect, cognition and behaviors toward the organization.

Moreover, analyses on sub-dimensions of variables give some more detailed insights; as revealing that sub-dimensions of organizational justice differ in contributing to PsyCap, employee voice, and organizational cynicism.

Analyses displayed that only procedural justice has a significant positive contribution to employees' self-efficacy, resilience, optimism, and on employee voice. Procedural justice is about having control over the processes through participating in decision making on the issues that may affect work activities and outcomes. Having this kind of control, plausibly, encourages employees' self-efficacy and voice behavior, such that they believe they can shape their lives and put more effort to accomplish their goals; and they raise suggestions, concerns and ideas about work related issues, contribute to management decision-making and concern with organizational functioning. Application of the six rules that forms the process of procedural justice (consistency, impartiality, accuracy, ethical standards, representativeness, and correctability) will supply a working environment where employees believe that they are psychologically safe. Hence, in a psychologically safe environment created by the application of procedural justice rules, employees will tend to be more optimist and resilient expecting good things to happen, putting efforts when setbacks occur, adapting and handling difficult situations.

It was also found that while both interactional and distributive justice have significant contributions on both affective and cognitive cynicism; especially distributive justice has significant contribution on behavioral cynicism. On the other hand, procedural justice was found to have insignificant contribution on affective, cognitive, and behavioral cynicism. This finding seems quite interesting implying that different types of justice have different degree of effect on employees' affect, cognition, and behaviors. It is argued that compared to procedural justice, interactional justice has more affective components and produces more affective reactions, on the other hand, distributive justice has the least affective and more cognitive components (Tyler, 1994; Umphress et al., 2003). Based on this argument, the relationship of interactional justice with affective cynicism; and the relationship of distributive justice with cognitive and behavioral cynicism are expectable. However, the significant relationship of interactional justice with cognitive cynicism; and the significant relationship of distributive justice with affective cynicism requires

further insights. In this regard, we point out the need for examining the nature and mechanism of the relationship between those two variables in more detail and meticulously in future research.

The findings also showed that psychological capital and employee voice are strongly related. This finding implies that employees who are more confident that they can successfully complete tasks, are more optimistic about the future and are more resilient against setbacks, have more resources to generate and share ideas which have the potential to contribute to organization's change and development. This finding is consistent with the suggestion of Walumbwa et al. (2008) stating that positive psychological conditions promote positive voice climate.

6. Limitations

There are limitations of the study should be taken account in interpreting the findings. One limitation arises from the heterogeneity of the sample (e.g., sectors, age, work experience, tenure) and from selecting participants with convenient sampling method. Therefore, future research should replicate these findings in more homogenous and larger samples for generalizability. Another limitation results from the fact that all data were gathered from the same source which may lead to common method bias.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). *Inequity in social exchange*. *Advances in experimental social psychology* New York: Academic Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Andersson, L. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11), 1395-1418.
- Arslan, A., & Yener, S. (2016). İşgören sesliliği ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması Çalışması. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 14(1), 173-191.
- Avey J. B., Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2009) Psychological capital: A positive resource for combating employee stress and turnover. *Human Resources Management*, 48, 677-693.
- Avey, J., Reichard, R., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employees' attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127-152.
- Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T.S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44, (1), 48-70.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Barefoot, J. C., Dodge, K. A. Peterson, B. L. Dahlstrom, W. G. & Williams, R. B. (1989). The Cook-Medley Hostility Scale: Item content and ability to predict survival. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 51(1), 46-57.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 51(6), 1173.
- Bennett, C. (2006). Taking the sincerity out of saying sorry: Restorative justice as ritual. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 23(2), 127-143.
- Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment a study of important organizational change variables. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), 303-326.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 676-685.
- Boroff, K. E., & Lewin, D. (1997). Loyalty, voice, and intent to exit a union firm: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 51, 50-63.
- Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the influence of outcome favorability. *Academy of Management Review*, 27, 58-76.
- Brotheridge, C. M. (2003). The role of fairness in mediating the effects of voice and justification on stress and other

- outcomes in a climate of organizational change. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(3), 253.
- Budd, J. W., Paul, J. G., & Adrian W. (2010). New approaches to employee voice and participation in organisations. *Human Relations*, 63, 303-310.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I. S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(2), 181-197.
- Cohen, R. (1987). Distributive justice: Theory and research. *Social Justice Research*, 1(1), 19-40.
- Cohen, Y., & Spector, P. (2001). The Role of justice in organizations: A meta analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Porter, C., Wesson M. J., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A Meta analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Çalışkan, K. (2006). Örgütsel politik davranış öncelleri ve sonuçları. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Çalışkan, S. C. (2014). Pozitif örgütsel davranış değişkenleri ile yeni araştırma modelleri geliştirme arayışları: Pozitif örgütsel davranış değişkenlerinin işe adanmışlık, tükenmişlik ve sinizm üzerine etkileri ve bu etkileşimde örgütsel adalet algısının aracılık rolü üzerine B. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(3), 363-382.
- Dean, W. D., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 341-352.
- Dundon, T., Wilkinson, A., Marchington, M., & Ackers, P. (2004). The meanings and purpose of employee voice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 15(6), 1149-1170.
- Fitzgerald, M. R. (2002). Organizational cynicism: Its relationship to perceived organizational injustice and explanatory style, *Doctoral dissertation*, University of Cincinnati.
- Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2003). Working from a cynical distance: Implications for power, subjectivity and resistance. *Organization*, 10, 157-179.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Levenson, R. W. (1998). Positive emotions speed recovery from the cardiovascular sequelae of negative emotions. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12, 191-220.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 6, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54, 81-103.
- Hirschman, A. O. (1970). *Exit, voice, and loyalty. Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 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, 627-647.
- Karacaoğlu, K., & İnce, F. (2012). Brandes, Dharwadkar ve Dean'in (1999) Örgütsel Sinizm Ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması: Kayseri organize sanayi bölgesi örneği. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(3), 77.
- Landau, J. (2009). To speak or not to speak: Predictors of voice propensity. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 13(1), 35-54.
- Lather, A. S., & Kaur, M. S. (2015). Psychological capital as predictor of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2, 102-112.
- Leventhal, G. S., Michaels, J. W., & Sanford, C. (1972). Inequity and interpersonal conflict: Reward allocation and secrecy about reward as methods of preventing conflict. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 23, 88-102.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executives*, 16, 57-72.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J., Avey, J.B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personality Psychology*, 60, 541-572
- Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33, 321-349.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee voice behavior: Integration and directions for future research. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 373-412.
- Nafei, W. (2015). The role of psychological capital on job embeddedness and organizational cynicism: A study on Menoufia University Hospitals. *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 5(1), 50.

- Ng, T. W., Feldman, D. C., & Butts, M. M. (2014). Psychological contract breaches and employee voice behaviour: The moderating effects of changes in social relationships. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23*, 537-553.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, M. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 527-556.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E.S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management, 25*, 897-933
- Premeaux, S. F., & Bedeian, A. G. (2003). Breaking the silence: The moderating effects of self-monitoring in predicting speaking up in the workplace. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*, 1537-1562.
- Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). *Absenteeism and turnover of hospital employees*. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.
- Saruhan, N. (2013) The role of trust in organization in the relationship between resistance to change and communication. The moderating effects of organizational justice and psychological capital on this relationship. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, İstanbul*.
- Sayü, P. (2014). The relationship between organizational justice and work alienation. *Unpublished Master Dissertation, Marmara University, İstanbul*
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). Positive social science. *APA Monitor, 29*(4), 2, 5.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*, 5-14.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*, 249-275.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S.T., (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 570-585.
- Tyler, T. R. (1994). Psychological models of the justice motive: Antecedents of distributive and procedural justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 850-863.
- Umpress, E. E., Labianca, G. J., Brass, D. J., Kass, E. E., & Scholten, L. (2003). The role of instrumental and expressive social ties in employees' perceptions of organizational justice. *Organization Science, 14*, 738-753.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 108-119.
- Van Dyne, L., Soon, A., & Botero, I. C. (2003). Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Management Studies, 40*, 1359-1392.
- Vance, R. J., Brooks, S. M., Tesluck, P. E. & Howard, M. J. (1999). Longitudinal and multilevel influences on cynical climates and resistance to change. *14th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Atlanta: GA.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of management, 34*(1), 89-126.
- Wilkerson, J. M., Evans, W. R., & Davis, W. (2008). A test of coworkers' influence on organizational cynicism, badmouthing, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 2273-2292
- Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş doyumu ile örgütsel adalet ilişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 62*(1), 253-278.