A CONCEPTUAL ASSESSMENT OF CYNICISM CONCEPT AT ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL

ÖRGÜTSEL DÜZEYDE SİNİZM KAVRAMININ KAVRAMSAL BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

Ayşe ARSLAN ÖZKAN

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Turizm Fakültesi/Turizm Rehberliği Bölümü, Aydın/Türkiye

ayse.arslan@adu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5459-0147

ABSTRACT

Organizational cynicism has emerged as a result of the belief that the organization lacks a sense of honesty and justice; therefore, it has become a significant topic of discussion between employees and top management. The consequences of organizational cynicism include multidimensional effects that negatively impact employees at the individual level and the functioning, productivity, and organizational climate at the organizational level. The aim of this study is to explain the concept and types of cynicism, as well as the theories used to explain organizational cynicism. A review of the existing research indicates that there are relatively few studies focusing on these theories. Therefore, this study is expected to enrich the literature and serve as a guide for future research. In this study, the literature review method was used as the research methodology. Accordingly, the study first addresses the concept and types of cynicism (personality cynicism, employee cynicism, occupational cynicism, organizational change cynicism, and social/institutional cynicism), and then focuses on the theories explaining organizational cynicism (expectancy theory, attribution theory, attitude theory, social exchange theory, affective events theory, and social motivation theory). Overall, understanding organizational cynicism through these theoretical approaches enables both researchers and practitioners to identify its root causes, anticipate potential negative outcomes, and design interventions aimed at reducing cynicism; thus allowing the development of more effective strategies to strengthen trust, employee commitment, and overall functioning within organizations.

Keywords: Cynicism, Organizational Cynicism Cynicism Theories

ÖZET

Örgütsel sinizm, örgütün dürüstlük ve adalet duygusundan yoksun olduğu inancının bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmıştır bu nedenle, çalışanlar ve üst yönetim arasında önemli bir tartışma konusu olmuştur. Örgütsel sinizmin sonuçları, bireysel düzeyde çalışanları; örgütsel düzeyde ise işleyişi, verimliliği ve kurumsal iklimi olumsuz etkileyen çok yönlü sonuçları içerir. Bu çalışmanın amacı sinizm kavramını ve türlerini ve örgütsel sinizmi açıklamada başvurulan teorileri ortaya koymaktır. Mevcut araştırmalara bakıldığında teorilerle ilgili oldukça az araştırma olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bakımdan araştırmanın literatürü zenginleştirmesi ve gelecekte yapılacak araştırmalara yol gösterici olması beklenmektedir. Bu çalışmada araştırma yöntemi olarak literatür taraması kullanılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, çalışma önce sinizm kavramına ve türlerine (Kişilik Sinizmi, Çalışan Sinizmi, Mesleki Sinizm, Örgütsel Değişim Sinizmi ve Sosyal/Kurumsal Sinizm) yer vermekte, ardından örgütsel sinizmi açıklamada başvurulan teorilere (Beklenti Teorisi, Atıf Teorisi, Tutum Teorisi, Sosyal Değişim Teorisi, Duygusal Olaylar Teorisi ve Sosyal Motivasyon Teorisi) değinmektedir. Genel olarak, örgütsel sinizmi bu kuramsal yaklaşımlar ışığında anlamak hem araştırmacıların

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

hem de uygulayıcıların sinizmin temel nedenlerini belirlemesine, olası olumsuz sonuçlarını öngörmesine ve sinizmi azaltmaya yönelik müdahaleler tasarlamasına olanak tanır; böylece örgütlerde güveni, çalışan bağlılığını ve genel işleyişi güçlendirmeye yönelik daha etkili stratejiler geliştirilmesini sağlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sinizm, Örgütsel Sinizm, Sinizm Teorileri

1. INTRODUCTION

Global changes and technological innovations in the world necessitate organizations to regularly follow change and development strategies. Organizations need qualified employees to implement these strategies. For this reason, the organization needs to give more subjects to its employees and strive to retain qualified employees in order to achieve the goals. On the other hand, this situation increases the expectation of employees to exhibit higher performance. Therefore, intensifying competition and stress factors increase the pressure on employees and cause changes in the attitudes of employees (Leiter & Maslach, 2004; Chiaburu et al., 2013). The negative attitudes of the employees towards their organization or other colleagues pave the way for the development of cynicism in the organization (Dean et al., 1998).

Many studies have pointed to the existence of cynicism in the workplace (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989; Mirvis & Kanter, 1991; Reichers et al., 1997; Abraham, 2000; Naus et al., 2007; Bedeian, 2007 ; Shahzad & Mahmood, 2012; Chiaburu et al., 2013; Simha et al., 2014; Scott & Zweig, 2016; Aly, et al., 2016; Aljawarneh & Atan, 2018; Dobbs & Do,2019; Megeirhi et al., 2020; Sguera et al., 2021; Divya & Seranmadevi, 2022; Ahtisham et al., 2023; Agina, et al., 2023; Rauf, et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2025). Kanter and Mirvis (1991) state that over the past 20 years, trust in the business world has declined from approximately 70% to 15%, and during the same period, a similar trend has been observed in management competence and confidence among employees. Kähkönen and colleagues' 2021 literature review covering 20 years shows that this situation is still ongoing, indicating that violations of employee trust have increased over time and that repairing this trust is associated with improvements in organizational performance (Kähkönen et al., 2021).

In the Kanter and Mirvis (1989) research, 43% of employees claim that they are frustrated, disappointed, insecure and suspicious as a result of the unethical behavior of leaders and uncertainties in the organization. From ancient Greece to the present day, cynics have developed some negative attitudes and behaviors (anger, disappointment, frustration, contempt, ridicule, etc.) towards institutions, societies and individuals. For this reason, the consequences of these attitudes and behaviors for organizations have been the subject of many researches. While some studies focus on the causes and consequences of cynicism, type of cynicism, others have examined numerous factors that have been empirically proven to negatively affect employees' work attitudes, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational change, burnout, work behavior, turnover intention and job alienation (Andersson,1996; Andersson & Bateman,1997; Dean et al., 1998; Abraham,2000; Arabacı, 2010; Atalay & Ozler, 2011; Nafei & Kaifi, 2013; Chiaburu et al., 2013; Khan, 2014; Ike, O. et al., 2024; Daş & Naldöken, 2025). Some studies have examined cynicism's mediating role or the mediating variables between cynicism and other organizational behaviors such as Shahzad & Mahmood, 2012; Simha et al., 2014, Yang et al., 2020; Agina et al., 2023; Ike, O. et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2025.

Cynicism affects the relationship between organizational support and performance. Participants experiencing high levels of cynicism tend to interpret perceived support negatively, and it has been observed that employee performance is at its lowest when perceived cynicism is very high (Byrne & Hochwarter, 2008). According to the findings of Panchali and Seneviratne (2019), there is a significant negative relationship between organizational cynicism and employee performance at different hierarchical levels in Sri Lanka. Additionally, each sub-dimension of organizational cynicism has been found to negatively affect employee performance.

The research conducted on bank employees in Konya revealed that there is a negative and statistically significant relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism (Ozturk et al., 2016). In the study targeting healthcare employees, it was found that perceived organizational support alleviates employees' burnout symptoms and reduces cynical attitudes (Alsubaie & Nasaani, 2021). There is a weak, negative, and significant relationship between tourist guides' levels of organizational cynicism and their job satisfaction (Arslan, 2018; Arslan & Şimşek, 2018). The findings of the study conducted by Kudo et al., (2016) and Kökalan (2019) also confirm the negative and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational cynicism. Furthermore, according to the results, the variable of hope partially mediates and reduces the negative relationship between organizational cynicism and job satisfaction (Kudo et al., 2016). Moreover, organizational spirituality reduces the negative effects of organizational cynicism on job satisfaction (Kökalan, 2019).

Organizational cynicism negatively affects organizational commitment (Nafei & Kaifi, 2013; Erarslan et al., 2018; Malkoç, 2018). According to the results of a survey conducted with 172 nurses in Taiwan, trust in coworkers, perceived fairness, and role conflict have shown weakening (negative) effects on the relationship between burnout and cynicism. Work-family conflict and depersonalization have a strengthening (positive) effect on organizational cynicism (Simha et al., 2014). It has been found that organizational cynicism has a partial mediating effect on the relationship between nurses' turnover intention and role stressors (Nazir et al., 2016).

Organizational cynicism directly affects job performance negatively. Additionally, workplace spirituality moderates the relationship between organizational cynicism and job performance (Risgiyanti et al., 2020). According to the results of the study conducted on university employees, cynicism plays a partial mediating role in the relationship between emotional exhaustion and task performance, contextual performance, and prosocial behavior. There is a connection between cynicism and lower performance and prosocial behavior (Bang &Reio, 2017)

The concept of cynicism has been examined from various perspectives by numerous researchers since the 1900s, and based on existing studies, it is evident that it remains a popular topic today. The aim of this study is to present the concept and types of cynicism, as well as the theories used to explain organizational cynicism. A review of the existing research shows that there are relatively few studies focusing on these theories. Therefore, this study is expected to enrich the literature and provide guidance for future research. In this context, a conceptual literature review was carried out to identify and synthesize the main concepts and theories related to the topic.

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

2. METHODOLOGY

In this research, literature review was carried out. Before conducting a literature review, it is necessary to establish the reasons why the review is needed. It should be clarified whether there is indeed a need for such a review and what its contribution to the field will be (Snyder, 2019: 336). After defining the research question, this stage involves selecting the search terms and appropriate databases, as well as deciding on inclusion and exclusion criteria. Search terms are the words or phrases used to access relevant articles, books, and reports. These terms should be based on words and concepts directly related to the research question. Depending on the purpose of the review and the research question, the search terms may be broad or narrow in scope. Since almost all initial literature searches yield a large number of studies, a strategy is needed to determine which ones are truly relevant. The inclusion criteria for the review should be guided by the chosen research question. Commonly considered and widely used criteria include publication year, language of the article, type of article (e.g., conceptual, randomized controlled trial), and the journal in which it is published (Snyder, 2019: 337).

A systematic literature review can be conducted with anywhere from 40-50 studies to 500 or more relevant works. This process may be challenging for the researcher. To determine which studies should be included in or excluded from the review, two common approaches can be helpful. The first is to focus on the titles, keywords, and abstracts of the studies; the second is to examine in more detail the sections where the key concepts or keywords are discussed in the selected studies. Additionally, defining a specific time period-for example, a 10-year span-can also help narrow the scope of the review. In this context, a search was conducted in the Google Scholar, Web of Science (WoS), and Scopus databases using the keywords *cynicism* and *theories* (Webster & Watson, 2010). Based on these studies, the theories explaining organizational cynicism were determined and are discussed in the following section.

3. CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In this section, the concept of cynicism and organizational cynicism, types of organizational cynicism, theories explaining organizational cynicism and its consequences are included.

The Concepts of Cynicism and Organizational Cynicism

Cynicism, which is a concept of philosophical origin, has a very broad dimension. For this reason, it has been the subject of different disciplines such as politics, religion, sociology and psychology as well as the subject of philosophy (Kalağan, 2009: 35). There are different views on the origins of the concept of cynicism (Hançerlioğlu, 1999: 16; Gökberk, 2000: 48; Cevizci, 2008: 55; Turan, 2011: 68). According to the first view, the origin of the concept of cynicism is based on the Greek word “kyon”. Kyon means “dog, like a dog”. Individuals whose basic principles are virtue and wisdom have been called “cynical” or “cynic”. Ancient cynics ignored social rules and adopted a natural way of life. He has always despised civilization. Although the first cynic was Antisthenes (445-360 BC), the most famous cynic was Diogenes of Sinop (412-320 BC), whose thoughts Alexander the Great was also influenced by. According to the legend, when Alexander the Great, who came to visit him one day, asked, “Do you have a wish?”, Diogenes said, “Stand out of my sunlight “and put forward the idea that a person can be happy and independent even in the most limited living conditions. Alexander the Great, who was a student of Aristotle, was very impressed by this answer of the famous thinker Diogenes and said, “If I were not Alexander the Great, I would

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

like to be Diogenes." Diogenes believed in the necessity of human self-sufficiency. He rejected life based on the rules imposed by civilization and argued that life should be natural and simple. By answering "I am looking for an honest person" to those who asked why he walked around with a lantern in his hand during the daytime, he expressed his cynicism philosophy, which essentially argues that people are deprived of honesty, in an ironic language.

According to the second view, the concept of cynicism is associated with the town of "Kynosarges" (gymnasium) near Athens, where Antisthenes, the founder of the cynical school, taught. The literal meaning of "kynosarges" is "the place of the white dog". It can also be stated as the reason why cynics are called by dog names. O'Hair and Cody (1987) base cynicism on the view of Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism, named after the Italian philosopher Niccola Machiavelli, is an understanding of attitude and political philosophy that legitimizes all kinds of immorality in order to achieve political goals (Hançerlioğlu, 1999: 195). The basic idea of this philosophy is "The end justifies the means" and its main purpose is to keep the state alive and to increase its power as much as possible. The famous thinker Machiavelli stated that everything that people value is valuable to the extent that it serves the purpose of the sovereignty of the state, and that the ruler can resort to any means for the sake of the sovereignty of the state. In Machiavellian thought, there is a belief that people are generally bad and deserve evil. On the contrary, there are no moral, legal or religious limits to achieve the goal; every means to achieve the goal is accepted legally and morally, and for this reason, they condemn not evil, but not doing evil to achieve the goal (Hançerlioğlu, 1999: 34; Cevizci, 1999: 567). It is possible to say that the association of the concepts of organizational cynicism and Machiavellianism stems from the similarity of both concepts in their perspective on human relations (Kalağan, 2009: 51).

In addition to being associated with the concept of Machiavellianism, it is possible to say that the concept of cynicism has a close meaning with concepts such as skepticism, distrust, disbelief, pessimism and negativity (Polat et al., 2010: 543). For this reason, the concept of cynicism is confused with skepticism. However, the concepts of skepticism and cynicism are quite different from each other. While skepticism helps to focus on the solution and making sensible decisions, considering every possibility for work and life, cynicism is an obstacle to success. Skeptics do not lose faith that there will be a positive change, even if they doubt whether the work they are going to do will be successful. However, cynics are more pessimistic in this regard, they are not selfish and open-minded, and they have negative thoughts from the beginning because they cannot get past failures out of their minds. This concept, which is similar to each other in terms of lack of trust, differs in terms of approach to the result (Kanter and Mirvis, 1989: 380).

Organizational cynicism is defined as "a person's negative attitude towards his/her job/institution". It has three dimensions: cognitive, emotional and behavioral. These; belief that the organization lacks integrity; negative impact on the organization and tendencies towards derogatory and critical behaviors towards the organization consistent with these beliefs (Dean et al., 1998: 345). Minnesota Multiple Personality Inventory Scale developed by the University of Minnesota in the 1940s and are the source of the oldest cynicism scale. Cook and Medley (1954) developed the "Cynic Hostility Scale" based on the scale of the University of Minnesota. These scales were originally designed to measure aggression and hostility as personality characteristics (Turner and Valentine, 2001: 128). Subsequent research on organizational cynicism has highlighted that cynicism is a mindset (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003: 631). The difference between the two stems from stability and continuity (Delken, 2000: 12).

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

Types of Organizational Cynicism

Cynicism is divided into two as employee and business cynicism by Andersson (1996); Dean et al., (1998) and James (2005) focused on five different focal points when conceptualizing organizational cynicism, these five different focal points also constitute the types of cynicism. These focus areas are personality approach, institutional focus, focus on employee cynicism, organizational change focus, focus of occupational cynicism (Dean et al., 1998: 342-346). Although Dean et al., (1998) used these focal points when trying to define cynicism as a concept. Abraham (2000) was the first to mention types of cynicism in the literature. Abraham mentioned five types of organizational cynicism and made a great contribution to the conceptual clarification of the process as presented in the Table 1 (Abraham, 2000: 271-273):

Table 1. Types of Organizational Cynicism

Type of Cynicism	Primary Emotions/Behavior	Target	Context	Temporal Nature
Personality Cynicism	Resentment, Anger	Human nature	-	Stable, dispositional
Employee Cynicism	Bitterness, Anger	Everything (generalized)	Psychological contract breach	Variable
Occupational Cynicism	Indifference, Disdain	Customers	Service-oriented organizations	Variable
Organizational Change Cynicism	Disappointment, Pessimism	Organizational Change	Unsuccessful change initiatives	Variable
Social/Institutional Cynicism	Alienation, Hopelessness	Institutions	-	Variable

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

a. Personality Cynicism

Personality cynicism is the only type of cynicism that perceives human behavior negatively in general and is congenital and unchanging. The basic character of personality cynicism is contempt and contempt for people and poor interpersonal bonding. The deep insecurity of individuals who have adopted personality cynicism stems from a generalization that the world is full of people who are dissatisfied with social interaction, dishonest, ignore crimes, do not care about others, and are selfish. This state of insecurity results in behaviors and attitudes such as anger, hatred, sadness, and dishonesty in individuals. Personality cynicism is an congenital, determined personality trait that reflects negative perceptions of human behavior (Abraham, 2000: 270-271).

It is seen that Cook and Medley's (1954) "The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory" and Wrigtsman's (1992) "Philosophy of Human Nature" are widely used scales to determine personality cynicism (Dean et al., 1998: 342-344). In the "Cynical Hostility Scale" developed by Cook and Medley (1954), the lack of belief of human nature is measured with the following items: "No one cares what happens to you"; "Most people will use unfair means to gain and advantage rather than lose"; "I often wonder about the ulterior motives of the person who does something nice for me". Personality cynicism is the strongest precursor of

organizational cynicism, although it affects all criteria such as burnout, person-role conflict, hostility, and psychological contract violations (Abraham, 2000: 269). It has been observed that personality cynicism is also used as general cynicism in some sources (Tokgöz and Yılmaz, 2008: 289).

b. Employee cynicism

Employee cynicism targets large business enterprises, senior management, and other individuals and departments in the organization. The fact that individuals with working cynicism have a sense of injustice distinguishes them from other individuals (Abraham, 2000: 272). Andersson (1996) defines employee cynicism as "*both a general and a specific attitude towards an individual, group, ideology, social tradition, and organization, shaped by disappointment and hopelessness, along with disdain and distrust"* (Andersson 1996: 1397-1398); Cartwritght and Holmes (2006) defined employee cynicism as a new paradigm of the relations between the employee and the employer that emerged as a result of long working hours, work intensity, ineffective leadership and management, new jobs in the organization, continuous shrinking of the organization and the reduction of levels in the organization (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006: 201).

Andersson's definition of cynicism covers all areas of cynicism, and this definition has been used at the same time as organizational cynicism since the beginning. Some researchers, such as Andersson (1996) and Andersson and Bateman (1997), Herriot (2001), have examined worker cynicism within the framework of the psychological contract (Delken, 2004: 16). Andersson grouped the violations that cause worker cynicism under three different categories: 1- the characteristics of the business world (lack of harmony in policies and practices, unethical behaviors, unfair compensation policies, etc.), 2- the characteristics of the organization (such as poor communication, lack of management in the implementation of change), 3- the nature of the work (role conflict, role ambiguity and excessive workload) (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006: 201).

Employee cynicism can have wide-ranging effects within the organization. Wanous et al., (2000) concluded that worker cynicism is associated with various negative behaviors such as absenteeism, complaints, poor performance, and dismissal. Negative emotions such as the employee's feeling that he is not informed and not participating in the decision-making process are also related to worker cynicism. In addition, cynical employees have a lower level of organizational commitment. Cynical employees are less motivated and perform less (Boomer et al., 2005: 736).

Although this form of cynicism derives from police cynicism, which is one of the first studies on cynicism, it is seen that it is also called occupational /vocational cynicism and organizational cynicism in the literature. However, these two types of cynicism have different characteristics from each other, occupational cynicism deals with the content of the job, while organizational cynicism deals with the general scope of the work (Delken, 2004: 16). Occupational cynicism is mainly customer-directed, but it is possible to generalize to the public. Cynicism expands in an organizational sense when employees blame the inadequacy of the service provided to the customer with the inadequacy of policies or practices and resources (Naus, 2007: 13). In addition, occupational cynicism is related to service employees with role conflict and ambiguity (Dean et al., 1998: 344).

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

c. Occupational cynicism

Occupational cynicism is a strategy to deal with the inhibitions of authority that cause the depersonalization of individuals or the distance between themselves and their consumers. Professional cynicism is characterized by emotional numbness, insensitivity, apathy and lack of compassion. The process of dehumanization involves denying humanity and customer identity, not empathizing and making connections between emotions, not understanding the sensitivity of consumers. By blaming consumers for their problems, the individual protects himself against negative and painful emotions. Dehumanization is mostly seen in social workers, police and psychiatric emergency teams (Abraham, 2000: 273). Abraham (2000) stated that factors such as personality-role conflict, role ambiguity and role conflict cause occupational cynicism. Personality-role conflict is the conflict between the personal value judgments of the employee and the value judgments of the organization. For example, babysitters, collectors and employees working in professions such as secretarial, police officers, and the health sector should not reflect their true feelings in their work. In this direction, individuals reflect emotions that they do not really feel. Cynicism causes individuals to act hypocritically and therefore lose their true identity. In particular, the fact that employees working in the service sector interact directly with customers exposes them to stress (Abraham, 2000: 273-274). This situation leads to emotional and physical exhaustion of the employee and even to quit the job (Delken, 2004: 16).

d. Organizational Change Cynicism

Wanous et al., (1994), Reichers et al., (1997), Wanous et al., (2000), Thompson et al., (2000) are important authors who have worked on cynicism in organizational change. Thanks to their work, the concept of organizational change has developed. Wanous et al., (1994: 269) defined organizational change cynicism as a mechanism that is based on the organization's belief that innovative managers are incompetent and lazy and spreads a pessimistic view about the future success of the organization. The fact that individuals have seen many attempts to change in the organization and know that only a few of them have resulted in success makes them cynical individuals. In addition, if employees are not informed about success, they assume that they are failures and are very prone to exhibit cynical attitudes. As a result of this process, they adopt pessimism as a defense mechanism in order not to be disappointed with future changes. When the expected change does not occur, individuals feel frustrated and betrayed by the individuals responsible for innovation. To avoid such feelings about future changes, individuals stop hoping and think that others will fail. Thus, it is a learned response to unsuccessful attempts at change for cynicism and prevents individuals from feeling bitter emotions. For this reason, change efforts are a mixture of success and failure and are interpreted as failures by cynics (Wanous et al., 1994: 296, Wanous et al., 2000: 133, Bommer et al., 2005: 737).

If employees oppose change in the organization, the cynicism of organizational change can happen on its own. The lack of support from these employees leads to failure or makes very limited success possible. Failure reinforces the cynics' beliefs and makes them reluctant to try change again. Very few changes are made and put into service at the behest of senior managers without the need for the approval of the employees. The success of many innovations depends on wholehearted commitment and fulfillment to the letter. For this reason, cynicism is seen as a major obstacle to change (Reichers et al., 1997: 48). Reicher et al., (1997) stated that organizational cynicism change stems from individuals' previous experiences. The employee, who sees that very few of the targeted changes are successful, is quite inclined to exhibit a cynical attitude towards later attempts, believing that the changes

will not be successful all the time. In addition, the change in organizational cynicism occurs as a result of unpleasant thoughts such as that the organization is experiencing serious problems. Such thoughts create the fear that employees will lose their jobs, and employees question the change and the managers who make the change. In this case, the employee avoids personal responsibilities and assumes that other managers can do better. If change efforts are doomed to failure by the current management, employees avoid being disappointed when the outcome fails because they do not take responsibility (Reicher et al., 1997: 50).

e. Social cynicism

Social cynicism is expressed as a combination of organizational cynicism and personality cynicism (Dean et al., 1998: 344). Kanter and Mirvis (1991) defined social cynicism as the disillusionment of individuals with their society, institutions, themselves and others. When the psychological contract between individuals and the organization is violated, an attitude of social cynicism is observed in individuals. The psychological contract *is "the individual's belief in the mutual obligations between the employee and the employer*" (Rousseau, 2000: 2). The reason why individuals are disappointed is that expectations cannot be met by the organization (Kanter and Mirvis, 1991: 59). For example, the social contract between the American people and the government, which they call the American dream, includes elements such as job security, home ownership, increased welfare, and providing children with a college education that promises an economic future. When this contract between the people and the government is broken, individuals feel unfair and disappointed, so they begin to feel a sense of distrust towards the organization and other individuals, and thus social cynicism manifests itself (Abraham, 2000: 270). Social cynics are alienated from social and economic institutions because of what happens to them. Their hopelessness for the future leads them to short-term interests, so they approach every new job-related task and opportunity with the understanding of "What is my interest". These attitudes of individuals result in not fully dedicating themselves to their work, being jealous of their peers and making fun of their achievements, attributing their success to their connections and luck (Kanter and Mirvis, 1989: 36).

Theoretical Foundations of Organizational Cynicism

Various theoretical perspectives aiming to explain the origins, development, and workplace effects of organizational cynicism have been explored. This section presents seven theories that help explain organizational cynicism: Expectancy theory, attribution theory, attitude theory, social exchange theory, *affective* events theory and social motivation theory.

a. Expectancy Theory

Expectancy Theory discusses the dependence of our inclination toward an action on the strength and attractiveness of the outcome of our expectations (Robbins and Judge, 2011: 225). Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory is based on four assumptions. According to the first assumption, individuals participate in organizations with their expectations, motivation and experience in line with their needs. These affect how individuals react to the organization. A second assumption is that an individual's behavior is the result of a conscious choice. Individuals are free to choose behaviors that are guided by their own expectation plans. According to the third assumption, individuals want different things from the organization (good salary, job security, etc.). According to the fourth assumption, individuals choose

among alternatives to improve personal outcomes. The individual assumes that the effort will lead to an admirable performance, that the performance will be rewarded, and that the value of the reward will be quite positive, and that this reward will satisfy their personal goals. For this reason, expectation theory focuses on three relationships. The effort that the individual puts into his work affects the level of performance. The performance expectation of the employee varies between 0-1 value. If the employee thinks that his/her effort will not result in the desired performance, the expectation value is 0. On the other hand, if the employee is absolutely sure that the job will be completed, the expectation value is 1. As a result of his successful performance, the employee expects that he will earn various deaths such as salary increase and promotion (Vroom, 1964; Lunenburg, 2011: 1; Robbins and Judge, 2011: 224).

Value is the employee's individual appreciation for a particular reward. That is, salary increases, promotions, recognition by management, or other rewards may be evaluated differently by individuals. While one employee expects a salary reward for his performance, the other may want to be rewarded with a vacation. The reward can be evaluated positively or negatively by the employee. The value is positive if the employee wants to achieve the reward, but if the employee is not interested in the value, it is negative and the value is 0. The total value ranges from -1 to +1. Theoretically, a reward has value because it is related to the needs of the employee. In this respect, value establishes a link with the motivation need theory (Vroom, 1964; Lunenburg, 2011).

Expectancy theory consists of four different elements and three relationships. Accordingly, in the first stage, when the employee makes maximum effort, he questions whether he will be taken into account in the performance evaluation. At this point, employees' abilities may be inadequate, making them less likely to perform well. From this, it can be concluded that a lot of effort does not always result in a high evaluation. In the second stage, it is considered whether the employee will be rewarded by the organization if he receives a good performance evaluation because; Many organizations give awards based on the performance of employees. When pay depends on factors such as being senior, collaborating, or having a good relationship with the boss, employees are prone to feel that the performance-reward relationship is weak and not motivating. In the final stage, the employee questions whether this reward, if it is rewarded, will be attractive to him. For example, the employee works hard to get a promotion but is rewarded with a wage increase instead, or the employee wants a more interesting and demanding job but is praised in just a few words instead. The reward that each employee wants to receive as a result of his performance is different, and failure to fulfill these different expectations causes the employee to be disappointed (Robbins et al., 2012: 225-227). From this point of view, it is possible to talk about a relationship between organizational cynicism and expectancy theory. Because one of the main reasons for the emergence of organizational cynicism is the inability of individuals to meet basic expectations and the resulting disappointment, sadness and anxiety (Abraham, 2000; Kanter and Mirvis, 1989). If the employee believes that his or her effort will not lead to performance (for example, if the system is not fair), this situation reduces motivation and eventually leads to organizational cynicism. If the employee believes that good performance will not be rewarded ("no one appreciates it"), this leads to distrust and cynicism toward the organization. If rewards have no meaning for the individual or are not distributed fairly, the employee develops a negative attitude toward the reward system and, consequently, toward the organization.In Vroom's model, low levels of expectancy, instrumentality, or valence weaken the employee's trust and commitment to the organization. This, in turn, creates a basis for the development of cynical attitudes.

b. Attribution Theory

The Attribution Theory emerged formally after the publication of Fritz Heider's book The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations in 1958. Heider (1958) discusses individuals' tendency to explain events in terms of causal relationships (Heider, 1958). Weiner (1985) explains the emotional consequences of attributions in success and failure.

The widespread use of attribution theory by researchers stems from the need to make sense of the underlying causes of individual and organizational behavior. A specific process is required to make sense of events and individuals and to make inferences. In this process, the individual systematically evaluates both his own behavior and the behavior of other people, and as a result, he makes various inferences and generalizations. Attribution theory focuses on the direct and indirect impact of the inferences obtained by the individual on their future behavior. Understanding the factors that cause behaviors makes it possible for individuals to control future events and behaviors. For this reason, individuals evaluate past events and develop new strategies to increase future success and eliminate risks (Cort et al., 2007: 10). Organizational cynicism as an attitude has been tried to be explained by Weiner's (1985) Social Attribution Theory. Accordingly, organizational cynicism is about referring to negative events in the organization. According to Weiner, people refer to negative events after them, depending on their perception of the event. These attributions result in liability provisions that give rise to specific emotions, such as anger or sympathy, and emotions that give rise to expectations, such as hope. These emotions lead to socially beneficial behaviors or antisocial behaviors such as hostility and deliberate aggression towards others. According to Weiner's model, referring to the organization as responsible for negative events results in employees blaming the organization (Eaton, 2000: 18-19). According to this theory, employees refer to people who have the status of leaders when evaluating. In the evaluations of the employees, it was seen that they were likely to conclude that the institutional efforts were unrealistic or that the decision-makers were not the main authority (James, 2005: 11-12). James (2005) points out that employees' tendency to attribute negative organizational outcomes to external causes increases cynicism.

In summary, employees make attributions for negative events, inconsistent or unfair practices, and when these situations become persistent over time: When the employee attributes negative situations in the organization (such as injustice, lack of merit, or failure) to management or the system, this leads to distrust and cynicism toward the organization. If the employee believes that reward-punishment or promotion processes are not fair, he or she attributes this perceived injustice to the organization and develops negative attitudes. When the employee continuously blames top management or the system for organizational problems, this perception becomes permanent over time and manifests as organizational cynicism.

c. Attitude Theory

Attitudes are formed as a result of elements such as knowledge, beliefs and emotions being in a systematic and continuous relationship (İnceoğlu, 2010: 19). Attitudes are a vital construct for understanding human behavior because they describe a person's tendency to experience a stimulus object as "good" or "bad" (Wagner, 2021).

Attitude Theory explains how individuals develop attitudes toward objects, people, or events and how these attitudes influence their behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). Attitudes are considered in three dimensions: Cognitive, affective, behavioral. According to the definition of Dean et al., (1989), organizational cynicism consists of cognitive (disbelief,

distrust), emotional (anger, frustration) and behavioral (contempt, criticism) attitudes. At this point, the elements that make up the attitude are also the source of organizational cynicism. In this respect, attitude theory helps to establish a theoretical framework for the understanding of organizational cynicism and is therefore important (James, 2005: 12).

Organizational cynicism manifests when an employee develops negative cognitive beliefs, negative emotions, and cynical or detached behaviors toward the organization. This is directly related to Attitude Theory (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Dean et al., 1989).

- **Cognitive dimension:** The employee believes that the organization is unethical, unfair, or untrustworthy.
- **Affective dimension:** The employee experiences feelings of frustration, anger, or contempt.
- **Behavioral dimension:** The employee makes cynical remarks and distances themselves from work or the organization.

Thus, cynicism can be seen as a form of employees' negative attitudes toward the organization and can be explained through Attitude Theory.

d. Social Exchange Theory

Researchers see social change as a theory-based phenomenon for understanding the relationship between individuals and organizations. Social Exchange Theory was developed by Blau (1964) and is based on the necessity of human relations for survival and the principle that individuals are constantly in mutual communication with each other to meet their needs (Mimaroğlu, 2008: 33). There are obligations between the employee and the organization that are not clearly expressed, and the parties are mutually expectant. Social exchange theory argues that parties must trust each other in order to fulfill expectations (Coyle-Shapiro and Conway, 2005: 777). Blau (1964) stated that failure of the parties to fulfill their responsibilities in the process of social exchange will disrupt the balance of the relationship and cause negative consequences for both parties. He also emphasized that the responsibilities of the parties should be equal, and if this is the case, the other party will feel that the contract has been broken. Gouldner (1960) states that the employee who feels that he is treated well feels that he should also treat the organization well and avoids harming the organization. As the degree of obligations between the employee and the organization increases, social exchange relations increase and continue their relations in line with mutual benefit as both parties benefit from this situation (Mimaroğlu, 2008: 34-36). Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly argued that organizational cynicism arises as a result of the failure to fulfill the basic expectations and promises of individuals or the violation of social exchange (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003: 627). For this reason, social exchange theory has been used to explain employee engagement and citizenship behaviors (James, 2005: 1).

Organizational cynicism manifests when employees develop distrust, disappointment, and negative attitudes toward the organization. Social Exchange Theory explains this process as follows:

When employees do not receive the rewards they expect from the organization (such as promotion, fairness, support, or pay), the relationship becomes unbalanced. This imbalance leads employees to develop negative feelings toward the organization and adopt cynical attitudes. For example, when management acts unfairly or fails to recognize performance, employees perceive the organization as self-interested, and cynicism increases.

e. Affective Events Theory

According to the Affective Events Theory, organizational events are the results of emotional reactions. Affective Events Theory, developed by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996), suggests that employees' daily emotional experiences in the workplace influence their emotional reactions, attitudes, and behaviors. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) considered the theory of emotional events in terms of emotion, mood, and job satisfaction in the workplace. According to the theory, the emotional experiences that individuals have gained in the past have a great impact on current and future organizational behavior. These effects manifest as negative or positive emotions. Negative emotions such as anger, jealousy, guilt, and disgust are some of the attitudes that emerge as a result of these experiences and can cause individuals to exhibit cynical attitudes towards the organization (Basch and Fisher, 1998: 3).

According to Affective Events Theory (AET), organizational cynicism is the result of employees' recurring negative emotional experiences in the workplace. This process operates as follows:

Negative organizational events (such as unfair decisions, lack of support, or unjust promotions) evoke negative emotions in employees (such as anger, disappointment, and distrust). These emotions are short-term affective reactions; however, if such events persist, employees generalize these feelings toward the organization and develop enduring cynical attitudes.Thus, emotional reactions transform into cognitive beliefs and behavioral cynicism directed toward the organization.

f. Social Motivation Theory

Social Motivation Theory was developed by Weiner in 1985. Social Motivation Theory suggests that individuals are motivated not only by material rewards but also by psychological needs such as social acceptance, belonging, respect, and recognition (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). According to this theory, people demonstrate higher levels of motivation and commitment when they find meaning and support in their social relationships.
However, when social needs-such as appreciation, fairness, support, and trust-are not fulfilled, employees experience a loss of motivation and develop negative attitudes.

Organizational cynicism is often associated with the failure to meet employees' social needs within the organization. When employees feel undervalued, believe that their contributions are not appreciated, or perceive a lack of organizational support, their social motivation decreases. This leads to emotional detachment, distrust, and the development of negative beliefs. Over time, these feelings manifest as organizational cynicism, in which the employee adopts a cold, sarcastic, and critical attitude toward the organization.

In order to explain the causes of organizational cynicism, it focuses on how individuals make sense of their environment. Accordingly, it produces experiments about the reasons why individuals are cynical and provides a theoretical basis to the literature by testing these experiments. Rather than trying to identify the events that cause organizational cynicism, such a theory allows for the examination of how events are interpreted by the employee and the role of these interpretations in organizational cynicism (Eaton, 2000: 12). According to Weiner's Social Motivation Theory, first of all, the causes of the outcome of the event are investigated and then the event is evaluated in certain causal dimensions. In line with this assessment, a judgment is made about the responsibilities of the incident and expectations are developed for similar events in the future. Responsibility decisions and expectations lead to special emotions that affect our subsequent behavior. According to

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

Weiner, individuals make ordinary references to decide how to behave and to predict future events. If individuals can predict events, they can control them, so it is very important to use these attributions to achieve ordinary purpose (Eaton, 2000: 13).

3. CONCLUSION

Organizational cynicism is a multifaceted phenomenon that manifests in various forms, including personality cynicism, employee cynicism, occupational cynicism, organizational change cynicism, and social/institutional cynicism. Each type has distinct characteristics, causes, and consequences, yet they share the common feature of generating negative attitudes, emotions, and behaviors toward the organization.

The theoretical frameworks explored in this study-expectancy theory, attribution theory, attitude theory, social exchange theory, affective events theory, and social motivation theory-provide comprehensive insights into the underlying mechanisms of organizational cynicism. These theories highlight how unmet expectations, perceived injustices, negative emotional experiences, and unfulfilled social needs contribute to employees' cynical attitudes. For instance, expectancy theory emphasizes the role of unmet performance-reward expectations, while social motivation theory underscores the impact of insufficient recognition, belonging, and support. Affective events theory explains how recurring negative workplace experiences shape enduring cynical attitudes, and social exchange theory illustrates the importance of balanced and trustworthy relationships between employees and the organization.

Overall, understanding organizational cynicism through these theoretical lenses allows both researchers and practitioners to identify its root causes, anticipate its negative consequences, and design interventions aimed at reducing cynicism. By addressing structural, managerial, and relational deficiencies, organizations can enhance trust, engagement, and employee well-being, thereby mitigating the emergence and impact of cynicism in the workplace.

REFERENCES

Acar, D. ve Tetik, N. (2018). *Genel muhasebe* (16. Baskı). Detay Yayıncılık.

Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences. Genetic, Social and *General Psycology Monographs*, *126*(39), 269-292.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice Hall.

Agina, M. F., Khairy, H. A., Abdel Fatah, M. A., Manaa, Y. H., Abdallah, R. M., Aliane, N., Afaneh, J., & Al-Romeedy, B. S. (2023). Distributive Injustice and Work Disengagement in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry: Mediating Roles of the Workplace Negative Gossip and Organizational Cynicism. *Sustainability*, *15*(20), 15011.

Ahmed, M. A. O., Zhang, J., Fouad, A. S., Mousa, K., & Nour, H. M. (2025). *The Dark Side of Leadership: How Toxic Leadership Fuels Counterproductive Work Behaviors Through Organizational Cynicism and Injustice*. *Sustainability*, *17*(1), 105.

Ahtisham, M. M., Anwar ul Haq, M., Ahmed, M. A., & Khalid, S. (2023). Effect of despotic leadership on organizational cynicism: role of moral disengagement and organizational identification. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *24*(1), 194-205.

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

Aljawarneh, N.M.S., & Atan, T. (2018). Linking Tolerance to Workplace Incivility, Service Innovative, Knowledge Hiding, and Job Search Behavior: The Mediating Role of Employee Cynicism. *Negotation and Conflict Management Research, 11*, 298-320.

Alsubaie, F. A., & Nasaani, A. (2021). Why so cynical? The effect of job burnout as a mediator on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational cynicism. *European Journal of Business and Management, 13*, 1-12.

Aly, NAEFM., Ghanem, M., & El-Shanawany, S. (2016). Organizational cynicism and its consequences on nurses and quality of care in critical care and toxicology units. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(8), 85-96.

Andersson, L. M., & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*(5), 449-469.

Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a Contract violation framework. *Human Relations, 49*(11), 1395-1418.

Arabacı, B. (2010). The effects of depersonalization and organisational cynicism levels on the job satisfaction of educational inspectors. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(13), 2802-2811.

Arslan, A. & Şimşek, G. (2018). Örgütsel Sinizm ve İş Tatmini Arasındaki İlişkiler: Aydın Turist Rehberleri Odası'na Kayıtlı Olan Profesyonel Turist Rehberleri Örneği. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research* (*13*), 115-134.

Arslan, M. (2018). Organizational cynicism and employee performance: Moderating role of employee engagement, *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 9(1).

Atalay, C., & Ozler, D. (2011). A research to determine the relationship between organisational cynicism and burnout levels of employees in health sector. *Business and Management Review, 1*(4), 26-38.

Bang, H., & Reio Jr, T. G. (2017). Examining the role of cynicism in the relationships between burnout and employee behavior. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones, 33*(3), 217-227.

Basch, J. & Fisher, C. D. (1998). *Affective Events-Emotions Matrix: A Classification of Work Events and Associated Emotions*, Presented at the First Conference on Emotions in Oganizational Life San Diego, California August, 1-22.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). *The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497-529.

Bedeian, A. G. (2007). Even if the tower is "ivory," it isn't "white:" Understanding the consequences of faculty cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6*(1), 9-32.

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

Byrne, Z. S. & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Perceived organizational support and performance: Relationships across levels of organizational cynicism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(1), 54-72.

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches

Cartwright, S. & Holmes, N. (2006). The Meaning of work: The challenge of Regaining Employee Engagement and Reducing Cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, *16*(2), 199-208.

Cevizci, A. (2008). *Etiğe Giriş*. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık.

Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I. S., Banks, G. C., & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *83*(2), 181-197.

Cort, K. T., Griffith, D. A. & White, D. S. (2007). An attribution theory approach for understanding the internationalization of Professional service firms.*International Marketing Review*, *2*(1), 9-25.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M. & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange Relationships: Examining Psychological Contracts and Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(4), 774-781.

Daş, E., & Naldöken, Ü. (2025). Örgütsel Değişim Sinizmi: Bibliyometrik Analiz. Sivas *Interdisipliner Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *8*(1), 1-10.

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., Dharwadkar (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, *23*(2), 341-352.

Delken, M. (2004). *Organizational cynicism: A study among call centers*. Unpublished master thesis, University of Maastricht.

Divya, B., & Seranmadevi, R. (2022). Impact of cynicism behaviour on employee engagement. *Studies of Applied Economics*, *40*(S1).

Dobbs, J. M., & Do, J. J. (2019). The impact of perceived toxic leadership on cynicism in officer candidates. *Armed Forces & Society*, *45*(1), 3-26.

Eaton, J. A. (2000). *A Social Motivation Approach to Organizational Cynicism (Dissertation of Master of Arts),* Faculty of Graduate Studies, York University, Toronto.

Erarslan, S., Kaya, Ç. & Altındağ, E. (2018). Effect of organizational cynicism and job satisfaction on organizational commitment: An empirical study on banking sector. *Süleyman Demirel University Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, *23* (Geybulla Ramazanoğlu Special Issue), 905-922.

Gökberk, M. (2000). *Felsefe tarihi*. Remzi Kitabevi.

Hançerlioğlu, O. (1999). *Düşünce tarihi*. Remzi Kitabevi.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Ike, O. O., Chuke, N. N., & Nnamchi, O. C. (2024). Organizational cynicism and turnover intention among nurses: Do perceived organizational support moderates the relationship. *SAGE Open Nursing.*

İnceoğlu, M. (2010). *Tutum, Algı, İletişim*, 5th Edition, Istanbul, Beykent University Press, No. 69.

James, M. S. L. (2005). *Antecedents and Consequences Of Cynıcısm In Organızatıons: An Examınatıon Of The Potentıal Posıtıve and Negatıve Effects On School Systems* (Dissertation Of Doctor Of Philosophy), The Florida State University, Florida.

Johnson, J. L. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 24, 627-647.

Kähkönen, T., Blomqvist, K., Gillespie, N., & Vanhala, M. (2021). *Employee trust repair: A systematic review of 20 years of empirical research and future research directions*. *Journal of Business Research,* 130, 98-109.

Kalağan, G. (2009). *Araştırma Görevlilerinin Örgütsel Destek Algıları ile Örgütsel Sinizm Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki*. Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Supervision Program, Master's Thesis. Antalya.

Kanter, D. L. & Mirvis, P. H. (1989). *The cynical Americans: Living and working in an age of discontent and disillusion.* Jossey-Bass.

Khan, M. (2014). Organisational cynicism and employee turnover intention: Evidence from banking sector in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 8*(1), 30-41.

Kökalan, Ö. (2019). The effect of organizational cynicism on job satisfaction: Testing the mediational role of perceived organizational spirituality. *Management Research Review*, *42*(5), 625-640.

Kudo, F. T., Sakuda, K. H., & Tsuru, G. K. (2016). Mediating organizational cynicism: Exploring the role of hope theory on job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Management*, *4*(12), 678-684.

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Expectancy Theory of Motivation: Motivating by Altering Expectations. *International Journal of Managment, Business and Administration* 15(1).

Malkoç, N. (2018). *Özel spor işletmeleri işgörenlerinin örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. Ankara University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Sports Sciences, Ph.D. Thesis. Ankara.

Megeirhi , H. A., Ribeiro, M. A., Woosnam, K. M. (2020). Job search behavior explained through perceived tolerance for workplace incivility, cynicism and income level: A moderated mediation model, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 88-97.

Mimaroğlu, H. (2008). *Psikolojik Sözleşmenin Personelin Tutum ve Davranışlarına Etkileri: Tıbbi Satış Temsilcileri Üzerinde Bir Araştırma.* Ph.D. Thesis, Çukurova University, Adana.

Mirvis, P.H., & Kanter, D.L. (1991). Beyond Demography: A Psychographic Profile of The Workforce, *Human Resource Management*, *30*(1), 45.

Nafei, W. A. & Kaifi, B. A. (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), 131-147.

Naus, A. J. (2007). *Organizational Cynicism on the Nature, Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Cynicsm Toward the Employing Organization*, Doctorial Dissertation, Mastricht: Maastricht University.

Naus, F., Van Iterson, A. & Roe, R. (2007). Organizational cynicism: Extending the Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect Model of employees' responses to adverse conditions in the workplace. *Human Relations, 60*(5), 683-718.

Nazir, T., Ahmad, U. N. B. U., Nawab, S. & Shah, S. F. H. (2016). Mediating role of organizational cynicism in relationship between role stressors and turnover intention: evidence from healthcare sector of Pakistan. *International review of management and marketing*, *6*(2), 199-204.

O'Hair, D., & Cody, M.J. (1987). Machiavelliai Beliefs and Social Influence, *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 51, 279-303.

Öztürk, M., Eryeşil, K., & Bedük, A. (2016). The effect of organizational justice on organizational cynicism and turnover intention: a research on the banking sector. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *6*(12), 543-551.

Panchali, J., & Seneviratne, S. M. (2019). Organizational cynicism and employee performance: evidence from a Sri Lankan audit sector, *Annals of Management and Organization Research*, 1(2), 155-169.

Polat, M., Meydan, C.H., Tokmak, İ. (2010). *Personel güçlendirme-örgütsel sinizm ilişkisinde örgütsel özdeşleşmenin aracılık etkisi.* Proceedings of the 9th National Business Congress, 6-7 May 2010, in Zonguldak: Kara Elmas University. 542-547.

Rauf, A., Mahmood, H., Naveed, R. T., & Yee Yen, Y. (2024). Modeling cynicism and organizational design on job performance: Mediation and moderation mechanism. *Heliyon, 10*, e32069.

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

Risgiyanti, Rini Hidayah, and Muhammad Fithrayudi T. (2020). The Role Of Workplace Spirituality In Reducing The Negative Impact Of Organizational Cynicism on Job Performance. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 18(4), 692-703.

Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2012). Organizational behavior /15th ed. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data: 224.

Rousseau, D. M (1989). Psychological and Implied Contracts in Organisations, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *2*(2), 121-139.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). *Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Scott, K. A., & Zweig, D. (2016). *Understanding and mitigating cynicism in the workplace*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *31*(2), 552-569.

Sguera, F., Patient, D., Diehl, MR., Boboce, R. (2021). Thank you for the bad news: Reducing cynicism in highly identified employees during adverse organizational change, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *95*(1), 90-130.

Shahzad, A., & Mahmood, Z. (2012). The mediating-moderating model of organizational cynicism and workplace deviant behavior: Evidence from banking sector in Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, *12*(5), 580-588.

Simha, A., F. Elloy, D., & Huang, H. C. (2014). The moderated relationship between job burnout and organizational cynicism. *Management decision*, *52*(3), 482-504.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333-339. Erişim adresi: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/BY-NC-ND/4.0/

Thompson, R. C., Joseph, K. M., Bailey, L.L., Worley, J. A., & Williams, C. A. (2000). Organizational Change: An Assessment of Trust and Cynicism. Working paper: *National Technical Information Service*, 1-9.

Tokgöz, N., Yılmaz, H. (2008). Örgütsel sinizm: Eskişehir ve Alanya'daki otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama, *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(2), 283-305.

Turan, Ş. (2011). *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Örgütsel Değişimi Etkileyen Bir Unsur Olarak Örgütsel Sinizm ve Karaman İli Kamu Kurumlarında Bir Çalışma.* Master's Thesis, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman.

Turner, J. H. & Valentine, S. R. (2001). Cynicism as a Fundamental Dimension of Moral Decision-Making: A Scale Development. *Journal of Business Ethics, 34*(2),123-136.

Wagner, S. H. (2021). Attitude theory and job attitudes: On the value of intersections between basic and applied psychology. In V. I. Sessa & N. A. Bowling (Eds.), *Essentials of job attitudes and other workplace psychological constructs* (pp. 13-42).

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. & Austin, J. (1994). Organizational Cynicism: An Initial Study. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 269-273.

Wanous, J.P, Reichers, A.E, & Austin, J. T. (2000). Cynicism About Organizational Change: Measurement, Antecedent and Correlates. *Group and Organizational Management*, *25*(2), 132-153.

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, *26*(2), xiii-xxiii. Retrieved from http://www.misq.org/misreview/announce.html

Weiner, B. (1985). *An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion.* New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Weiss, H. M. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1-74.

Yang, C., Chen, Y., Roy, X. Z., & Mattila, A. S. (2020). Unfolding deconstructive effects of negative shocks on psychological contract violation, organizational cynicism, and turnover intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *89*, 102591.

Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Researches