Organizational Cynicism: A Study Among Advertising Agencies

Özlem Güllüoğlu Işık[1]

Abstract

This study is about one of those less favorable aspects of work and employee behavior: Cynicism toward the employing organization, in the organizational sciences referred to as organizational cynicism. Cynicism is a somewhat controversial issue. It can be define as a belief that an organization lacks integrity, which, when coupled with a powerful negative emotional reaction, leads to disparaging and critical behavior. The aim of this paper is to examine cynic behavior of the employees in the organization. Therefore, in the first part, cynicism, organizational cynicism and the nature of the concept will be explained theoretically. In the second part, we will share the results of the study conducted in advertising agencies in Kayseri. It is thought that this study contributes to the knowledge on workplace deviance and cynicism an area of research that is almost unexplored in especially ad agencies.

In the study questionnaire technic was used and data was gathered from advertising agency employees in Kayseri. There are 23 advertising agencies in Kayseri. A total of 122 questionnaires were distributed from which 88 questionnaires were received by the researcher and this result in response rate of 86% out of which questionnaires were found suitable for the analysis. Data were obtained using the "Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS)," which was developed by Brandes, Dhartwadkar and Dean (1999). The scale consists of emotional, cognitive and behavioral dimensions. The research hypotheses that were developed based on theoretical knowledge and findings, were tested in the study. Correlation and regression analysis were conducted to test hypothesis. Some demographic variables have been found related with ad employees' cynicism level like gender, age, education and department. However it has been found that ad agency employees' marital status, income and year of the service were not related with their cynicism level.

Keywords: Cynicism, Organizational Cynicism, Advertising Agencies.

Örgütsel Sinizm: Reklam Ajanslarında Bir Araştırma

Öz

Bu çalışma örgütlerde yaşanan ve son yıllarda adı sıkça duyulan "sinizm" kavramı üzerinedir. Kavramın literatürde kökeni oldukça eski olmasına rağmen örgütlerde problem olarak söz edilmesi oldukça yenidir. Örgütsel sinizm, bir bireyin çalıştığı örgüte karşı çeşitli nedenlerle olumsuz tutumlara sahip olduğu durumu anlatmaktadır. Örgütsel sinizmin, örgütün dürüstlükten yoksun olduğuna dair inanç, örgüte karşı olumsuz duygular ve örgütün samimiyet ve dürüstlükten yoksun olduğuna dair ifadeler gibi olumsuz davranışlara yönelme olmak üzere üç temel unsuru bulunmaktadır. Örgütsel sinizmin nedenleri arasında kişilik, psikolojik sözleşme ihlali, liderlik davranışındaki eksiklikler sayılmakta; umutsuzluk, düşük performans, yabancılaşma ve işten

uzaklaşma gibi örgütler sonuçları da doğurabilmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı çalışanların örgüt içindeki sinik davranışlarını araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla çalışmanın ilk bölümünde yerli ve yabancı literatür taranarak sinizm ve örgütsel sinizm üzerine kavramsal bir çerçeve oluşturulmuş; sinik çalışan profili, örgüt içinde sinizmin ortaya çıkış nedenleri ve muhtemel sonuçlarına ilişkin bir değerlendirme yapılmaya çalışılmıştır. Çalışmanın ikinci bölümünde ise Kayseri ilinde faaliyet gösteren reklam ajansı çalışanları ile gerçekleştirilen araştırma sonuçlarına yer verilmiştir.

Araştırmada veri toplama tekniği olarak anket yöntemi kullanılmış ve Kayseri ilinde hizmet veren 23 reklam ajansına ulaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. 122 anket metni dağıtılmış ve % 86'lık geri dönüşle 88 anket analize alınmıştır. Araştırmada Brandes, Dhartwadkar ve Dean (1999) tarafından geliştirilen ve duygusal, bilişsel ve davranışsal olmak üzere 3 boyutu olan ölçek kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda reklam ajansı çalışanlarının örgütsel sinizm düzeyleri cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim ve departman değişkeniyle pozitif yönde ilişkili bulunmuş; medeni durum, gelir ve hizmet süresi ile anlamlı bir ilişki tespit edilememiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sinizm, Örgütsel Sinizm, Reklam Ajansları.

Introduction

Cynics are made, not born. Karl Marx

The time when people were largely self-supporting, without organizations to take care of their wants and needs, seems long gone. Especially in the Western world, people no longer provide for their own food, housing, footwear and clothing, health care, education and other vital and less vital products and services. Over time, more and more of these activities have been taken over by specialized organizations and, not surprisingly, these organizations have become central to our lives. Crossing our path from the cradle to the grave, they satisfy an almost infinite variety of human needs. It is obvious, then, that organizational effectiveness and the motivation and engagement of the persons working to accomplish that effectiveness are of paramount importance (Naus, 2007). On the other hand modern organization and management theories emphasize not only organizational productivity and efficiency but these theories also indicate the fact that organization is to be a viable environment. If organizations only consider the productivity and disregard human behaviors and sentiments, then it is unavoidable for the employees to feel unsafe and to develop negative attitudes and sentiments towards the organization itself. Such problems in the organization indicate the importance of organizational trust and organizational cynicism variables (Polat, 2013: 106).

However over the past 20 years, confidence in business has fallen from 70% to 15%, and ratings of management competence and trust have fallen almost as among workers in the same period (Kanter and Mirvis, 1991: 46). Kanter and Mirvis (1989) suggest that as many as forty three percent of all workers are frustrated, disillusioned, distrustful, and skeptical as a result of what they perceive to be unethical behavior on the part of organizational leaders, and general uncertainty in organizations. Disillusionment and uncertainty is often expressed by organizational cynicism; a relatively understudied, but important organizational phenomenon that can affect a host of organizational experiences. Researchers claim that cynicism is one of the reasons of this situation and it rises in business and industry, which increasingly hurts their competitiveness and ability to accommodate today's needed organizational change.

Organizational cynicism is defined as "a negative attitude toward one's employing organization, comprising three dimensions: (1) a belief that the organization lacks integrity; (2) negative affect toward the organization; and (3) tendencies to disparaging and critical behavior toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs" (Dean et al., 1998: 345).

Conceptualization of organizational cynicism is very important in providing a number of advantages over existing conceptualizations. Many of these advantages are based on our use of the tripartite attitude framework. First, conceptualization makes it clear that organizational cynicism is a state—not a trait—which implies both that it is based on specific organizational experiences and that it is likely to change somewhat over time as individuals' experiences change. By relying on an attitudes framework, we have clearly differentiated organizational cynicism from personality- or trait-based cynicism, which focuses on human nature in general. Second, it is not limited to a particular type of work; cynicism certainly is observable in a wide range of occupations. Third, conceptualization rounds out the construct by including affect and behavior, as well as beliefs.

In this paper we will try to study both the ancient view of cynics as critics with something constructive to say in their criticism, as well as the literature on modern organizational cynics. We will adopt a modified version of the Dean et al. definition, defining cynicism as: (1) a belief that

there is a gap between desired and observed organizational identity; (2) a negative affect toward the organization or organizational change (strategy); and (3) tendencies to disparaging and/or critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with those beliefs and affect.

We address one major question: how should organizational cynicism is conceptualized? We organize this article as follows. First, we discuss the origin of the concept of cynicism and briefly review the literature that has begun to appear on this topic. We then propose a conceptualization of cynicism in organizations and discuss a number of issues related to this conceptualization. Next, we discuss the research results conducted among advertising agencies in Kayseri.

1. What is Cynicism?

In the fourth century, a group of philosophers, followers of Antisthenes, flouted "popular opinion or public convictions simply for the sake of doing so," particularly a prominent member. Greeks deemed these followers "disciples of the dog," or Cynics. Still, Antisthenes was a serious follower of Socrates, a man of deliberate and applied conviction, and Cynics were perceived as progressive and taken seriously enough to involve in serious debate. However, in the third century, Cynicism was revived as a school of thought, but this time it "tended to lose its serious character of emphasis on independence, suppression of desire and physical endurance, and to give itself rather to mockery of convention and tradition and prevailing beliefs and modes of behavior" (Copleston, 1986: 142, 189).

Cynics believed 'virtue' to be the only 'good' of human existence and the only means of achieving such virtue was through 'self-control', often achieved through 'pointing out of flaws in others' as flaws to be avoided in oneself. Through similar behaviors, the cynics of modern time have become known as "faultfinders." A modern cynic, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2003) is: "A person who believes all people are motivated by selfishness, and whose outlook is scornfully and often habitually negative". Cynicism is paradoxical in that the cynic must hold both positive feelings (improvability of the organization) and negative feelings (inevitable failure of change efforts) simultaneously (McColough et al., 1998: 33).

This comical satire highlights the trials that many cynics face on a daily basis. For example, most employees dislike having a number of supervisors to report to, being micro-managed, and dealing with nepotism in the workplace. The two types of withdrawal behaviors are psychological withdrawal and physical withdrawal. Psychological withdrawal consists of actions that allow an individual to mentally depart from the work environment. Some examples of psychological withdrawal are: daydreaming, looking busy, moonlighting, and cyber loafing (Kaifi, 2013). Physical withdrawal, on the other hand, consists of actions that allow an individual to physically depart from the work environment. Some examples of physical withdrawal are: missing meetings, tardiness, and absenteeism (Nafei and Kaifi, 2013: 132).

It is emphasized that cynic personnel, who do not make things easy both for the organization and themselves, experience apathy, alienation, despair, disappointment and have a higher level of emotional exhaustion (Abraham, 2000; Kutanis et al., 2010:189). Furthermore, it is possible that employees with high degree cynic attitudes might have feelings, such as insecurity, anxiety, worries and angriness and even experience depression or other psychosomatic problems and cause them to apply mobbing against other employees (Pelit and Pelit, 2014: 35).

On the other hand, Chiaburu et al. (2013: 5) claim that employees with high psychological strain that arises from role ambiguity or being unable to fulfill family responsibilities may question the efficiency and fairness of the organizational procedures. They may be irritated by the unspecified job descriptions and perceive that the organization cares little about their family life. Based on the rationale above, researchers posit that experienced psychological strain at work will result in negative attitudes toward the organization, leading to feelings of organizational cynicism. Therefore organizational cynicism encompassing personnel's negative and subversive feelings, beliefs and behaviors about their organizational affect, organizational culture and achievement negatively (Karadağ et al., 2014: 110).

Cynicism has a long history dating back to the Cynic School in the 4th century B.C. (Dudley, 1937). More recently, it has become the focus of study in a variety of contexts (Andersson, 1996; Dean et al., 1998). Our emphasis here is on applications of relevance to organizational behavior in general.

2. Theoretical Framework for Organizational Cynicism

Fred H. Goldner et al., (as cited in McNamara, www.management.org) suggest that as today's organizations become more complex, members become more cynical. This does not bode well, considering that our organizations are indeed becoming more complex as they struggle to respond to increased competition, public expectations, dynamic technologies, and a diverse workforce. Cynical employees losing trust in their leaders and having strong perception that their employers will exploit their involvement at suitable moment (Nair and Kamalanabhan, 2010).

In organizational context, Niederhoffer (1967) was probably the first researchers who studied and measured cynicism in an organizational setting. He studied police officers and examined the role of cynicism which was termed as occupational cynicism by Dean et.al., (1998). Later researchers continued work on the topic and found that a significant percentage of employees working in the United States were highly cynical about their organizations (e.g. Kanter and Mirvis, 1989; Reichers et al., 1997).

In the historical process many definitions conducted about the organizational cynicism according to research results. Some of them are below:

- Andersson (1996: 1397-1398) defines organizational cynicism (OC) as "...a general and specific attitude characterized by frustration, hopelessness, and disillusionment, as well as contempt toward and distrust of a person, group, ideology, social convention, or institution".

- Fujitu Andersson (1996) defined cynicism as an attitude characterized by the feelings of disappointment, hopelessness and being restricted such as despise and distrustfulness towards work organizations, managers and/or other things existing in the workplace.

- Organizational cynicism is defined as "a negative attitude toward one's employing organization, comprising three dimensions: (1) a belief that the organization lacks integrity; (2) negative affect toward the organization; and (3) tendencies to disparaging and critical behavior toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs" by Dean et al. (1998: 345).

- Acoording to Naus et al., (2007) cynicism is the manner through which the members of an organization defend themselves against problematical events and conditions in the working environment.

- Özler ve Atalay (2011: 26) defined cynicism as individual's having negative emotions about the organization, such as anger, disappointment, hopelessness, and the negative feelings included some organizational outcomes such as burnout syndrome.

Stanley et al, (2005) have identified two problems with the general definitions of cynicism. First, cynicism is thought of as a multi-component construct but the components have not been identified. Second, the definition differs depending upon the point of function. Finally, cynicism is believed to be multi-dimensional but no relations between the dimensions have yet been explained. Cynicism is mostly examined in relation to trust and societal capital.

Most definitions of OC also include some reference to the emotions associated with OC. When it comes to the emotions or affective aspects of organizational cynicism such as disillusionment and anger, Ajzen (2001) argues that in the process whereby the mind compares the standard belief attribute combinations with the attributes of the attitude object; both emotions and cognitions influence this process. The "storage" of the attitude as a belief is also influenced by both emotions and cognitions. While these emotions and cognitions are directly and strongly associated with the attitude of cynicism, it thus seems they are not part of the attitude itself. Furthermore, this opens the possibility that people do not have the same emotions because of OC. Indeed, it seems unlikely that all people have the same emotional reactions from OC. This may depend on character, for example (Delken, 2004).

However, most researchers nowadays tend to regard cynicism as an attitude (e.g., Andersson, 1996; Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Cole et al., 2006; Dean et al., 1998), that is as 'a psychological tendency to evaluate a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor' (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). The word 'tendency' implies that attitudes can change and be changed over time as a result of disconfirming experiences, whereas cynicism as a disposition or personality trait puts employees in a lasting or even permanent state of distrust (Naus, 2007).

In organizational context, there has been a debate on nature of this variable. Some researchers term it as a personality trait (e.g. Cook and Medley, 1954). This school of thought considers that cynicism is an inbuilt feature among individuals, either you have it or you don't have it. If we accept this analogy then there is a little environment and situation that can change this feeling of employee. But later researchers ignored this concept and presented their ideas. Becker and Geer (1961) were the main opponents of trait conceptualization of organizational cynicism. They suggested that cynicism is situation specific rather than personality specific. This version was later appreciated by many researchers in coming decades who were of the opinion that level of cynicism can be controlled in different situations (Bashir, 2011: 49).

An organizational cynicism occurs when one who believes that organization has different problems and his efforts are useless to solve those problems (McClough et al., 1998). Combating negativity is very important issue for the employee and the organization (Namie and Lutgen, 2010). There should be a step wise methodology to do the same – negativity should be eliminated first at the oneself level, then at the level of co-worker, then at the level of a one's team and ultimately at the level of organization as a whole (Brown and Cregan, 2008). Negativity should be eliminated at our own level first. As cynicism derives from employees experiences in the workplace, it can take

substantial efforts by management to reduce it (Pailing and Segalowitz, 2004). Cynicism gives rise to a number of unconstructive sentiments in the person towards their own organizations. The most common are the feelings of dislike, rage, hurt and hatred (Dean et al., 1998).Cynicism outcomes are negative for organization as well as for organization like due to cynicism employees are hopeless, less committed with their work and they become less satisfied and at the end employees decided to quit the organization (Nair and Kamalanabhan, 2010).

However, not all employees are similarly affected by the same circumstances. Situational characteristics of the organization interact with dispositional characteristics of employees in the development of cynicism. People with significant work ethic or other similar values tend to work harder and expect the employing organization to treat them with respect and dignity, and to be honest with others too. The failure of the organization to satisfying these expectations causes disappointment and disillusionment, making the employees susceptible to a cynic attitude. On the other hand, people who care less, or not at all, about the lack of honesty or sincerity, or have learned over time to deal with them, most likely they will not become cynical, as a result of their experiences (Grama 2013: 125).

On the other hand Meyerson (1990: 303) distinguished between healthful and deleterious forms of cynicism. She identified a healthful form of cynicism to be adaptive and to act as a defense mechanism when "…expressing frustration and relinquishing responsibility for aspects of a situation that are beyond [ones'] control without renouncing all hope". Meyerson's (1990) deleterious form was shown to be marked by self-defeat and apathy, which she paralleled to Maslach's (1982) notion of cynicism defined as "an attitudinal concomitant of burnout and expression of role conflict and role ambiguity" in occupations extending or giving 'care' as its major task responsibility.

In summary, as more employees begin to question corporate life, they have started experiencing more negativity and cynicism about their organization resulting in a change in behavior. Cynical employees are more likely to perceive inconsistencies within their organization's policies, goals, and practices and question the integrity of their organizations. They are less likely to engage in the behaviors exhibited by highly committed employees (as being ethical and upholding the values of the organization) as this would also create cognitive dissonance in one's attitudes and behavior—people who question the integrity of their organization can scarcely be personally attached to it. Employees who were more generally and organizationally cynical were less likely to be ethical in their intentions (Nair and Kamalanabhan, 2010: 159).

3. Dimensions of Organizational Cynicism

Our conception of cynicism, thus, is multidimensional, corresponding to the three components—beliefs, affect, and behavioral tendencies—that have long characterized attitude theory (Breckler, 1984; Goldner et al., 1977; Eagly and Chaiken, 1993; Hilgard, 1980). All three components vary on an evaluative continuum, from positive to negative.

Beliefs: The first dimension of organizational cynicism is the belief that the organization lacks integrity. Thus, organizational cynics believe that the practices of their organizations betray a lack of such principles as fairness, honesty, and sincerity. These cynics may believe that, in their organization, such principles are often sacrificed to expediency and that unscrupulous behavior is the norm. They may also believe that choices of organizational direction are based on self-interest and that people are inconsistent and unreliable in their behavior. Cynics often feel there

are hidden motives for actions; thus, they expect to see deception rather than candor and are unlikely to accept at face value the official rationale for organizational decisions.

Affect: The affective dimension of organizational cynicism comprises several of these emotions. Cynics may, for example, feel contempt for and anger toward their organization. They may also experience distress, disgust, and even shame when they think about their organization. Thus, cynicism is associated with a variety of negative emotions. Ironically, however, cynics may also experience a secret enjoyment of their superiority to the organization, which they have judged by their standards and found wanting. Therefore, we see organizational cynics as not only holding certain beliefs about their organizations but also as experiencing a related set of emotions.

Behavior: The final dimension of organizational cynicism is tendencies toward negative, and often disparaging, behavior. The general thrust of the literature indicates that cynical attitudes comprise tendencies toward certain types of behavior, rather than specific behaviors.

In the most researches organizational cynicism including three dimensions developed by a person to his organization, namely; cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimension of the cynical construct (Dean et al., 1998; Brandes, 1999; Abraham, 2000; Turner and Valentine, 2001; Johnson and O'Leary, 2003; O'Brien et al., 2004; Stanley et al., 2005; Urbany, 2005; Brandes and Das, 2006; Arabacı, 2010; Nafei, 2013; Kasalak and Aksu, 2014).

Cognitive Dimension: This is the dimension that refers to employees' disbelief in their organizations. They believe that the practices and behaviors in the organization lack certain values such as fairness and sincerity. Due to these beliefs, they think that the organizational practices betray them.

The cognitive (belief) dimension of organizational cynicism consists of the belief that the organization's practices are deficient in justice, honesty and sincerity. Cynics believe that those principles are mostly forfeited and replaced by unprincipled actions and immoral attitudes as if they are norms. Besides, they may also believe that human beings are untrustworthy and incoherent in their behaviors. For this reason, both fairness in the distribution of tasks shared between personnel as well as high quality interaction support may decrease workers' tendency to display verbal and/or non-verbal cynical behaviors.

Emotional Dimension: Along with a disbelief in the organization, emotions concerning it are among the components of organizational cynicism. This dimension consists of emotional reactions such as anxiety, shame, anger, disappointment or rage/pessimism. Organizational cynicisms of emotional dimension also contain some powerful emotional reactions like disrespect, anger, boredom and shame.

The sensitive/emotional dimension of organizational cynicism consists of strong emotional reactions towards the organization. These strong reactions can be exemplified; cynics may feel disrespect and anger towards their organizations; or feel discomfort, hatred and even shame when they think about their organizations.

Behavioral Dimension: It is the dimension that covers employees' fierce criticisms of the organization such as condescension, denigration and belittlement. In this dimension, the employee may get alienated from or sever her ties with the organization. Linked with the emotional dimension, most behaviors exhibited under this dimension involve expressions of lack of sincerity

and fairness that are thought to be inherent in the organization. Besides, employees exhibit cynical attitudes towards the organization that include pessimistic estimations and ridicule. For example, when faced with change, cynical employees display insecurity towards authority, put down the communication and instructions within the organization, and criticize their managers negatively, thus forming a wall of resistance to change. Employees with a cynical attitude do not only hinder their own development, but that of the organization too. Employees glancing meaningfully at each other, mocking, laughing and smiling with scorn manners can be also examples of cynical behaviors. The most prominent of behavioral tendencies is strong critical expressions towards the organization. These may occur in various forms. The most obvious one is the expressions about the organization asserting that it lacks critical notions like honesty and sincerity.

In summary, Dean et al. (1998) conceive of organizational cynicism as an attitude, thereby adopting a 3-dimensional cognitive, affective, and behavioral structure of the cynicism construct. These dimensions are represented in the various conceptualizations of cynicism. The cognitive dimension as 'cynicism being thought and experienced through cognition' is expressed as denial of the sincerity of the organization (Goldner et al., 1977; Urbany, 2005), as the belief that selfishness and fakery is at the core of human nature (Kanter and Mirvis, 1989, 1991), or that organizations are unscrupulous and self-serving (Turner and Valentine, 2001) and fall short of integrity (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003) or alternatively, as the disbelief of stated motives (Stanley et al., 2005). The affective dimension of cynicism 'being felt' is represented in emotionally flavored conceptualizations, such as frustration and disillusionment (Andersson, 1996; Andersson and Bateman, 1997), or pessimism (Reichers et al., 1997; Wanous et al., 1994). Finally, the behavioral dimension of employees overtly or covertly 'acting out' their cynicism is key to conceptualizations such as hostile impugning and vilification of motives (Turner and Valentine, 2001), alienation and psychological exit and disengagement (O'Brien et al., 2004), a loss of faith in leaders of change (Reichers et al., 1997; Wanous et al., 2000, 2004), or as distrust of a person, group, ideology, social convention or institution (Andersson, 1996; Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Bateman et al., 1992; Turner and Valentine, 2001).

Cynicism is typically examined in specific organizational settings, such as police departments and social service providers. However, little research attention is paid to cynicism in other organizations or work settings. The present study extends the range of organizations where cynicism is examined and investigates previously untested relationships among relevant variables.

4. Methodology

4.1. Purpose of the Study

In the first part of this paper, we have explored the concept of organizational cynicism. Now, we will further elaborate the problem statements and test them in a study among advertising agency employees. Finally, we will draw the conclusions of the study.

The central question that this paper tries to answer is: how do demographical factors relate to organizational cynicism? The logic behind using demographics as variables in present study is based on studies which indicate that attitude is affected by demographical factors. Gibson and Klein (1970) reported that some of the job outcomes such as job satisfaction (a job related attitude) is affected by different demographical variables. Similarly studies like Wu et al. (2006) and Balfour and Wechsler (1996) also reported a relationship between demographics and job related attitudes.

The impact of some important demographical factors will be tested in relation to organizational cynicism. The factors which will be part of this dissertation are age, gender, qualification, occupation...etc. Though these factors are quite important to study any organization related variable, still most of the researchers treat the demographics as control variable (Anderson and Bateman, 1997; Bateman et al., 1992; Mirvis and Kanter, 1991; 1992; Anderson and Bateman, 1997; Recihers et al., 1997). Still the impact of these demographics and their relationship with organizational cynicism needs a thorough investigation.

4.2. Population and Sample

It is seen that there have been an increase in the studies related to cynicism and related job outcomes in recent years. The current study is trying to examine the attitudes of employees toward organizational cynicism (the cognitive dimension, the affective dimension, and the behavioral dimension).

In the study cross-sectional data is gathered from advertising agency employees in Kayseri. There are around 23 advertising agencies in Kayseri. These advertising agencies mostly have 13 departments. The main problem in advertising sector is that most of the agencies (around 40) are signboard makers but they call themselves as advertising agencies. Therefore at the beginning of the study we elaborated the list of ad agencies in order to specify the sample.

A total of 122 questionnaires were distributed from which 88 questionnaires were received by the researcher and this result in response rate of 86% out of which questionnaires were found suitable for the analysis. Sample size was calculated using the formula provided by Yamane (1967: 886).

4.3. Limitation of the Research

- In this study, organizational cynicism has only been determined based on ad agency employees' perceptions. Other factors that may cause organizational cynicism, as well as cynicism's effect on the individual, are among those subjects requiring research.

- In the research ad agency employees' demographic variables and the department they are working at matched with emotional, cognitive and behavioral dimensions of organizational cynicism.

- The research findings show only ad agency employees' opinion between April and May 2014.

- This study is designed under the positivist paradigm. By performing different studies under the post-positivist paradigm, ad agency employees' problems may be more deeply analyzed.

4.4. Measurement Tool

Different scales exist to measure organizational cynicism like Neiderhoffer (1967) or Reichers et al. (1997). However the conceptualization and scale developed by Dean et al., (1998) is the most widely used scale in recent research to measure organizational cynicism. The "Organizational Cynicism Scale" consists of 13 items, which fall under three main sub-dimensions: cognitive (five items), emotional (four items) and behavioral (four items).

4.5. Research Questions

According to aim of the study we developed research questions below:

Research Questions 1: What is the relationship between employee's cynicism level and demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, education and income)?

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between employees' cynicism level and department in the ad agency they are working at?

4.6. Data Analysis

In research, frequency analysis were used for the demographic features of the participants while descriptive statistic was used for the levels of cynicism. Two independent sample t test was used to survey cynicism subdimensions, demographic variables and department variable in ad agency. Frequency and percentage techniques have been used in analyzing the data. The relationships between variables have been analyzed with correlation analysis; the differences between groups have been analyzed with T-test and ANOVA test and the results have been interpreted. Pearson correlation analysis was used to investigate the link between cynicism and other variables. Significance level was preferred as 0,05 in tests. It was calculated as 5-4=1 having been considered the given answers for the questions in likert scale, which is maximum point 5 and minimum point 1,in the scales of organizational cynicism. Also, tab space was found as 4/5=0,80 for the category levels. In this situation, the categories related to the average point are determined as following: 1,00-1,80 = "I totally do not participate", 1,81-2,60 = "I do not participate", 2,61-3,40 = "Neither I do not participate nor I do", 3,41-4,20= "I participate", 4,21-5,00 = "I totally participate".

Table 1. Demographical Characteristics of Participants

Demographic Variables		N	%
Gender	Woman	40	47,6
	Men	40	47,6
Age	25 years and younger	15	17,9
	Between 26-30 years	31	36,9
	31 years and bigger	38	45,2
Marital Status	Married	57	67,9
	Single	27	32,1
Education Status	High school	9	10,7
	College	57	67,9
	Post-Graduate	13	15,5

Department	Customer Care	15	17,9
	Creative Department	18	21,4
	Strategic Planning	15	17,9
	Financial Affairs	7	8,3
	Production	11	13,1
	Publishing units	5	6,0
	Media Planning	7	8,3
	Human Resources	6	7,1
Incoming profit	650-1000TL	13	15,5
	1001-1500TL	24	28,6
	1501-2000TL	25	29,8
	2001TL and more	21	25,0
Service period	Less than 1 year	10	11,9
	1-5 year	22	26,2
	6-10 year	39	46,4
	More than 10 years	10	11,9

40 of participants (47,6%) are women, while the remaining 40 (47,6%) are men. 4 participants didn't state their gender. 15 people (17,9%) are aged 25 or under, 31 people are (36,9%) between 26-30 and 38 are (45,2%) 31 and over 57 of participants (67,9%) are married, while 27 (32,1%) are single. 9 participants (10,7%) are high school graduates, 57 (67,9%) participants have college degree and the remaining 13 (15,5%) have post graduate degrees. 5 of the participants didn't state their educational status. Of all participants 15 work at (17,9%) customer relations, 18 (21,4%) at creative department, 7 (8,3%) financial affairs department, 11 (13,1%) at production, 5 (6,0%) publishing units, 7 (8,3%) at media planning and 6 (7,1%) at human resources department. As for income, 13 have (15,5%) a salary between 650-1000TL, 24 (28,6%) work for 1001-1500TL, 25 (29,8%) for 1501-2000TL, 21 (%25,0) for more than 2000TL income. 10 participants (11,9%) have an experience of less than 1 year, 22 (26,2%) have worked for 1-5 years, 39 (46,4%) for 6-10 years, 10 (11,9%) for more than 10 years.

Table 2. Cynicism Scale Sub-Scales Descriptive Statistics

Variables	X	SS	Min.	Max.	Degree
Cognitive Dimension	2,75	1,01	1,00	4,40	I neither agree nor disagree
Emotional Dimension	2,30	1,19	0,00	4,00	I disagree
Behavioral Dimension	3,71	0,96	2,00	5,00	I agree

It is identified in Cynicism Scale that the average grade for cognitive sub-scale is 2,75±1,01 on "I neither agree nor disagree" level; the average grade for Emotional sub-scale is 2,30±1,19 on "I disagree" level; "the average grade for behavioral sub-scale 3,71±0,96 on "I agree" level.

Table 3. "t" Test Results For Relation Between Cynicism Level and Gender

	Gender	n	X	SS	sd	T	p
Cognitive Dimension	Man	40	2,30	0,85	78	-4,065	0,000
	Woman	40	3,13	0,97			
Emotional Dimension	Man	40	2,06	1,12	78	-1,760	0,091
	Woman	40	2,51	1,23			
Behavioral Dimension	Man	40	3,37	0,98	78	-3,366	0,001
	Woman	40	4,04	0,81			

The average grades for participants' Cognitive sub-Scale represent differences with respect to gender (t=-4,065; p<0,05). There is a significant difference (significantly higher) between average grades of female participants (3,13±0,97) and those of male participants (2,30±0,85) in Cognitive sub-scale. Average grades obtained by participants in Emotional sub-scale represent significant differences according to gender variable (t=-1,760; p>0,05). There is no significant difference between Emotional sub-scale and gender variable. Average grades of participants in Behavioral sub-scale differ according to gender variable (t=-3,366; p<0,05). The average grades of female participants for Cognitive sub-scale (4,04±0,81) is significantly higher than the average grades of male participants (3,37±0,98).

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results For The Relation Between Cynicism Level and Age Variable

	Age	N	X	SS	X^2	p
Cognitive Dimension	25 years and younger	15	2,76	1,09	0,123	0,940
	Between 26-30 years	31	2,79	1,10		
	31 years and bigger	38	2,70	0,94		
Emotional Dimension	25 years and younger	15	2,66	0,96	3,229	0,010
	Between 26-30 years	31	2,34	0,94		
	31 years and bigger	38	2,85	0,92		
Behavioral Dimension	25 years and younger	15	3,92	0,95	0,961	0,618
	Between 26-30 years	31	3,62	0,97		
	31 years and bigger	38	3,70	0,97		

There is no statistically significant difference between average grades obtained from Cynism scale for Cognitive sub-scale and Behavioral sub-scale according to age groups (p>0,05). The average grades obtained from Emotional sub-scale represent significant differences with respect to age variable (X^2=3,229, p<0,05). According to LSD Post Hoc test results conducted to identify the origins of this difference, the average grades obtained by participants aged between 26-30 and over 30 in Emotional sub-scale are significantly higher than those of participants aged 25 and

lower (p<0,05). The Emotional Scale levels of participants aged 25 and younger is identified as "I neither agree nor disagree"; while those of participants in other age groups are identified as "I agree".

Table 5. "t" Test Results For The Relation Between Cynicism Level and Marital Status

	Marital Status	n	X	SS	sd	t	p
Cognitive Dimension	Married	57	2,62	1,00	82	-1,597	0,114
	Single	27	3,00	1,02			
Emotional Dimension	Married	57	2,16	1,18	82	-1,650	0,103
	Single	27	2,61	1,16			
Behavioral Dimension	Married	57	3,65	0,93	82	-0,859	0,393
	Single	27	3,84	1,03			

The difference between average grades of married participants and single participants in Cynicism sub-scale is not statistically significant for Cognitive, Emotional and Behavioral sub-scales (p>0,05). There is no relation between Cynicism level and marital status.

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results on The Relation Between Cynicism Level and Educational Status

	Educational Status	N	X	SS	X^2	p
Cognitive Dimension	High school	9	3,41	0,74	3,273	0,001
	College	57	3,39	0,82		
	Post-graduate	13	3,09	0,11		
Emotional Dimension	High school	9	2,22	1,18	0,244	0,885
	College	57	2,29	1,21		
	Post-graduate	13	2,44	1,21		
Behavioral Dimension	High school	9	3,39	1,10	3,195	0,002
	College	57	3,18	0,86		
	Post-graduate	13	2,86	0,76		

There is a statistically significant difference between average grades of agency staff with post-graduate degrees and high school degree in the Cognitive and Behavioral Cynicism sub-scales of Organizational Cynicism scale (p<0,05). It is identified that as the educational status of participants gets higher, there occurs a significant difference between Cognitive (0,001) and Behavioral sub-scales (0,002) of cynicism level.

Table 7. Kruskal Wallis H Test Results For The Relation Between Cynicism Level and Department

	Department	N	X	SS	$F_{(8,299)}$	p
Cognitive Dimension	Customer Care	15	2,98	0,90	2,046	0,041
	Creative Department	18	3,10	0,91		
	Strategic Planning	15	3,29	0,94		
	Financial Affairs	7	3,16	0,96		
	Production	11	2,94	0,87		
	Publishing Units	5	2,63	0,85		
	Media Planning	7	2,75	0,77		
	Human Resources	6	2,65	0,77		
Emotional Dimension	Customer Care	15	2,88	0,91	1,768	0,083
	Creative Department	18	2,59	0,97		
	Strategic Planning	15	2,70	0,93		
	Financial Affairs	7	2,90	0,99		
	Production	11	2,76	1,02		
	Publishing Units	5	2,60	0,98		
	Media Planning	7	2,17	0,84		
	Human Resources	6	2,41	0,91		
Behavioral Dimension	Customer Care	15	2,98	0,84	1,973	0,049
	Creative Department	18	2,88	0,86		
	Strategic Planning	15	2,68	0,87		
	Financial Affairs	7	2,83	0,90		
	Production	11	2,97	0,82		
	Publishing Units	5	3,33	0,76		
	Media Planning	7	3,17	0,74		
	Human Resources	6	3,26	0,73		

The average grades obtained from Cognitive sub-scale in Cynicism scale represent significant difference with respect to departments at which participants work within the agency ($F_{(8, 299)}$=2,046, p<0,05). According to LSD Post Hoc test results conducted to identify the origins of difference, the average grades of participants working at recreational department for Cognitive sub-scale are significantly higher than those of participants working at Media Planning Department; the grades of participants working at Strategic Planning and Financial and Administrative Affairs Departments for Cognitive sub-scale are significantly higher than those of participants working at Media Planning, Publishing Affairs and Human Resources departments (p<0,05). There is a significant difference between the average grades obtained from Behavioral sub-scale with respect to departments at which participant work within the agency ($F_{(8, 299)}$=1,973, p<0,05).

The average grades obtained from Behavioral Cynicism sub-scale of Organizational Cynicism Scale are significantly different with respect to department variable ($F_{(8, 299)}$=1,973, p<0,05). According to LSD Post Hoc test results conducted to identify the origins of difference, the average grades obtained by participants working at production department in Behavioral Cynicism sub-scale are significantly higher than those of participants working at Recreational Department, Strategic Planning and Financial and Administrative Affairs Departments; while the average grades of participants working at Publishing Affairs and Human Resources Department

in Behavioral Cynicism sub-scale are significantly higher than those of participants working at Housekeeping Services Department (p<0,05).

Table 8. ANOVA Test Results for the Relation between Cynicism Level and Income Status

	Income Status	N	X	SS	X²	p
Cognitive Dimension	650-1000TL	13	2,62	0,92	5,120	0,163
	1001-1500TL	24	2,44	0,76		
	1501-2000TL	25	2,93	1,14		
	2000TL and more	21	3,03	1,09		
Emotional Dimension	650-1000TL	13	2,06	0,95	1,206	0,752
	1001-1500TL	24	2,34	1,02		
	1501-2000TL	25	2,38	1,31		
	2000TL and more	21	2,43	1,32		
Behavioral Dimension	650-1000TL	13	3,42	0,77	4,079	0,253
	1001-1500TL	24	3,61	0,91		
	1501-2000TL	25	3,77	1,09		
	2000TL and more	21	3,92	1,00		

There is no statistically significant difference in Cynicism scale for average grades obtained from Cognitive, Emotional Scale and Behavioral sub-scales with respect to income level (p>0,05). There is no significant relation between Cynicism level and income status.

Table 9. ANOVA Test Results For Relation Between Cynicism Levels and Service Period

	Service Period	n	X	SS	X²	p
Cognitive Dimension	Less than 1 year	10	2,51	1,14	1,181	0,758
	1-5 year	22	2,86	1,02		
	6-10 year	39	2,78	1,00		
	More than 10 years	10	2,56	0,89		
Emotional Dimension	Less than 1 year	10	1,80	0,57	2,893	0,408
	1-5 year	22	2,47	1,25		
	6-10 year	39	2,32	1,22		
	More than 10 years	10	2,23	1,30		
Behavioral Dimension	Less than 1 year	10	3,25	0,59	4,216	0,239
	1-5 year	22	3,72	1,08		
	6-10 year	39	3,81	0,95		
	More than 10 years	10	3,78	0,92		

There is no statistically significant relation between average grades obtained from Cognitive, Sensitive and Behavioral sub-scale of Cynicism Scale according to year of service (p>0,05). There is no relation between Cynicism Level and year of service.

Conclusion

In recent years some philosophical concepts are being used to understand and explain the relationship between the employees and the organizations. Cynicism, as being one of these concepts, reflects the employees' negative perceptions and attitudes against the organizations they are working for. Organizational cynicism is an outcome of an employees' belief that organizations lack honesty. More specifically, expectations of morality, justice, and honesty are violated. Over the years, researchers have become more interested on issues relating to organizational cynicism. The concept of cynicism has become the subject of various disciplines in social sciences like philosophy, religion, political science, sociology, management and psychology.

Many managers of organizations have considered employee's cynical attitude as a real problem and attempts were made to reduce them. A general feature in this respect was the fact that most of them are focused on the problem of basic cynicism (Reichers, 1997).

The central question that this paper tried to answer was: how do demographic factors relate to organizational cynicism? The logic behind using demographics as variables in present study is based on studies in the literature which indicate that attitude is affected by demographical factors. At the end of our research we have reached the findings below:

It is identified in Cynicism Scale that the average grade for cognitive sub-scale is on "I neither agree nor disagree" level; the average grade for Emotional sub-scale is on "I disagree" level; "the average grade for behavioral sub-scale on "I agree" level.

There is a significant difference between average grades of female participants and those of male participants in Cognitive sub-scale. Average grades obtained by participants in Emotional sub-scale represent significant differences according to gender variable. There is no significant difference between Emotional sub-scale and gender variable. Average grades of participants in Behavioral sub-scale differ according to gender variable.

There is no statistically significant difference between average grades obtained from Cynicism scale for Cognitive sub-scale and Behavioral sub-scale according to age groups. The average grades obtained from Emotional sub-scale represent significant differences with respect to age variable.

The difference between average grades of married participants and single participants in Cynicism sub-scale is not statistically significant for Cognitive, Emotional and Behavioral sub-scales. There is no relation between Cynicism level and marital status.

There is a statistically significant difference between average grades of agency staff with post-graduate degrees and high school degree in the Cognitive and Behavioral Cynicism sub-scales of Organizational Cynicism scale. It is identified that as the educational status of participants gets higher, there occurs a significant difference between Cognitive and Behavioral sub-scales of cynicism level.

The average grades obtained from Cognitive sub-scale in Cynicism scale represent significant difference with respect to departments at which participants work within the agency.

There is no statistically significant difference in Cynicism scale for average grades obtained from Cognitive, Emotional Scale and Behavioral sub-scales with respect to income level.

There is no statistically significant relation between average grades obtained from Cognitive, Sensitive and Behavioral sub-scale of Cynicism Scale according to year of service.

According to literature review and our research findings the proposed solutions for reducing or eliminating cynicism included items such as:

Studying issue within different branches of service sector or different sectors (banking, healthcare, etc.) shall be beneficial in order to comparing and possibility to have different results in connection with organizational cynicism and other organizational outcomes.

More academic researches are needed. Future researches are expected to determine how cognitive and affective components of cynicism are related and how the two combine to influence organizational behavior such as, job satisfaction, job turnover…etc.

Encouraging employees to have a positive attitude, to see opportunities where others see threats.

Managing more fairly and operating in an open, honest, straightforward, and particularly, realistic manner.

Giving employees something to believe in. The use of corporate mission and values statement may prove to be useful here, but the major factor is if they are widely distributed, and actively and consistently implemented.

Should not discriminate and discourage employees in the organization.

Learning how to manage values with care to avoid disillusionment and organizational cynicism among employees and recruit people who have lower general cynicism.

By learning more about the causes of cynicism, managers can address certain issues that have a tendency to trigger such unwanted behaviors. Having weekly conversations with each employee (i.e., one-on-one) can be a great time and venue for such conversations to take place.

More understanding when dealing with all employees. Thus, emotional intelligence training for all managers can be effective.

By this study we have tried to lead attentions to the concept of organizational cynicism. If we want to qualified employers in the workplace we should encourage them in all steps of the company process. Their psychological well-being should be considered so special and valuable. We hope that our findings and other research findings in the literature can give a proof to both managers and academicians in order to understand the importance of the organizational cynicism and cynic personnel in the workplace.

References

Abraham, Rebecca (2000). "Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences", Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs. 126(3): 269-292.

Ajzen, Icek (2001). "Nature and Operation of Attitudes", Annual Review of Psychology. 52: 27-58.

Andersson, Lynee M. (1996). "Employee Cynicism: An Examination Using A Contract Violation Framework", Human Relations. 49(11).

Andersson, Lynee M. and Bateman, Thomas S. (1997). "Cynicism in the Workplace: Some Causes and Effects". Journal of Organizational Behavior. 18: 449-469.

Arabacı, Bakir (2010). "The Effects of Depersonalization and Organizational Cynicism Levels on the Job Satisfaction of Educational İnspectors", African Journal of Business Management. 4(13).

Balfour, Danny L. and Wechsler, Barton (1996). "Organizational Commitment: Antecedents and Outcomes in Public Organizations", Public Productivity and Management Review. 29: 256–277.

Bateman, Thomas S., Sakano, Tomoaki and Fujita, Makoto (1992). "Roger, Me, and my Attitude: Film Propaganda and Cynicism toward Corporate Leadership", Journal of Applied Psychology. 77: 786-771.

Becker, Howard S. and Geer, Blance (1958). "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School", American Sociological Review. 18: 449-469.

Brandes Pamela, Dharwadkar, Ravi and Dean, James W., (1999). "Does Organizational Cynicism Matter? Employee And Supervisor Perspectives On Work Outcomes", Eastern Acad. Manage. Proceedings

Brandes, Pamela and Das, Diya (2006). "Locating Behavioural Cynicism At Work: Construct Issues And Performance Implications", Employee Health, Coping And Methodologies, Pamela L.Perrewe, Daniel C. Ganster (Eds), New York: JAI Press.

Breckler, Steven J. (1984), "Empirical Validation of Affect, Behavior, And Cognition As Distinct Components Of Attitude", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47: 1191-1205.

Brown, Michalle and Cregan, Cregan (2008). "Organizational Change Cynicism: The Role of Employee Involvement", Human Resource Management. 47(4): 667–686.

Chiaburu, Dan., Peng, Ann C., Oh, In-Sue., Banks, George C. and Lomeli, Laura C., (2013), "Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Organizational Cynicism: A Meta-Analysis", Journal of Vocational Behavior. 83.

Cole, Michael S., Bruch, Heike and Vogel, Bernd (2006), "Emotion as Mediators Of The Relations Between Perceived Supervisor Support And Psychological Hardiness On Employee Cynicism", Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27: 463-484.

Cook, Walter W. and Medley, Donald M. (1954). "Proposed Hostility and Pharisaic-Virtue Scales for the MMPI", Journal of Applied Psychology, 38:414-418.

Copleston, Frederick (1986). A History of Philosophy, Vol.I-Greek and Rome. New York: Doubleday.
Dean, James W., Brandes, Pamela and Dharwadkar, Ravi (1998), "Organizational Cynicism", Academy of Management Review, 23(2): 341-352.

Delken, Menno (2004). "Organizational Cynicism: A Study Among Call Centers" http://www.academicrepublic.com/academicrepublic/dissertations/organizational_cynicism.pdf Access Date: 11 March 2014.

Dudley, Donald R. (1937). A History of Cynicism. London: Methuen and Co.

Eagly, Alice H. and Chaiken, Shelly (1993). The Psychology of Attitudes, Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Gibson, James L. and M. Klein, Stuart (1970). "Employee Attitudes as a Function of Age and Length of Service: A Reconceptualization", Academy of Management Journal. 13: 411.

Goldner, Fred H., Ritti, Richard and Ference, Thomas (1977). "The Production of Cynical Knowledge in Organizations", American Sociological Review. 42(4): 539-551.

Grama, Blanca (2013). "Cynicism in Organizational Change, Cross-Cultural", Management Journal. 3(29).

Hilgard, Ernest R. (1980). "The Trilogy Of Mind: Cognition, Affection, and Conation", Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences. 16: 107-117.

Johnson, Jonathan L. and O'Leary-Kelly, Anne, 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.

Kanter, Donald L. and H. Mirvis, Philip (1991). "Cynicism: The New American Malaise", Business & Society Review. 91(77): 57-61.

Kanter, Donald L. and H. Mirvis, Philip (1989). The Cynical Americans: Living And Working In An Age Of Discontent And Disillusion. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Karadağ, Engin., Kılıçoğlu, Gökhan and Yılmaz, Derya, (2014). "Organizational Cynicism, School Culture, and Academic Achievement: The Study of Structural Equation Modeling", Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice. 14(1): 102-113.

Kasalak, Gamze and Aksu, Mualla (2014). "The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Cynicism of Research Assistants", Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice. 14(1): 125-133.

Kutaniş, Özen Rana and Çetinel, Emine (2010). "Adaletsizlik Algısı Sinisizmi Tetikler mi?: Bir Örnek Olay", Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 1: 26: 186-195.

Maslach, Christina (1982). Burnout The Cost of Caring Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall

McClough, Anita C. (1998). "Cynicism and the Quality of an Individual's Contribution to an Organizational Diagnostic Survey", Organization Development Journal. 16(2): 31-42.

McNamara, Carter, (1999) "Overview of Cynicism in Business Organizations", http://managementhelp.org/personalwellness/cynicism/ Access Date: 21 March 2013.

Merriam-Webster, Inc. (2003). Webster's Tenth New Collegiate Dictionary. Springield, MA: Author.

Meyerson, Debra E. (1990). "Uncovering Socially Undesirable Emotions: Experiences of Ambiguity In Organizations", American Behavioral Scientist, 33:296-307.

Nafei, Wageeh A. (2013). "Examining the Relationship between Organizational Cynicism and Organizational Change: A Study from Egyptian Context", Journal of Business Administration Research. 2(2).

Nafei, Wageeh A. and Belal A. Kaifi, (2013) "The Impact of Organizational Cynicism on Organizational Commitment: An Applied Study on Teaching Hospitals in Egypt", European Journal of Business and Management, 5(12):132.

Nair, Priya and T.J Kamalanabhan (2010). "The Impact of Cynicism on Ethical Intentions of Indian Managers: The Moderating Role of Seniority", Journal of International Business Ethics. 3(1).

Namie, Gary and Lutgen, Pamela (2010). "Active and Passive Accomplices: The Communal Character of Workplace Bullying", International Journal of Communication. 4: 343-373.

Naus, Alphons Johannes Aloysius Maria (2007). "Organizational Cynicism on the Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences of Employee Cynicism Toward the Employing Organization", Unpublished Thesis, http://arno.unimaas.nl/show.cgi?fid=9199, Access Date: 25 February 2014.

Niederhoffer, Arthur (1967). Behind The Shield: The Police In Urban Society. NJ: Garden City, Anchor

O'Brien Anne T., Haslam, Alexander and Jetten, Jolanda (2004). "Cynicism And Disengagement Among Devalued Employee Groups: The Need To Aspire", Career Development International. 9(1): 28-44.

Özler, Derya E. ve Atalay, Ceren (2011). "Research To Determine The Relationship Between Organizational Cynicism and Burnout Levels Of Employees In Health Sector", Business and Management Review. 1(4): 26 – 38.

Pailing, Patricia E. and Segalowitz, Sidney J. (2004). "The Error-Related Negativity as A State and Trait Measure: Motivation, Personality and ERPs in Response to Errors", SPR Psychophysiology. 41(1): 84–95.

Pelit, Elbeyi and Pelit, Nil (2014). "The Effects of Mobbing on Organizational Cynicism: A Study on Hotels in Turkey", International Journal of Human Resource Studies. 4(1): 34-56.

Polat, Soner, (2013). "The Impact of Teachers' Organizational Trust Perceptions on Organizational Cynicism Perception", Global Journal of Teacher Education. 1(1): 106-111.

Reichers, Arnon E., Wanous, John and Austin, James (1997). "Understanding and Managing Cynicism about Organizational Change", Academy of Management Executive. 11(1): 48-59.

Sajid, Bashir (2011) "Organizational Cynicism Development and Testing of an Integrated Model A study of Public Sector Employees in Pakistan", Unpublished PhD thesis, Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi.

Stanley, David J., Meyer, John and Topolnytsky, Laryssa (2005). "Employee Cynicism and Resistance to Organizational Change", Journal of Business & Psychology, 19(4): 429-459.

Turner, James H. and Valentine, Sean R. (2001). "Cynicism as a Fundamental Dimension Of Moral Decision-Making: A Scale Development", Journal of Business Ethics. 34(2): 123-136.

Urbany, Joel E. (2005). "Inspiration and Cynicism in Values Statements", Journal of Business Ethics. 62: 169-182.

Wanous, John P., Reichers, Austin and Austin, James 1994). "Organizational Cynicism: An Initial Study", Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings.

Wanous, John P., Reichers, Austin and Austin, James (2000), "Cynicism about Organizational Change. Measurement, Antecedents, and Correlates", Group and Organization Management. 25(2): 132-153.

Wu, Shih-Ying (2006). "Corruption and Cross-Border Investment by Multinational Firms", Journal of Comparative Economics. 34: 839–856.

Yamane, Taro (1967). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis, New York: Harper and Row.