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Abstract

One of the problems in improving process of the schools is “cynicism”. Cynicism is an attitude in which individual benefits are the foreground and is described as scepticism, negativism and being pessimistic about facts. In schools, what is expected from the school principals is to realize the change and mutation depending on the improvements. Leadership is a process that manages people affecting towards organizational aims. Leadership has two dimensions: to organize a structure and tolerance in organization (culture and climate). In this study, it is tried to determine correlations between teacher’s organizational cynicism and leadership skills of school principals. The analysis of the data was made by using SPSS 15.0 and in order to determine whether some demographic features (e.g., sex, marital status, educational status) show a meaningful difference on the lower dimensions of organizational cynicism and leadership behaviour, Whitney-U and Kruskal Wallis-H tests were used; and a meaningful difference was not observed. Furthermore, Pearson correlation and regression analysis were used to measure the level of relation and being predictable between the organizational cynicism and lower dimensions of leadership behaviour. In accordance with the result of the research’s findings, it was found a negatively directed and medium-level relation between cynicism and leadership behaviour.

Introduction

It is necessary for organizations to keep pace with the developing and changing world conditions. From this
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standpoint, as being the most important element of organizations, it is important for the workers to have high incentives and job satisfaction besides their trust and commitment to the organization. The factors that lower workers’ organizational trust and commitment, job satisfaction may damage organizations. Organizational cynicism that can be considered as one of the threatening elements has become extremely important for the organizations. It has started to be claimed that the job efficiency and motivation of the workers with high level of organizational cynicism decreases, their motivation levels and job satisfactions diminish and their organizational commitments weaken.

Leadership behaviour goes beyond the management duty whose job definitions are stated by laws and regulations and can be defined as a person who transfers his knowledge and skills to his subordinates and the role that a leader acts in his organization. Leadership behaviour has two dimensions. Organizational development and alteration process and the circumstances such as the communication with workers in the organization or increasing efficiency of workers express its construction dimension. The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between organizational cynicism and leadership behaviour. In this regard, a negative relationship between organizational cynicism and leadership behaviour is expected.

Organizational Cynicism
Cynicism; the person who believes people only look out for themselves and considers everybody as self-seeker is called “Cynic” and the idea that explains this is called “Cynicism”. The main belief about cynicism is that honesty, justice and sincerity are sacrificed for personal interests. Although cynicism has a close meaning with the words “scepticism, suspiciousness, disbelief, pessimism, negativity”, its meaning of an individual’s being censorious, fastidious and critical” is more dominant in modern interpretation (Erdost et al., 2007: 514). Andersson (1996) defined it as disappointment, dissatisfaction and an individual or group’s general or private attitudes which are identified with ideologies towards institutions and social traditions. These definitions have some problems that can cause debates in the future. They, however, state that attitudes constitute the main component of cynicism (Delken, 2005: 8-9).

As the notion of organizational cynicism is new in literature and closely associated with organizational alienation, organizational unreliability, organizational negative climate, there are a lot of definitions (Tokgöz and Yılmaz, 2008: 286; Kalağan, 2009: 40-41). Goldner, Ritti and Ference (1977) put forward that cynical information is rejecting the goodness and sincerity of altruism behaviour in the organizational actions, decisions and methods. Kanter and Mirvis (1989-1991) say that it is a personal characteristic which reflects that selfishness and deceitfulness are in the centre of human nature. Bateman, Sakano and Fujita (1992) claim that it is a negative attitude towards authority and organizations. Guastello, Rieke, Guastello and Billings (1992) state that it is not only a business manner but a general point of view over life. Andersson (1996) says that it is a general or private attitude which is shaped by chagrín, disappointment and negative feelings towards a person or all of their (a person’s or a group’s) mistrustfulness. According to O’Sullivan and Postmes’e (2004), it is a type of psychological escape and independence. Stanley, Meyer and Topolnytsky (2005) claim that it is not to believe others’ motives stated or pointed about a decision or an action. Urbany (2005) states that it reflects the negative comments or feelings about favourable things, especially the rejection of positive effect of the organization’s valuable statements in the main decision phase. Wanous, Reichers and Austin (1994) and Cole, Bruch and Vogel (2006) define it as an attitude which arises from a critical regard of an employer organization’s beliefs values, actions or motives and the leaders who make the changes will be incapable or lazy.

Main Factors That Cause Organizational Cynicism
The factors that cause workers to experience cynicism are dealt in different aspects by different researchers. According to literature, the main factors that constitute cynicism are examined under two main titles as personal and organizational. The factors that affect cynicism in terms of personal characteristics are variances such as gender, age, marital status, service period, and income and education level, from organizational aspect, organizational cynicism is a part of organization and the factors such as organizational justice, psychological breach of contract, individual-role conflict trigger cynicism. The age period individuals are in can affect their attitudes, perceptions, wishes and expectations from their job (Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Çakır, 2001: 107; Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild & Walker, 2007; Bommer et al, 2005; James, 2005; Efılıti, et al, 2008; Erdost et al, 2007; Güzelliler & Kalağan, 2008; Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008). In some researches, however, gender difference is not seen as a personal characteristic that affects the manner of organizational cynicism (Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Bommer et al, 2005; Efılıti et al,
The negative situations in an organization occur according to the organization climate and the culture it adopts. The most apparent factors that cause organizational cynicism are organizational justice, organizational policy, and psychological breach of contract and individual-role conflict. Organizational justice is considered as one of the most important factors that affect organizational cynicism (Bernerth et al., 2007; Bommer et al., 2005; James, 2005). Moreover, organizational policy is defined as the behaviours that affect the decision period have a connection between organizational policy and cynicism (James, 2005). Another cause of organizational cynicism is individual-role conflict. If a manager makes his workers do his own works, the worker will have individual-role conflict, be disappointed because his job is different from his expectations, get pessimistic and experience cynicism (Sur, 2010: 29). As an expression of role conflict and role uncertainty, cynicism is more common in jobs in which interest should be shown as a main duty responsibility, especially in public sector (Andersson, 1996:1399).

The Dimensions of Organizational Cynicism
The first dimension of organizational cynicism is the belief that the organization is deprived of honesty which comes up with the negative feelings such as anger, scorning and condemnation. From this point of view, cynicism is the tendency towards the disbelief of the goodness and sincerity of people’s motives. Due to this reason, cynics believe that their organizations betray them with their applications because of lack of principles such as honesty and sincerity. Showing emotional responses towards an object constitutes the second dimension of organizational cynicism. Apart from opinions and beliefs, cynicism includes strong emotional responses towards the organization such as condemnation and anger which do not have any objective judgment. It is even stated that individuals with high cynicism level can feel disgusted and ashamed while thinking about their organizations. The last dimension of organizational cynicism is the tendency towards negative behaviours. Most of these behaviors are the statement about the organization’s being lack of sincerity and honesty. This dimension also includes sharp criticism, pessimistic predictions, sarcastic humour and snubs and critical statements about the organization (Özgener et al., 2008: 56; Kutaniş and Çetinel, 2010: 188).

Leadership
The word leadership had the meanings such as influential, aggressive, strong, determined, even governing in the past. In the 21st century, however, leaders need to have different leadership features (Titrek, 2010: 144). Based on features, leadership is grouped under 10 titles by Stogdill (1974): 1) the focal point of group process, 2) personality and its effects, 3) persuasive skill for adjusting and following, 4) usage of influence, 5) action and behaviour, 6) shaping the belief, 7) a means to achieve the goals, 8) the effect of interaction, 9) a differentiating role and 10) initiator action (cited: Baloglu & Karadağ, 2009: 168). There have been over 3000 pieces of research about leadership in management science. According to these researches, leadership group activities are stated as influencing process towards reaching group’s goals (Base, 1985), affecting, guiding and managing ideas, actions and tendencies (Bennis ve Nanus, 1985), a two-way interaction between the leader and each follower (Grean, 1976), a strong impact (Argyris, 1976), a power related with effective personal characteristics (Etzioni, 1964), using power to influence followers’ ideas and actions (Zaleznik, 1977) (cited: Çelik, 2011: 5). According to Hoy and Miskel (2010:377), leadership is a social process that affects the members’ interpretation of inner and outer incidents, choice of goal, regulations of activities, individual motivation and abilities, power relationships and common points. Leadership occurs in accordance with new situations without being connected with distinct qualifications.

The Dimensions of Leadership Behaviours
Some researcher tried to determine leadership behaviour in organizations. Hemphill and Coons (1957) One of them and they tried to explore the leadership behaviours with nine dimensions of the leadership behaviour in order to define the leadership behaviours: (1) integration, (2) communication, (3) the significance of the production, (4) substitution, (5) evaluation of the organization, (6) the power of attempt and (7) gaining superiority, (8) construction, (9) being tolerant. Moreover, Aydin (2010: 291-292) said that the style of a certain leadership has two dimensions: task-oriented behaviour and people-oriented behaviour. While some leaders are more task-oriented, others are more people-oriented. Most of leaders make a balance between these two orientations. However, Halpin (1976) tried to measure leadership behaviour to make it better understandable and he determined as two dimensions:
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construction and empathizing (cited: Bursalıoğlu, 2010: 208):

Construction dimension: construction dimension can be defined as individuals’ expressing their attitudes clearly, showing a democratic administrative mentality, problem solving, stating their ideas without hesitation, exchanging ideas about who will do the duties in the organization, working in a planned way, paying attention for duties conforming to standards, caring for duties done on time, obeying the regulations, rules and orders, stating their opinions about the duties, doing everything for them to work in coordination.

Empathizing dimension: Empathizing dimension means leader’s making personal support, providing job satisfaction, an easy and understandable management mentality, sparing time to listen to ideas, being indulgent and open the new ideas, being friendly, being open to make innovations, having strong personal human affairs, being open to suggestions.

The Relationship between Organizational Cynicism and Leadership

Based on some research’s result cynicism is affecting some organizational behaviours such as job satisfaction When workers’ cynicism level increases, their job satisfaction decreases (Sur, 2010; Abrahm, 2000; Eaton, 2000; Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly, 2003; Reichers et al, 1997; Wanous et al, 1994). Moreover, if there is cynicism in an organization, cynics who disbelieve in the organization have also a negative, hopeless point of view in their organizational expectations (Kalağan, 2009: 83). Organizational cynicism brings alienation with it. The more organizational cynicism increases, the more alienation towards organization and everything related to it increases (Kalağan, 2009: 88; Abrahm, 2000: 276). As trust is a belief and attitude in organizational cynicism, there are some signs that shows mistrustfulness can be an antecedent. It can be said that mistrustfulness is a belief component of organizational cynicism. In some studies it is defined that when the level of organizational cynicism increases, the level of trust decreases (Andersson & Bateman; 1997, Dean et al; 1998; Erdem, 2003; Brandes, 1997; Thompson et al, 2000; cited. Kalağan, 2009: 84). Organizational cynicism affects organizational citizenship in a negative way. It, however, does not affect organizational citizenship directly but it affects it via the alienation caused by organizational cynicism indirectly (Abrahm, 2000: 287; Brandes & Das, 2006: 245).

Furthermore, Hemphill and Coons (1957) decided on the leadership as two useful dimensions in order to construct and test the being tolerant behaviours. Effective leadership behaviour is fruitful both in construction and being tolerant dimensions. It was observed that superiors gave importance to the construction dimension while the under group gave importance to the being tolerant dimension. Leadership understanding and its implication affect the group members’ attitudes and changes (cited: Kabadayi, 1982:27). Nowadays, it has been seen that there are lots of research examining the tolerance dimension in organizational behaviour and its reasons. ‘Organizational cynicism’ is one of them. One of the prior works about organizational cynicism and leadership belongs to Davis and Gardner (2004). The researchers worked on how the process of attribution between the leader and the member and how these attributions affect the organizational cynicism. Wuve et al. (2007) studied on the connections between the transformational leadership and group members in organizational cynicism. This study showed that there is a negative correlation between the transformational leadership and the cynicism connected to the organizational variation and workers perceptions about the group harmony or designs the relation between transformational leadership and organizational cynicism and they revealed that high perception about group harmony strengthened the impact of transformational leadership on the organizational cynicism (Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008: 293).

Üstündag (1973), Ergun (1981), Korkut (1992), Yılmaz (2007) and Uzun (2008) have studied the dimensions of leadership behaviours in Turkish public management; Kabadayi (1982) has studied on school principals’ leadership behaviours and teachers’ motivation; and Koçak (2006) found a significant relationship between primary school teachers’ job satisfaction and school principal’s leadership behaviours. It can be said that there is a negative relationship between the leadership behaviours and cynicism attitude as it is seen on Wuve’s study (2007) which reveals that in transformational leadership, individual support dimension provides the highest job satisfaction. İççi, Şişman and Bektas studied cynicism with personnel empowerment in organization and they have found some relations between empowerment, motivation and cynicism behaviours. Motivation also related with leadership as well. There is not a study in Turkey which reveals this relationship of school principals’ leadership behaviours and organizational cynicism attitudes. Based on this literature, the aim of this study is to determine the level of school principals' leadership behaviours according to the teachers who believe in cynicism. For this reason, our research problem is: Is there a correlation between the school principals' leadership behaviours and teachers' cynicism attitudes? We will try to answer the following questions:
1. Is there a significant difference between the cynicism and attitudes and teachers' gender, age, seniority level and educational status?
2. Do the teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes differ according to cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions?
3. To what extent do the school principals show leadership behaviour according to the teachers?
4. Is there a significant difference between the cynicism attitudes and teachers' gender, age, seniority level, and educational status?
5. Is there a correlation between the school principals' leadership behaviours and organizational cynicism according to the teachers?

**METHOD**

**Research Design**

In this study, relational correlation model was used to reveal the relationship between the teachers' organizational cynicism levels and school principals' leadership behaviours. In the correlation study design the purpose of research is to reveal the level of change between two variables (Karasar, 2010:81).

**Participants**

Research population consists of 1284 teachers working in Karabük. Sample group includes 500 teachers. The questionnaire was applied with simple random sampling method because of the timing and economic reasons. Study group was classified according to numbers, gender, educational status, seniority level, marital status, and duty. According to gender variable, there are 192 (38.7%) females and 304 (61.3%) males. 450 (90.7%) of the teachers are married and 46 (9.3%) of them are single. According to age variable, there are 9 teachers (1.8%) between 20-25, 77 (15.5%) between 26-30, 95 (19.2%) between 31-35, 100 (20.2%) between 36-40, 102 (20.6%) between 41-45, and 113 (22.8%) 46+. According to seniority level variable, there are 47 teachers between 0-5 years, there are 86 (17.3%) teachers between 6-10 years, there are 112 (22.6%) teachers between 11-15 years, there are 90 teachers (18.1%) between 16-20 years, and 161 (32.59%) teachers are 20+. Finally, when we categorize the group according to their educational status, 89 of them (17.9%) are graduates of vocational schools, 6 (1.2%) of them are graduates of 3-year vocational schools, 393 (79.2%) of them are graduates of faculties, and only 8 (1.6%) of them have MA degrees.

**Data Collection Instruments**

The data were collected through two different scales. In the first part, there is a 'personal information' section and in the other part, there is 'organizational cynicism and leadership behaviour' scale.  

**Organizational cynicism scale;** developed by Brandes, Dharwadker and Dean (1999), consists of 13 items. There are three dimensions; cognitive, affective and behavioural. Brandes et al. (1999) calculated that items in cognitive dimensions had factor loads between .63 and .81; in affective dimensions they were between .75 and .80; in behavioural dimension they were between .54 and .80. It was also found that Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients were .86, .80, and .78 in order. Likert scale was used as "strongly agree" (5), "agree" (4), "partially agree" (3), "disagree" (2) and "disagree at all" (1) (cited: Kalağan, 2009). The reliability level of organizational cynicism scale was found as α=.92. According to the data, factor load value is .91-.92. Sub-dimensions of cynicism, cognitive dimension's Cronbach alpha value is α=.88 and factor load value is between .84-.85; affective dimension's Cronbach alpha is α=.97 and factor load value is between .95-.97 and behavioural dimension's Cronbach's alpha is α=.80 and factor load value is between .78-.80. These data show that organizational cynicism scale has a high reliability in this study.

**Leadership behaviour description scale;** was developed by Hemphill & Coones (1950) and some different researchers adapted the scale in Turkish. Önal (1979) is prior in Turkey who adapted this scale's sub-dimensions; construction and describing relationship. However, the researcher did not consider the reliability and validity level of the scale. Ergene (1990) found that for construction dimension r=.82 (p<.01) for relationship dimension r=.77 (p<.01) via pre and post-tests. It can be said that the scale is valid and reliable. The scale has two sub-dimensions; construction and being tolerant. The one whose construction level is high, has tendency for work, the one whose being tolerant level is high has tendency for the individuals. Both sub-dimensions are Likert scale based on 15 items consist of participant responses (between always and never). Positive items are graded as "always" (5), "mostly" (4), "sometimes" (3), "rarely" (2), "never" (1); and negative items are graded vice versa. In construction dimension 3rd
and 7th items; in being tolerant dimension 5th, 7th, 8th, and 9th items were graded conversely. In the study, the more points the principals get from any sub-dimension, the more leadership behaviour belonging to that sub-dimension they have (cited: Çemberci, 2003:78). In this study Cronbach alpha was found as α=.91 and factor load value was between .90-.91. Construction sub-dimension s Cronbach alpha was α=.84 and factor load value was between .81-.86; being tolerant sub-dimension's Cronbach alpha was α=.87 and factor load value was between .85 and .87. When we consider these, data leadership scale items' reliability level is high.

**Data Analysis**

The data were analysed with SPSS 15.0 program. Cronbach alpha coefficient was used to measure reliability level of the data. Alpha coefficient which is found by dividing the total variance of the items into general variance is a standard deviation mean ranges between 0-1. Cronbach alpha is used in order to explore whether the items on the scale work as a whole so as to explain a homogeneous structure. (Büyüköztürk, 2010). In data analysis normality test was implemented in order to configure which analysis method should be used, parametric or nonparametric. Leadership behaviours and cynicism scales' sub-dimensions total of items are not bigger than .50, so the distribution is not normal. For this reason, in data analysis nonparametric analyses were used.

In data analysis; frequency tables, descriptive statistics were used in order to analyse two variables' correlation, Pearson correlation coefficient was used, for the subtract of two groups' mean Mann Whitney U-test was used, for the subtract of more than two groups' mean Kruskal Wallis H-test was used. In statistical comparisons p values smaller than .5 are accepted as significantly as. After collecting data and analysing them, they were generalized. Exceptions were dealt additionally. While interpreting the statistical analyses it is considered "p" significance value; in some cases it was interpreted according to the groups' distribution among themselves. Mann Whitney U-test was used for independent sampling groups in order to decide whether the teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes affect the school principals' leadership behaviours. Kruskal Wallis H-Test was used so as to measure the significance in the groups more than two. Kruskal Wallis H-Test can be used in the cases that ANOVA's assumptions, one of the parametric analyses cannot be provided to measure the significance (Büyüköztürk, 2010). Pearson Correlation Coefficient was calculated in order to examine the levels and the directions of positive correlations between organizational cynicism dimensions and leadership behaviours. Regression analysis was used in order to examine the effect of perceived organizational cynicism dimensions on the all leadership behaviour dimensions. Regression analysis is the discrimination of two or more correlational variables as dependent and independent variables, and the explanation of the correlation between the variables with mathematical equality (Büyüköztürk, 2010).

**FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION**

In the comparison of teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes according to the arithmetic averages of the items in organizational cynicism sub-dimensions it is revealed that there is a positive linear correlation in an average level; cognitive and affective ($r=0.580;\ p<0.01$) cognitive and behavioural ($r=0.573;\ p<0.01$) behavioural and affective ($r=0.465;\ p<0.01$). According to the matched group t-test values, which is done for comparison of the dimensions as pairs, there is a significant distinction among all comparisons, $\alpha=0.01$. The ordering of the dimensions from the highest to the lowest is; (1) cognitive, (2) behavioural, and (3) affective.

According to the scale points of gender dimension, calculated according to Mann Whitney U-test, male teachers' points are higher than the male teachers'. There is not a significant difference ($p<.05$) in cognitive and behavioural dimension according to the gender. But, there is a significant difference according to affective dimension. It shows that male teachers lived much more cynicism than the female teachers. ($p<.05.U=25049,00$). These findings show that teachers' genders do not affect their organizational cynicism attitudes. There are some studies showing that there is not a significant relationship between organizational cynicism and gender (Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Bernerth et al., 2007; Bommer et al., 2005; Efılti et al., 2008; Erdost et al., 2007; Güzeller & Kalağan, 2008; Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008; Kalağan, 2009).

According to marital status variable, when we consider the Mann Whitney U-Test results related to teachers' organizational cynicism dimension, in all dimensions married teachers' views' means are higher than the single ones. According to analysed Mann Whitney U-Test results, it was seen that there was not a significant difference in organizational cynicism attitudes in behavioural, cognitive and affective dimensions according to marital status variable. This finding supports the previous ones found by Efılti et al. (2008), Erdost et al. (2008), and Kalağan (2009).
According to age and seniority variables, a significant difference in cognitive, behavioural and affective dimensions has not been found when we consider the Kruskal Wallis Test results related to organizational cynicism dimensions (p<.05). This finding shows a parallelism with some kinds of researchers’ such as Andersson & Bateman, 1997; Bernerth et al., 2007; Bommer et al., 2005; Efıltı et al., 2008; Erdost et al., 2007; Güzeller & Kalağan, 2008; James, 2007; Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008; Kalağan, 2009. According to seniority level, this finding supports the findings of some works such as Bernerth et al., 2007; Bommer et al., 2005; Efıltı et al., 2008; Erdost et al., 2007; Johnson, 2007; Tokgöz & Yılmaz, 2008; Kalağan, 2009. According to educational status variable, when we consider the Kruskal-Wallis Test results related to teachers’ organizational cynicism dimensions, there is not a significant difference between behavioural and affective dimensions and organizational cynicism dimensions (p<.05).

Table 1. Correlation Analysis Results by Teacher’s Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Empathizing</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathizing</td>
<td>0.652(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>-0.495(**)</td>
<td>-0.553(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>-0.331(**)</td>
<td>-0.408(**)</td>
<td>0.588(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>-0.169(**)</td>
<td>-0.255(**)</td>
<td>0.483(**)</td>
<td>0.581(**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation p <.01 significant level.

After examining the Table 1 for the relationship between the sub dimensions of organizational cynicism scale and the sub dimensions of leadership behaviour scale, it was observed that there was a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.495) between the construction and cognitive dimension; a negative relationship at low level (r=-0.331) between the construction and emotional dimension. It was also observed that there was a negative relationship at medium level between the empathizing dimension of leadership behaviour and the cognitive dimension of cynicism. It was observed that there was a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.553) between the indulgence dimension of leadership behaviour and the cognitive dimension of cynicism; a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.408) between the indulgence dimension and emotional dimension; a negative relationship at low level (r=-0.255) between the indulgence dimension and behavioural dimension. According to these findings, it can be interpreted that the leadership behaviour is not exhibited as the level of cynicism increases and it is better exhibited as the level of the cynicism decreases.

Table 2. The Effects of the Dimensions of Teachers’ Perceived Organizational Cynicism on the Construction Dimension of Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Deviation(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>binary r</th>
<th>partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>67,059</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,771</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>-0.986</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-10,336</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-2,355</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-0.334</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=0.523 R²=0.273 F(3,484)=60,593 p=.000

When we observed Table 2, it is seen that there is a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.51) between the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism and the construction dimension of leadership behaviour. There is a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.33) between the emotional and construction dimension. However, it is seen that this correlation is (r=-0.12) when other two variables are controlled. It is also seen that the negative binary correlation calculated between the behavioural and construction dimension of cynicism is (r=-0.17) and that it is positive and at a low level (r=0.15) if other two variables are controlled.
The cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions of cynicism give a positive relationship at medium level on the construction dimension of leadership behaviour. These three variables explain approximately 27% of total variance jointly (R=0.523, R²=0.273, p<.01). According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the predictor variables on the construction dimension is cognitive, behavioural and emotional dimension. According to the regression analysis results, the regression equation (mathematical model) related to the predicting of construction dimension is given below.

\[ \text{CONSTRUCTION} = 67.059 - 0.986 \text{COGNITIVE} - 0.256 \text{EMOTIONAL} + 0.371 \text{BEHAVIORAL} \]

Table 3. The Effects of the Dimensions of Teachers’ Perceived Organizational Cynicism on the Indulgence Dimension of Leadership Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Deviation(B)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>binary r</th>
<th>partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>69.550</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50.861</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>-1.228</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.512</td>
<td>-10.929</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.566</td>
<td>-.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>-.424</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-3.316</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>-.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=0.580  R²=0.336  \( F_{(3,484)} = 81.783 \)  p=.000

When we observed bilateral and partial correlations between predictor variables and the dependent variable in the Table 3, it is seen that there is a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.56) between the cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism and the indulgence dimension of leadership behaviour. However, it is seen that this correlation is (r=-0.51) when other two variables are controlled. There is a negative relationship at medium level (r=-0.42) between the emotional and indulgence dimension. However, it is seen that this correlation is calculated (r=-0.16) when other two variables are controlled. It is also seen that the negative binary correlation calculated between the behavioural and indulgence dimension of cynicism is (r=-0.25) and that it is positive and at a low level (r=0.09) if other two variables are controlled.

The cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimensions of cynicism give a positive relationship at medium level on the indulgence dimension of leadership behaviour. These three variables explain approximately 34% of total variance jointly (R=0.580, R²=0.336, p<.01). According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the predictor variables on the indulgence dimension is cognitive, emotional and behavioural dimension. According to the regression analysis results, the regression equation (mathematical model) related to the predicting of indulgence dimension is given below.

\[ \text{EMPATHISING} = 69.550 - 1.228 \text{COGNITIVE} - 0.424 \text{EMOTIONAL} + 0.273 \text{BEHAVIORAL} \]

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between the organizational cynicism and leadership behaviour according to teachers’ perceptions in schools. According to the research results, it can claim that the cynicism level of school administrators is low based on teacher’s perceptions. Besides, the cynicism levels of school administrators are low in terms of cognitive and emotional factors which are sub dimensions of organizational cynicism. The leadership behaviours of school administrators were found at a high level.

Based on teachers’ perceptions, their attitudes towards organizational cynicism are in the cognitive and behavioural dimension at the highest level and in the emotional dimension at the lowest level. In terms of gender, marital status, age, and education level, any significant difference could not find between the school administrators’ attitudes towards organizational cynicism related to the cognitive and emotional dimensions. The mean values of the items in the emotional dimension were too low level. According to the results of this dimension, it was proposed that school
administrators’ attitudes towards organizational cynicism were in the emotional dimension at the lowest level. Based on these results not only teacher but also school principals in Turkey have cynic behaviours towards their jobs. Moreover, we can claim that Turkish teachers and school principals have emotional commitment towards their job but they are acting differently. The reason of this dilemma can be a little economic and some negative situations in Turkish school climate and the culture. Before being a teacher, people can have high expatiations and high level positive emotional commitment about this job. However when they will be teachers after years and years, their burnout level is increasing and some determinants related cynicism development are increasing their unrealistic high expectations, disappointment caused by non-fulfilment of these expectations, and the disappointment that follows it (Kanter & Mirvis, 1991: 58-59) in Turkey as well. When the expectations of workers cannot be met, organizational cynicism occurs and it causes various psychological results. It is stated that this situation results in neurotic and emotional deregulations, depression, insomnia, emotional burnout and disappointment (Kanter and Mirvis, 1989). In addition the writers who mentioned the behavioural results of cynicism stated that cynicism is connected with unhealthy behaviours such as using alcohol, smoking (Daviglus, Costa and Stamler, 1991; Houston and Vavak, 1991) and being overweight (Houston and Vavak, 1991; Brandes, 1997: 39-40; cited. Kalağan, 2009: 80). Moreover, there is not any career progress for teacher and also this can create monotonous life and it can increase cynical behaviour for them as well. Based on Esmeray and Erçen (2007), teachers and school principal are having burnout in Turkish schools and there is some factor leading burnout in organizations including high expectation and motivation. If motivation level and high expectations getting down, burnout level is increasing and cynical behaviours in organization increasing (Örmen, 1992; Çam, 1995; Tümkaya, 1996; Kürılmaz, Çelen ve Sarp, 2003; Oruç, 2007, Gündüz, 2005).

In terms of gender, marital status, age, and education level, any significant difference could not be found between the attitudes towards organizational cynicism related to the emotional dimension in terms of teachers’ perception. The mean values of the items in the behavioural dimension were too low. Similar research findings were parallel to the results of the other studies in the literature and the sub dimensions of organizational cynicism could not be found, and this result overlaps with the results of other studies (Erdost et al, 2007; Güzeller and Kalağan, 2008; Efıltı et al, 2008; Kalağan, 2009; Sur, 2010). However, a significant difference was found in the study of Kanter and Mirvis (1991) in terms of gender; accordingly men had a higher level of cynicism than women. However, some results which do not show parallelism with our research findings have also emerged. Some different results in Erdost et all (2007) and Kalağan’s studies (2008) emerged and it was detected in Erdost et all’ (2007) studied that the individuals who studied at vocational schools were apt to show more cynical behaviour than the ones who have undergraduate degree. It was concluded in the study of Güzeller and Kalağan (2008) that the master or doctoral graduates’ negative attitudes towards their institutions were higher than the associate degree graduates. According to the teachers’ perceptions, there is no difference among the levels of organizational cynicism in terms of seniority. In the study of Efıltı et all (2008), it was seen that professional characteristics also did not affect the personal and organizational cynicism subscales. Sur (2010) could not find a significant difference between personal variable in the study applied to the office workers. No significant difference could find among the cynicism dimensions in terms of seniority as in Kalağan’s study (2009) applied to the research assistants. James (2005) claims that organizational cynicism is the response to the past personal and social experiences which are likely to change as a result of environmental factors as educational level. Moreover İşiçi, Şişman and Bektas (2013) have been determined that there is a relationship between personnel empowerment and organizational cynicism. Personnel empowerment which is believed to enhance employee motivation and have a positive impact on the employees should also be evaluated from this perspective.

According with the teachers’ perceptions related to leadership behaviours, the leadership behaviours of school principals take part in the construction dimension at the highest level, and in the indulgence dimension at the lowest level. It is accepted that school principals who get high scores in the construction dimension are successful in managing, planning, communication and putting forward new ideas. There are some school principal behaviours focusing on mutual trust and solidarity in human relationships in the indulgence dimension (Korkut, 1992). According with these values, it can be concluded that the school principals displayed a good leadership behaviour when compared with the teachers. According to the school principals’ perceptions, Üstündag (1973) found a significant difference in the construction dimension between the real leadership behaviours which they show and the ideal leadership behaviours which they should show in his study. However, he could not find any significant
difference in the indulgence dimension. According to the teachers’ perceptions, they also found a significant difference between the ideal leadership behaviours which the school principals show and the ideal leadership behaviours which school principals should show in his study (Çemberci, 2003: 138). In terms of teachers’ styles of leadership behaviour (construction and indulgence dimensions), Erkuş (1997) saw nine out of 17 school administrators in the construction dimension and eight out of them in the indulgence dimension in the study in which he aimed to determine the relationship between teachers’ perception of school administrators and school principals’ perception of themselves. Moreover, no significant difference found between the construction and indulgence sub dimensions of leadership behaviour according to teachers’ gender and age variables. Çemberci (2003) found a significant difference in the indulgence dimension while he could not find a significant difference in the construction dimension. However, Çemberci (2003) found a significant difference between the 46 and over, 26-30 and (31-35 / 36-40) age groups in the construction dimensions; however, he could not find any significant difference in the indulgence dimension. However, a significant difference was found between leadership behaviours in terms of marital status. The mean scores of the married individuals were higher than the singles in the study findings.

It was found that all the relations between teachers’ attitudes towards organizational cynicism (cognitive, emotional and behavioural) and school principals’ leadership behaviour (construction and indulgence) were significantly and negatively associated. The highest negative linear relation was found between the cognitive and the indulgence dimensions while the lowest negative linear relation was found between the behavioural and construction dimensions. Those teachers’ attitudes towards cynicism are low; school principals’ leadership behaviours are high and the relation between them is negative. Based on these results, leadership affecting cynical behaviour levels in Turkish schools. According to Lane, Corwin and Monahan (1967), if problematic behaviours (as cynicism) increase in organization, principals indulgence behaviour also decreasing, and we can say that also in this organization, doing leadership and motivating people is not easy.

The cognitive, emotional and behavioural variables give a highly significant relation with the teachers’ scores of construction collectively and they explain 27 % of total variance in the teachers’. When we observed the results related to the significance of regression coefficients, the cognitive, emotional and behavioural variables have high significant correlation with the teachers’ scores of construction collectively. The cognitive, emotional and behavioural variables explain 34 % of total variance in the teachers’ indulgence variable collectively. Furthermore when observed the results related to the significance of regression coefficients, it was observed that cognitive, emotional and behavioural variables are predictor variables on indulgence dimension. As a result, the education sector organizational leadership of school principals’ perceptions of high levels of cynicism observed that low. The following suggestions were developed for the practitioners in the frame of the results obtained from the study:

- The factors leading to organizational cynicism should be determined and some precautions should be taken according to those factors in order to obtain sufficient yield in educational institutions.
- In-service training should be provided to educational employees in the time of need in order to eliminate the effects of organizational cynicism.
- Working environments and conditions should be improved in order to decrease teachers and school principals’ attitudes levels towards organizational cynicism and to increase their leadership skills.
- The personal rights of school principals and teachers should be protected by strengthening. The attitude levels towards organizational cynicism of the educational employees whose expectations are met; whose opinions are taken and considered important will be lower.
- Some departments or programs may be opened at universities with the aim of bringing up education principals so that expert education principals can be brought to schools.
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