

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT PERCEPTIONS AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM ATTITUDES

Necmi GÖKYER

*Assoc. Prof. Dr., Firat University, ngokyer@firat.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-8107-2388*

İsmail TÜRKOĞLU

*Assoc. Prof. Dr., Firat University, isturkoglu@firat.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-7810-5329*

Received: 27.08.2018

Accepted: 25.12.2018

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the relationship between secondary school teachers' organizational support perceptions and their organizational cynicism attitudes. The population of this relational survey included 1,602 teachers who were working at the 55 secondary schools located in central Elazig during the 2016-2017 school year. A total of 389 teachers working at 13 randomly selected schools from among these were distributed the data collection tool. However, tools from only 319 teachers were ultimately analyzed. The results showed that secondary school teachers agreed with the organizational support and justice and organizational ownership sub dimensions and the entire scale, while they partially agreed with the personal and professional development sub dimension. The organizational support perceptions of teachers who did not consider leaving their schools were higher than those who were considering or partly considering leaving. Teachers' organizational cynicism levels manifested at the highest level in the behavioral domain, followed by the cognitive and affective domains.

Keywords: Secondary school, organizational support perception, organizational cynicism.

INTRODUCTION

The behaviors of the employees are ruled by the organizational motivators. Specially, the organization accepting its employees as a value, appreciating their happiness and making them feel this, affects occupational and emotional relations within the organization in a very positive way (Eisenberger vd., 1986: 501). Organizational support based on the social change theory (Loi vd, 2006: 109) and organizational support as a subject of psychological contracts (Eisenberger vd., 1986: 503; Shore and Shore, 1995: 151) is significant for occupations which are particularly difficulty to meet demands from work and from outside of the workplace (Eisenberger vd., 1990: 56). Perceived organizational support is defined by Eisenberger and his colleagues (1986: 500) as an emotional attachment to the employee, involvement and perceptions about their well-being and voluntary involvement in activities that affect their employees. The organizational support is a sort of concept based on perception and it also means that the individual feels and thinks how much support the organization has given to him (Yoshimura, 2003: 10).

Perceived organizational support reflects the quality of the relationship between the employee and the organization. The quality of this relationship is related to the individual perceiving the organization, as an organization which puts value to the contributions of the employees and considers the well-being of the employees. (Yürür, 2005: 96). Perceived organizational support is significant because it specifies the universal beliefs that include the commitment of workplaces to their organizations, the valuation of the contributions of the employees, and their concern for their peacefulness (Zagenczyk, 2001: 13). The organizational support perceived by the employees causes them to feel safe and feel their strength behind them (Özdevecioğlu, 2003b: 116). The organizational support means “trusting the institution to show dedication to its employees”. (Schaffer and Harrison, 2001: 102).

Cynicism as a form of thought and life has emerged in the ancient Greece (Brandes, 1997: 7). Its origins come from the “cynical” word of ancient Greek philosophical thought that emerged in 500 BC. (Mantere and Martinsuo, 2001: 4; Metzger, 2004:2 4). When we examine the literature on organizational cynics, it was seen that various definitions and theoretical foundations were created. According to Dean et al. (1998: 345), the expectancy theory, the attribution theory, the attitude theory, the social change theory, the emotional incidents theory as well as the concept of organizational cynicism are the lack of integrity and honesty, the negative attitude of the individual to the organization. The concept of organizational cynicism also includes beliefs and emotions that tend to have “negative feelings” related to the organization, “degrading” and “critical” behaviors related to the organization. The organizational cynicism is described as harsh critics, cynical (negative) beliefs and negative emotions that are made openly or discreetly about the organization. It is observed that the concept of organizational cynicism is a tentative phenomenon in the understanding of Dean and others (1998: 345).

The concept of the organizational cynicism is defined as “the attitudes of an individual to the employee organization which are shaped by negative beliefs, emotions and behaviors, as well as an answer to the past social and personal experiences which are open to change by the environmental factors” according to James

(2005:7). It is observed that the organizational cynicism is examined under two dimensions. First one is the negative attitudes due to personal mistakes and second one is the idea that the organization will improve (Brandes, 1997: 18). What is essential in the organizational cynicism is sincerity, truthfulness, honesty and justice. Leaders in institutions are deprived of these principles in order to bring their individual interests to the forefront. As a result, there are reasons to be based on motives and deceptions hidden in the institution (Abraham, 2000:269). Andersson, 1996: 1404; Mirvis and Kanter 1991: 61 stated that institutions may have cynical features when institutional cynicism can be defined. The characteristics of these institutional which are cynical are listed as following: based on games and abuse, one-sided communication with employees, nervous behaviors, institutions that support executives who act hypocritically to their employees and embody values selfishly.

The reasoning of the cynicism is based on personality and organizational features (Kalağan, 2009). As personality traits, the negative features such as inadequacy or laziness of the workshops are emphasized. It is expected a change in institutions to prevent negative personality traits that the employees will fulfill their responsibilities (Brandes, 1997: 17-18). The organizational cynicism in terms of institutional features is a part of institutions and a sort of power affecting institutions, individuals and business life (James, 2005: 25). There are several factors of the organizational cynicism such as increased unfair behavior in institutions, decreased organizational support, violations of psychological contracts, increased working hours, and ineffectiveness of leaders in institutions (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006: 201; Eaton, 2000:8; James, 2005:37).

Problem Statement and Sub-Problems (Hypotheses)

The purpose of this research study is to try to determine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational support and attitudes of organizational cynics. In the research, the following questions were answered.

1. What is the level of the teachers' perception of the organizational support?
2. Does the teachers' perceptions of the organizational support lead to a significant difference between their sub-dimensions?
3. Do the teachers' perception of the organizational support with respect to organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational commitment, change according to gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, place of work and thinking about leaving the institution?
4. What is the level of the teachers' attitudes towards the organizational cynicism?
5. Do the attitudes of teachers to institutional cynics lead to a significant difference in their sub-dimensions?
6. Do the teachers' perception of the organizational support with respect to cognitive, affective and behavioral sub-dimensions, change according to gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, place of work and thinking about leaving the institution?
7. Are the teachers' perceptions of the organizational support a predictor of organizational cynicism attitudes?

METHOD

Method of the Research

In this study, the relational scanning type research among the scanning type research methods were recruited. Scanning type of researches aim to describe past or present situations as they exist (Karasar, 2009: 77). As for the relational scanning researches, they aim to determine the presence or degree of interchange between two or more variables (Karasar, 2009: 81).

Population-Sampling

The universe of the study constitutes a total of 1602 teachers working in 55 secondary schools located in Elazığ province center in the academic year of 2016-2017. The data collection tool was distributed to 389 teachers who worked in 13 schools determined by random sampling method. Only, the data collection tool of 319 teachers was taken into consideration. The graphs computed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was recruited in order to determine the size of the sample (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970: 607). When the demographic characteristics of the teachers participating in the study are examined, the following data is observed: 55.8% of the teachers are female (178 persons) and 44.2% (141 people) are male. 73,0% is married (233 people) and 27,0% (86 people) is single. 32,6% (104 people) are between 21-30 years old, 43,6% (139 people) are between 31-40 years old and 23,8% (76 people) are between 41-50 years old. 13,8% (44 people) has 1-2 year seniority, 29,2% (93 people) has 3-7 year seniority, 35,7% (114 people) has 8-12 year seniority, 15% (48 people) has 13-17 year seniority and 6,3% (20 people) has 18-22 year seniority. 10,7% (34 people) of the teachers are candidate teachers, 79,0% (252 people) are teachers and 10,3% (33 people) are specialist teachers. 39,2% (125 people) are in science and 60,8% (194 people) are in social sciences. 80,6% of the teachers (257 people) work in the city center and 19,4% (62 people) work in the district center. 16,6% (53 people) of the teachers give yes answer, 23,2% (74 people) give the answer of 'partially' and 60,2% (192 people) gave no answer to the question of "Do you consider to leave the institution you work in?".

Data Collection Tools

Data collection tool is formed of three parts. In the first part there are 9 factual questions. In the second part, there is a perceived organizational support inventory (29 items) developed by Kalağan (2009) and adapted to the project to be implemented by the researcher. And finally, in the third part, there are 13 items developed by Brandes, Dharwadkar and Dean (1999) and the items of Organizational Cynicism Scale which are validity and reliability studies made by exploratory factor analysis by the researcher.

Reliability and Validity of Data

Data collection tool is classified as "I totally agree" (5), "I agree" (4), "Partially agree" (3), "I disagree" (2), "I never agree" (1). Factor analysis of perceived organizational support inventory was done. The Bartlett Test = 5499,747 and the validity coefficient is KMO = .946, $p = .000$. The fact that the value of KMO is greater than 0.90 indicates

that the sample size is perfect (Şencan, 2001). According to these results, it was determined that data are suitable for factor analysis. The first exploratory factor analysis for perceived organizational support inventory was derived from three item samples (5, 7 and 12). These are those that fall under 0.35 of the end-point factor loadings and are included in multiple factors, with a difference of .10 and less (Büyüköztürk, 2009: 125). After the second factor analysis, two items (11 and 29) in multiple factors with a difference of less than or equal to .10 were extracted from the scale. The scale of 29 items decreased to 24 items. Perceived organizational support inventory is three factored. The total variance explained by the three factors is 55%. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is ,921. Right after the factoring, the first factor of the scale consists of 17 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28) and the Cronbach Alpha reliability value of this dimension is .946. The load values of the materials in this dimension are between 0.524-0.795. The second dimension consists of three items (20, 21, 22) and the Cronbach Alpha reliability value of this dimension is .708. The load values of the materials in this size range from 0.525 to 0.842. The third factor consists of four factors (6, 23, 24, 25). The Cronbach Alpha reliability value for this dimension is .708. The load values of the items in this factor range from 0.452 to 0.814. The factors have been tried to be named by considering the contents of the materials. The first factor is named "Organizational support and justice", the second factor is "Personal and professional development", and the third factor is "Organizational ownership".

The organizational cynicism scale Bartlett Test = 2800,766 and the validity coefficient KMO = .921, $p = .000$. For items that do not measure the same structure for the organizational cynicism scale, those with a factor load value of over 0.40 are considered (Hair et.al, 1998:112). As a result of the analysis, it is observed that the dimensioning in this study is similar to the dimensioning in the original dimension. The organizational cynicism scale has three factors. The total variance explained by the three factors is 72,433%. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale is ,922. Right after factor rotation, the first dimension of the scale consists of 5 items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and the Cronbach Alpha reliability value of this dimension is .890. The load values of the materials in this dimension are between 0.752 and 0.781. The second dimension is 5 (6, 7, 8, 9, 10) items and this dimension has a Cronbach Alpha reliability value of .930. The load values of the items in this factor are between 0.653-0.855. The third factor consists of 3 items (11, 12, 13). The Cronbach Alpha reliability value for this dimension is .701. The load values of the items in this factor are between 0.572-0.869. The factors have been tried to be named by considering the contents of the materials. The first factor is called "cognitive", the second factor is "affective", and the third factor is called the "behavioral" dimension.

Analysis Techniques

The data were analyzed in the SPSS 21 program. The frequency and percentage values of the teachers' demographic characteristics (gender, marital status, age, occupational seniority, title, branch, work place, place of employment and situation of leaving the institution) are calculated. Basic statistical techniques were recruited to determine teachers' organizational support perceptions and organizational cynicism attitudes. T-Test was conducted for the variables of gender, marital status, area and workplace. Additionally, for the variables of age,

title, seniority, and intention to leave the institution that you are working with, one-dimension ANOVA was used to test whether there is a difference between the groups' averages. For the non-parametric tests, the Kruskal Wallis H test was recruited (Büyüköztürk, 2009:158). The Pearson Correlation Coefficient is also calculated to determine the level or amount and direction of the relationship between the variables. Simple regression analysis is also calculated to find the answer of the following question: is perceived organizational support a meaningful predictor of organizational cynicism?

FINDINGS (RESULTS)

This section presents the findings coming from teachers.

1. What is the level of secondary school teachers' perception for the organizational support in terms of sub dimensions and scale? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Analysis Results of Teachers' Perceptions of The Organizational Support

Sub-dimensions	\bar{x}	SS
1.Organizational support and justice	3,49	,80
2. Personal and occupational development	2,76	,92
3. Organizational ownership	3,74	,84
4. All	3,44	,69

As it is seen in Table 1, the perceptions of the organizational support and justice in secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,49$) and organizational ownership ($\bar{x}=3,74$) are in "I agree" as well as the perceptions of the subscale of personal and professional development ($\bar{x}=2,76$) are in "I partially agree" to the whole of the scale ($\bar{x}=3,44$).

2. Is there any meaningful relationship between the subscales of teachers' perceptions of organizational support? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given in Table 2.

Table 2. The Relationship between Teacher' Organizational Support Perceptions According to Sub-Dimensions

		1.	2.	3.
1.Organizational Support and Justice	r	1	,568**	,270**
	p		,000	,000
2. Personal and Occupational Development	r	,568**	1	-,047
	p	,000		,401
3. Organizational Ownership	r	,270**	-,047	1
	p	,000	,401	

**Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (2 sided).

As it is seen above, there is a moderate and positive correlation between organizational support and justice and personal and occupational development with $r = 0.568$, $p < 0.01$. Therefore, it can be stated that as organizational support and justice increase, personal and occupational development increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.33$) is taken into account, 33% of the total variance in personal and professional development comes from organizational support and justice. There is a weak and positive correlation between organizational support and justice and organizational ownership with $r = 0.270$, $p < 0.01$. Therefore, it can be stated that as organizational support and justice increase, organizational ownership increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.07$) is taken into consideration, 7% of the total variance in organizational ownership comes from organizational support and justice.

3. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational support: Organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational ownership sub-dimensions and the whole scale: is there any differentiation according to the variables like gender, marital status, branch, working place? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given in Table 3.

Table 3. t-Test Results on Teachers' Organizational Support Perceptions by Some Variables

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	N	\bar{x}	SS	Levene		t	p																																																																																																																								
					F	p																																																																																																																										
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Woman	178	3,45	,82	,661	,417	-1,050	,295																																																																																																																								
	Man	141	3,54	,78					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Woman	178	2,81	,95	,816	,367	,980	,328	Man	141	2,71	,88	3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	178	3,67	,86	,535	,465	-1,702	,090	Man	141	3,83	,80	4. All	Woman	178	3,41	,70	,028	,868	-1,044	,297	Man	141	3,49	,68	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	233	3,44	,80	,002	,960	-1,820	,071	Single	86	3,63	,80	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279	Single	86	2,86	,92	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94	Sciences	125	3,78
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Woman	178	2,81	,95	,816	,367	,980	,328																																																																																																																								
	Man	141	2,71	,88					3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	178	3,67	,86	,535	,465	-1,702	,090	Man	141	3,83	,80	4. All	Woman	178	3,41	,70	,028	,868	-1,044	,297	Man	141	3,49	,68	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	233	3,44	,80	,002	,960	-1,820	,071	Single	86	3,63	,80	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279	Single	86	2,86	,92	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503			
3. Organizational Ownership	Woman	178	3,67	,86	,535	,465	-1,702	,090																																																																																																																								
	Man	141	3,83	,80					4. All	Woman	178	3,41	,70	,028	,868	-1,044	,297	Man	141	3,49	,68	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	233	3,44	,80	,002	,960	-1,820	,071	Single	86	3,63	,80	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279	Single	86	2,86	,92	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																
4. All	Woman	178	3,41	,70	,028	,868	-1,044	,297																																																																																																																								
	Man	141	3,49	,68					1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	233	3,44	,80	,002	,960	-1,820	,071	Single	86	3,63	,80	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279	Single	86	2,86	,92	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																													
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Married	233	3,44	,80	,002	,960	-1,820	,071																																																																																																																								
	Single	86	3,63	,80					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279	Single	86	2,86	,92	3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																										
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Married	233	2,73	,92	,018	,894	-1,087	,279																																																																																																																								
	Single	86	2,86	,92					3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503	Single	86	3,79	,89	4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																																							
3. Organizational Ownership	Married	233	3,72	,82	,809	,369	-,671	,503																																																																																																																								
	Single	86	3,79	,89					4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077	Single	86	3,56	,72	1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																																																				
4. All	Married	233	3,40	,67	,733	,393	-1,783	,077																																																																																																																								
	Single	86	3,56	,72					1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82	2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																																																																	
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Sciences	125	3,42	,77	,745	,389	-1,310	,191																																																																																																																								
	Social Sciences	194	3,54	,82					2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94		Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																																																																														
2. Personal and Occupational Development	Sciences	125	2,79	,89	,627	,429	,417	,677																																																																																																																								
	Social Sciences	194	2,75	,94																																																																																																																												
	Sciences	125	3,78	,86					,005	,945	,670	,503																																																																																																																				

3.	Organizational Ownership	Social Sciences	194	3,71	,83				
		Sciences	125	3,40	,67				
4.	All	Social Sciences	194	3,47	,70	,697	,405	-,869	,385
1.	Organizational Support and Justice	City Center	257	3,50	,81	1,251	,264	,518	,605
		District Center	62	3,45	,75				
2.	Personal and Occupational Development	City Center	257	2,80	,94	1,099	,295	1,386	,169
		District Center	62	2,63	,82				
3.	Organizational Ownership	City Center	257	3,72	,85	,611	,435	-,644	,521
		District Center	62	3,80	,81				
4.	All	City Center	257	3,45	,69	,038	,846	,503	,616
		District Center	62	3,40	,66				

As it is seen in Table 3, there is no significant difference between organizational support perceptions of teachers according to sub-dimensions and scale variables. In this case, none of the variables have any effect on teachers' perceptions of organizational support.

4. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational support: organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational ownership sub-dimensions: is there any differentiation according to the variables like age, occupational seniority, title? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 4. ANOVA on the Variables of Teachers' Age, Title and Thinking about Leaving the Institution

Sub-dimensions		N	\bar{X}	SS	F	P	Differentiation	
Do you consider to leave the institution you work for?								
1.	Organizational support and justice	Yes	53	3,26	,88	7,013	,001	3-1,2
		Partially	74	3,31	,71			
		No	192	3,63	,79			
2.	Personal and occupational development	Yes	53	2,50	1,00	4,339	,014	1-3
		Partially	74	2,64	,78			
		No	192	2,88	,93			
3.	Organizational ownership	Yes	53	3,38	,98	7,192	,001	1-3
		Partially	74	3,67	,76			
		No	192	3,86	,80			

According to Table 4, perceptions of teachers' organizational support do not show any significant difference according to age and title variables in all sub-dimensions. In all sub-dimensions, teachers' perceptions of

organizational support differ significantly in terms of the change in thinking about leaving work as the following: $F(2, 316) = 7,013$, respectively; 4,339; 7,192, $p < .05$. According to Scheffe test results to find out the meaningful differences among the groups, the scores of the teachers in the No answer group (= 3, 63) in the organizational support and justice sub-dimension were higher than the scores of the teachers in the Yes answer group (= 3, 26) and partially group (= 3, 31) seems to be high. As for the personal and professional development sub-dimension, it is seen that the scores of the teachers in the group of Yes answer (= 2, 50) are lower than the scores of the teachers of the No answer group (= 2, 88). In the organizational ownership sub-dimension, it is seen that the scores of the teachers in the Yes answer group (= 3.38) are lower than the scores of the teachers in the No answer group (= 3.86). As there is no significant difference according to age and title variables, no tabulation is provided.

5. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational support: Organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational ownership sub-dimensions: is there any differentiation according to the variable of professional seniority? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis Results on Teachers Perceptions of Organizational Support According to the Professional

Sub-dimension	Seniority	n	Seniority Variable		χ^2	p	MWU		Meaningful
			Rank Average	sd			U	p	
Organizational support and justice	1-2 year	44	79,09	4	10,080	,039	1602,000	,004*	1-2
	3-7 year	93	64,23						
	1-2 year	44	55,34				667,000	,002*	1-4
	13-17 year	48	38,40						
	8-12 year	114	85,72				2179,000	,049*	3-4
	13-17 year	48	69,90						

The Kruskal Wallis H test was used to compare the organizational support perceptions of the teachers according to the professional seniority variable and the Mann Whitney U test used in the binary comparisons as a result of the difference in organizational support and justice subscale. These test results show that teachers who have 1-2 years of seniority have perceptions of organizational support 3-7 and 13-17 years; It was found that the perceptions of organizational support of teachers with 8-12 years of seniority were higher than the teachers with 13-17 years of seniority and the differences were significant.

6. What is the level of the attitudes of teachers for the organizational cynicism? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 6. Analysis Results of Teachers' Attitudes towards Organizational Cynicism

Sub-dimensions	\bar{x}	SS
1.Cognitive	2,04	,87
2. Affective	1,68	,80
3. Behavioral	2,21	,89
4. All	1,94	,73

When the arithmetic mean of teachers' attitudes of organizational cynicism were examined, it was found that the highest level was behavioral ($\bar{x} = 2.21$) which is followed by cognitive ($\bar{x} = 2,04$) and affective dimension ($\bar{x} = 1,68$).

7. Is the relationship between teachers' cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes and the attitudes of organizational cynicism scale meaningful? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 7. The Relationship between Teachers' Cynicism Attitudes According to Lower Dimensions

		1.	2.	3.
1. Cognitive	r	1	,698**	,498**
	p		,000	,000
2. Affective	r	,698**	1	,580**
	p	,000		,000
3. Behavioral	r	,498**	,580**	1
	p	,000	,000	

**The correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (2 sided).

As it is seen in Table 7, there is a high and positive correlation between cognitive attitude and affective attitude with $r = 0,698$, $p < 0.01$. According to this, it can be said that cognitive cynicism increases the affective cynicism. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.49$) is taken into consideration, it can be said that 49% of the total variance in affective cynicism comes from cognitive cynicism. There is a moderate and positive correlation between cognitive cynicism and behavioral cynicism with $r = 498$, $p < 0.01$. Accordingly, it can be said that as cognitive cynicism increases, behavioral cynicism increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.25$) is taken into account, it can be said that 25% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism comes from cognitive cynicism. There is a moderate and positive correlation between affective cynicism and behavioral cynicism $r = 580$, $p < 0.01$. According to this, it can be said that behavioral cynicism increases as affective cynicism increases. When the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.34$) is taken into account, it can be said that 34% of the total variance in behavioral cynicism comes from affective cynicism.

8. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational cynicism: cognitive, affective, and behavioral and all the rest of the sub-dimensions: is there any differentiation according to the variables of gender, marital status, branch, working place? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 8. T-Test Results on Teachers' Perceptions of Organizational Support

Sub-Dimensions	Variables	N	\bar{x}	SS	Levene		t	p																																																																																																																																																																																														
					F	p																																																																																																																																																																																																
1.Cognitive	Woman	178	2,08	,88	,002	,963	,791	,429																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Man	141	2,00	,86					2. Affective	Woman	178	1,75	,86	3,569	,060	1,641	,102	Man	141	1,60	,72	3. Behavioral	Woman	178	2,25	,97	6,096	,014	,941	,347	Man	141	2,15	,78	4. All	Woman	178	1,99	,78	2,585	,109	1,321	,188	Man	141	1,88	,66	1. Cognitive	Married	233	2,05	,86	,302	,583	,252	,802	Single	86	2,02	,90	2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867	Single	86	1,70	,84	3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122
2. Affective	Woman	178	1,75	,86	3,569	,060	1,641	,102																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Man	141	1,60	,72					3. Behavioral	Woman	178	2,25	,97	6,096	,014	,941	,347	Man	141	2,15	,78	4. All	Woman	178	1,99	,78	2,585	,109	1,321	,188	Man	141	1,88	,66	1. Cognitive	Married	233	2,05	,86	,302	,583	,252	,802	Single	86	2,02	,90	2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867	Single	86	1,70	,84	3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76								
3. Behavioral	Woman	178	2,25	,97	6,096	,014	,941	,347																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Man	141	2,15	,78					4. All	Woman	178	1,99	,78	2,585	,109	1,321	,188	Man	141	1,88	,66	1. Cognitive	Married	233	2,05	,86	,302	,583	,252	,802	Single	86	2,02	,90	2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867	Single	86	1,70	,84	3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																					
4. All	Woman	178	1,99	,78	2,585	,109	1,321	,188																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Man	141	1,88	,66					1. Cognitive	Married	233	2,05	,86	,302	,583	,252	,802	Single	86	2,02	,90	2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867	Single	86	1,70	,84	3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																		
1. Cognitive	Married	233	2,05	,86	,302	,583	,252	,802																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Single	86	2,02	,90					2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867	Single	86	1,70	,84	3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																															
2. Affective	Married	233	1,68	,79	,867	,352	-,167	,867																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Single	86	1,70	,84					3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127	Single	86	2,34	,98	4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																												
3. Behavioral	Married	233	2,16	,85	2,031	,155	-1,534	,127																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Single	86	2,34	,98					4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692	Single	86	1,97	,78	1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																									
4. All	Married	233	1,93	,72	1,521	,218	-,398	,692																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Single	86	1,97	,78					1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83	2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																						
1. Cognitive	Sciences	125	2,04	,93	3,362	,068	-,051	,959																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	194	2,04	,83					2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77	3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																			
2. Affective	Sciences	125	1,71	,86	2,346	,127	,458	,647																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences.	194	1,67	,77					3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84	4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																
3. Behavioral	Sciences	125	2,19	,96	2,725	,100	-,197	,844																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	194	2,21	,84					4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67	1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																													
4. All	Sciences	125	1,95	,82	8,199	,004	,112	,911																																																																																																																																																																																														
	Social Sciences	194	1,94	,67					1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941	District Center	62	2,03	,90	2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																																										
1. Cognitive	City Center	257	2,04	,87	,737	,391	,075	,941																																																																																																																																																																																														
	District Center	62	2,03	,90					2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778	District Center	62	1,66	,79	3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																																																							
2. Affective	City Center	257	1,69	,81	,000	,992	,283	,778																																																																																																																																																																																														
	District Center	62	1,66	,79					3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340	District Center	62	2,31	,94	4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																																																																				
3. Behavioral	City Center	257	2,18	,88	1,054	,305	-,959	,340																																																																																																																																																																																														
	District Center	62	2,31	,94					4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																																																																																	
4. All	City Center	257	1,94	,73	,394	,531	-,122	,903																																																																																																																																																																																														
	District Center	62	1,95	,76																																																																																																																																																																																																		

Findings of the research are presented as follows: teachers' gender, marital status, branch and workplace variables have no effect on organizational cynicism attitudes. The gender, marital status, branch and workplace variables of the teachers do not have an effect on the attitudes of organizational cynicism.

9. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational cynicism: cognitive, affective, and behavioral sub-dimensions: is there any differentiation according to the variable of the following question: do you consider to leave the institution you work for? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 9. ANOVA on the Variables of Thinking about Leaving the Institution in Which Teachers Work

Sub-dimensional		N	\bar{X}	SS	F	P	Differentiation
Do you consider leaving the institution you work for?							
1. Cognitive	Yes	53	2,44	,95	12,231	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	74	2,23	,92			
	No	192	1,86	,78			
2. Affective	Yes	53	2,05	1,00	10,491	,000	3-1,2
	Partially	74	1,82	s,81			
	No	192	1,53	,70			
3. Behavioral	Yes	53	2,32	,87	2,023	,134	-
	Partially	74	2,33	,91			
	No	192	2,12	,88			

According to Table 9, in the sub-dimensions of cognitive cynicism and affective cynicism, there is a significant differentiation for the question of “do you intend to leave the institution from which you work?” relatively as follows, $F(2, 316) = 12,231$; A significant difference of $10,491 p < .05$. As to the Scheffe test results suggest, in the cognitive cynicism subscale, the scores of the teachers in the no group (= 1.86) are lower than the scores of the teachers of the yes (= 2.44) and partly (= 2.23) teachers. In the subscale of affective cognition, it is seen that the scores of the teachers in the no group (= 1,53) are lower than the scores of the teachers of the yes (= 2,05) and partially (= 1,82) teachers. Since there is no significant difference according to age and title variables, no tabulation is given.

10. In terms of perceptions of teachers’ organizational cynicism: cognitive, affective, and behavioral and all the rest of the sub-dimensions: is there any differentiation according to the variables of professional seniority? The findings of the analysis for the sub-purpose are given below.

Table 10. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results on Teachers’ Organizational Cynicism

Term of Duty	n	Mean Rank	sd	χ^2	p	MWU			
						U	p	Meaningful Differentiation	
Behavioral	3-7 year	93	78,02	4	9,563	,048	1579,000	,004*	2-4
	13-17 year	48	57,40						

The Kruskal Wallis H test was recruited to compare the organizational cynic attitudes of the teachers according to the occupational seniority variable and the Mann Whitney U test used in the binary comparisons when the

difference was observed in the behavioral cynicism subscale. These test results show that teachers with 3-7 years of seniority have higher organizational cynicism attitudes than teachers who have 13-17 years of seniority with organizational cynicism attitudes, and the differences are significant.

11. Are teachers' perceptions of organizational support a predictor of organizational cynicism attitudes? Table 11 presents the results of the correlation analysis of teachers' opinions.

Table 11. The Results of the Correlation Analysis of the Teachers' Opinions

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Organizational Support and Justice	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (two sided)						
	N	318					
2. Personal and Professional Development	Pearson Correlation	,568**	1				
	Sig. (two sided)	,000					
	N	318	319				
3. Organizational Ownership	Pearson Correlation	,270**	,046	1			
	Sig. (two sided)	,000	,412				
	N	318	319	319			
4. Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	-,397**	-,174**	-,608**	1		
	Sig. (two sided)	,000	,002	,000			
	N	318	319	319	319		
5. Affective	Pearson Correlation	-,396**	-,169**	-,509**	,698**	1	
	Sig. (two sided)	,000	,002	,000	,000		
	N	318	319	319	319	319	
6. Behavioral	Pearson Correlation	-,122*	-,108	-,359**	,498**	,580**	1
	Sig. (two sided)	,030	,054	,000	,000	,000	
	N	318	319	319	319	319	319

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01 (2 sided).

* Correlation is significant at the level of 0.05 (2 sided).

According to Table 11; moderate negative linear relationship between cognitive ($r = -0,397$; $P < 0.01$) and affective cynicism ($r = -0,396$; $P < 0.01$) and organizational support and justice; There is a weak negative linear relationship between behavioral cynicism ($r = -0,122$; $P < 0.01$) and organizational support and justice. There was a significant relationship between personal and professional development with cognitive ($r = -0,174$; $P < 0.01$), affective cynicism ($r = -0,169$; $P < 0.01$) and behavioral cynicism ($r = -0,122$; $P < 0.01$). There is a negative linear relationship between cognitive ($r = -0,608$, $P < 0.01$), affective ($r = -0,509$, $P < 0.01$) and behavioral cynicism ($r = -0,359$; $P < 0.01$).

12. Regression analysis of the predictions of cognitive cynicism variable according to organizational justice and organizational support, personal and professional development and organizational ownership variables are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Multiple Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Cynicism Cognitive Dimension

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	5,107	,214	-	23,885	,000	-	-
Organizational Support and Justice	-,266	,059	-,244	-4,494	,000	-,397	-,246
Personal and Professional Development	-,010	,050	-,011	-,210	,834	-,175	-,012
Organizational Ownership	-,562	,047	-,541	-12,071	,000	-,607	-,563
	R=0.653	R ² = .427	F(3, 315)= 77.988		p= .000		

When the binary and partial correlation between predictive variables and dependent (predictive, criterion) variables are examined in the Table 12, there is a moderately negative relationship between organizational support and justice and cognitive cynicism attitude ($r = -0.40$), but when the other variables are controlled, the correlation between the two variables is calculated as $r = -0.25$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.18$) between personal and professional development and cognitive cynicism, however when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.012$. There is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.60$) between organizational ownership and cognitive cynicism, however when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.56$. Together with the mentioned above variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' cognitive cynic attitude scores as $R=0.653$, $R^2=0.42$, $P<0.05$. Three variables mentioned above account for about 42% of the total variance in the prediction of cognitive cynicism. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the independent variables over cognitive cynicism is as follows; organizational ownership, organizational support and justice, and personal and professional development. When the results of the t-test on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the variables of organizational ownership and organizational support and justice have significant influence on cognitive cynicism.

According to the results of regression analysis, the regression equation for the prediction of cognitive dimension is presented below: COGNITIVE CINISM = 5,107-0,266, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE -0,010, PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT -0562 ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP

13. The following is a regression analysis of estimating the affective cynicism variable according to organizational justice and organizational support, personal and professional development, and organizational ownership variables.

Table 13. Multiple Regression Analysis on the Estimation of Affective Dimension of Organizational Cynicism

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	4,203	,213	-	19,771	,000		
Organizational Support and Justice	-,286	,059	-,285	-4,857	,000	-,396	-,264
Personal and Professional Development	,010	,049	,011	,201	,841	-,171	,011
Organizational Ownership	-,413	,046	-,432	-8,925	,000	-,509	-,450
R=0.575		R ² = .331	F(3, 315)= 51,695	p= .000			

When the binary and partial correlation between the predictive variables and the dependent variable are examined in Table 12, it is seen that there is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.40$) between organizational support and justice and the attitude of affective cynicism, however when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.26$. There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.17$) between personal and professional development and the attitude of affective cynicism, however, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = 0.011$. There is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.51$) between organizational ownership and the attitude of affective cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as $r = -0.45$. Above mentioned variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with the teachers' attitude scores of affective cynicism as follows: $R=0.575$, $R^2=0.33$, $P<0.05$. These variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' attitude cynic attitude scores. These variables give a moderate and meaningful relationship with teachers' attitudinal cynic attitude scores. Together, the three variables explain about 33% of the total variance in the predictive cynicism attitude. Together, these three variables account for about 33% of the total variance in the estimation of affective cynicism. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of significance of the predictive variables on affective cynicism is as following: organizational ownership, organizational support and justice, and personal and professional development. When the results of the t-test on the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it is observed that the variables of organizational ownership and organizational support and justice are significant predictors of affective cynicism.

The regression equation for predicting the cognitive dimension is given below: AFFECTIVE CYNICISM=4,203-0.286, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE +0.010 and PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT -0.413, ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP.

14. The regression analysis for estimating the behavioral cynicism variable according to organizational support and justice, personal and professional development, and organizational ownership variables are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Multiple Regression Analysis of Organizational Cynicism Behavioral Size Estimation

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	t	p	Binary r	Partially r
Fixed	3,786	,266		14,251	,000		
Organizational Support and Justice	,050	,074	,046	,685	,494	-,122	,039
Personal and Professional Development	-,117	,062	-,121	-1,890	,060	-,113	-,106
Organizational Ownership	-,383	,058	-,364	-6,630	,000	-,357	-,350
R=0.372		R ² = .138		F(3, 315)= 16,792		p= .000	

When Table 14 is examined, there is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.12$) between organizational support and justice and attitude of behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as ($r = -0.39$). There is a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.11$) between personal and professional development and attitude of behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were checked, the correlation between two variables was calculated as ($r = 0.10$). There is a moderate negative correlation ($r = -0.36$) between organizational ownership and behavioral cynicism, however, when the other variables were controlled, the correlation between the two variables was calculated as ($r = -0.35$). Above mentioned variables present a meaningful and correlative correlation with teachers' behavioral cynicism attitude scores in the middle level as $R=0.372$, $R^2=0.14$, $P<0.05$. These three variables account for about 14% of the total variance in the predictive behavioral cynicism. According to the regression coefficient (β), the order of importance of the estimator variables on behavioral cynicism is as following organizational ownership, personal and professional development and organizational support and justice. When the results of the T-test are examined, it is seen that only organizational ownership variable has a significant effect on behavioral cynicism. The regression equation for predicting the cognitive dimension is given below: BEHAVIORAL CYNICISM= $3,786+0.050$, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AND JUSTICE- 0.117 , PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT- 0.383 , ORGANIZATIONAL OWNERSHIP

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In this study, the correlation and effect between organizational support perceptions and organizational cynicism attitudes of secondary school teachers were examined. The findings related to the research have been discussed and supported by the literature. Teachers' perceptions of organizational support change according to sub-

dimensions and remain moderate and low. Teachers think that personal and occupational development is supported at the lowest level. As a result of the research conducted by Kalagan (2009), it was determined that research assistants perceive organizational support at the highest academic counseling and lowest development opportunity dimension. The results of developmental dimensions are similar. In terms of perceptions of teachers' organizational support: organizational support and justice, personal and occupational development and organizational ownership sub-dimensions and the whole scale: there is some differentiation detected according to the variables like gender, marital status, branch and working status. It is seen that the findings of the research done by Tansky and Cohen (2001: 293), Foley et al. (2005: 247), Fuller and others (2006: 337), Hill (2006: 59) and Kalağan (2009: 143) overlap. For marital status change, Foley and others (2005: 247) support the findings of their work.

In terms of the variable of 'do you consider to leave the institution you work for?' organizational support perception and justice scores of the group of 'No' in the sub-dimension of justice are higher than the groups of 'Yes' and 'Partially'. In the personal and occupational development sub-dimension, the scores of the teachers in the yes group are lower than those of the no-group teachers. In the organizational ownership sub-dimension, the scores of the teachers in the yes group are lower than the scores of the teachers in the no group. Teachers who do not want to leave the institution they work for, perceive higher levels of organizational support in the subscale than teachers who are considering leaving and partly thinking. As a result of the research conducted by Kalagan (2009), research assistants who do not consider leaving the institution they work for, are higher in all sub factors of organizational support than others. The findings support the finding of Yüksel (2006), which indicates that the perceptions of organizational support of employees who have an attitude of leaving the job are lower than those who are not in a position to leave the job.

As for the seniority variable, organizational support perceptions of teachers with 1-2 years and 8-12 years of seniority are higher and more significant than teachers of other seniority. Candidate teachers may be enthusiastic and enthusiastic because of new beginnings in the profession. Also, it is expected that all the staff of the school will be aware of their responsibilities when they are raised during the nomination process. Therefore, it can be said that they have received support from the school and have not experienced an unfair attitude or behavior for a long time. The following may increase teachers' perceptions of organizational support: their attachment to the profession in the first years of their profession, and that they have the desire to establish and maintain an order (Super, 1968; Shepherd, 2016: 143).

There was no significant difference between teachers' organizational cynicism and gender and marital status. According to the research results of Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), there was no significant relationship between the teachers' gender and marital status and organizational cynicism levels. Mirvis and Kanter (1991), Bateman, Sakano and Fujita (1992), Andersson and Bateman (1997), Reichers et al. (1997), Wanous et al. (2000) and Tokgöz and Yilmaz (2008) also coincide with the findings of this research. However, in literature, there are also evidences that organizational cynicism levels of single employees are high (Delken, 2004; Kalağan, 2009).

According to the findings of this research, there was no significant difference between teachers' organizational cynicism and their fields. According to the results of the research made by Kalağan and Güzeller (2010), the level of organizational cynicism of teachers whose field is science is high. The results are different. There was no significant difference in the organizational cynicism attitudes of the teachers according to the age and title variables in all the sub-dimensions. As a result of the research conducted by Kalağan (2009), it was observed that there was not a significant difference in the organizational cynic attitudes of the research assistants in terms of age variation in all sub dimensions. The age-related finding of the study is similar to the findings of various investigations (Bernerth et.al, 2007:317; Bommer et.al, 2005:743; Andersson and Bateman,1997:460; Erdost et.al, 2007:519; Efilti et.al, 2008:12; Fero, 2005:34; Tokgöz and Yılmaz, 2008:302; Kalağan and Güzeller 2010: 92; James, 2007:97;).

According to the occupational seniority variable, teachers' attitudes of organizational cynics were significant only in the behavioral subscale. According to the research done by Kalağan (2009), according to the variable of service duration, organizational cynicism attitudes of researchers were significant only in the cognitive sub-dimension. The results are different. As a result of the research conducted by Nartgün and Tin (2014), the year of service change did not make a meaningful difference in the organizational identification, organizational support, and organizational cynicism levels of teachers. According to Kalapan and Güzeller' research results (2010), there is a significant correlation between organizational cynicism and the professional seniority of teachers. This situation overlaps with the results of James (2005) and Naus (2007) researches. According to Kalapan and Güzeller (2010) research results, there is a meaningful correlation between organizational cynicism and the professional seniority of teachers. This situation overlaps with the results of James' (2005) and Naus' (2007) researches. Furthermore, in the research conducted by O'Connel, Holzman and Armandi (1986), the relationship between service duration and organizational cynicism has emerged.

Teachers' attitudes of organizational cynics were highest at behavioral level and lowest at affective dimension. As a result of research conducted by Kalağan (2009), organizational cynics attitudes of researchers were highest in cognitive, lowest in affective dimension. The results are different. It has been determined that teachers' cognitive, affective and behavioral cynic attitudes affect each other moderately also to a high degree. According to the research result made by Kalağan (2009), a positive linear correlation was found between the cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions in the middle level. The similar results have emerged.

The results of the research show that gender, marital status, branch and workplace variables have no effect on teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes. Similar research has also been done to indicate that there is no significant relationship between organizational cynicism and gender (Efilti et.al, 2008:11 Bernerth et.al, 2007:317; Bommer et.al, 2005:743; Andersson and Bateman, 1997:460; Erdost et.al, 2007:522; Fero, 2005:34; Güzeller and Kalağan, 2008:92; James, 2005:97; Tokgöz and Yılmaz, 2008:302; Kalağan, 2009:157). There are similar researches in the literature that indicate that there is no significant relationship between organizational cynicism and gender. It is seen that there was no significant difference in organizational cynicism attitudes

according to the marital status variable in all of the sub-dimensions. This finding of the research supports the findings of Efiliti et al. (2008: 11) and Erdost et al. (2007: 522). However, in the study conducted by Kalağan, (2009: 157), there was a significant difference in the behavioral sub-dimension except cognitive and affective cynicism sub-dimensions.

Organizational cynicism attitudes in these dimensions are higher for teachers who think about leaving the institution they are working in and partly thinking about leaving, than teachers who do not think about leaving. In the study conducted by Kalağan (2009: 164), the organizational cynicism attitudes of research assistants who think about leaving the institution they work for in all sub-dimensions and partly think about leaving are higher than those who do not think to leave. There are similar results. Organizational cynicism influences teachers' thinking about leaving their institutions. Teachers' thinking about leaving their organizations can give some tip as to their negative attitude towards their organizations. As a result, the level of organizational cynicism may increase.

Negative linear relationship emerged between affective, cognitive and behavioral cynicism and organizational ownership in the middle level. In the research result of Kalağan (2009), a negative linear relationship between organizational cynicism sub-dimensions was calculated in the middle level. There are similar results. What teachers perceive as organizational support: organizational ownership, organizational support and justice sub-dimensions have an important influence on cognitive and affective cynicism. Organizational ownership change has a significant influence on behavioral cynicism. Organizational ownership change has an important influence on behavioral cynicism. According to the research result made by Kalağan (2009), it was determined that the dimensions that research assistants perceive as organizational support have an effect on organizational cynicism sub-dimensions. There are similar results. As a result of the research conducted by Nartgün and Tin (2014), there is no correlation between organizational cynicism and organizational support scale, according to the opinions of teachers.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Teachers' perceptions of organizational support are moderate and low. Careful attention should be paid to the appropriateness and fairness of personal and professional competences while assigning tasks and course schedules.
2. Teachers consider that personal and professional development is supported at the lowest level. To provide teachers with development opportunities, research and participation in academic activities should be supported by superiors.
3. Some measures may be taken in order to increase the perceptions of organizational support by investigating with the qualitative research methods that the teachers who think and partially think about leaving the institution.
4. Teachers' behavioral cynical attitudes were found to be higher in the first years. The reasons can be examined.
5. In order to strengthen the organizational support, the communication with the teachers should be empowered.

ORTAOKULLARDA GÖREV YAPAN ÖĞRETMENLERİN ÖRGÜTSEL DESTEK ALGILARI İLE ÖRGÜTSEL SİNİZM TUTUMLARI ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİ

TÜRKÇE GENİŞ ÖZET

GİRİŞ

İş görenlerin davranışları örgütsel güdüleyicilerden etkilenmektedir. Özellikle kurumdaki işgörenlerin bir değer olarak görülmesi, mutluluklarının ve memnuniyetlerinin önemszenmesi ve bunların içselleştirilmesi, işgörenlerin kurum ile olan duygusal iletişimlerini pozitif yönde etkilemektedir (Eisenberger vd., 1986: 501). Toplumsal değişim kuramına dayandırılan (Loi vd, 2006: 109) ve psikolojik sözleşmelere konu olan örgütsel destek (Eisenberger vd., 1986: 503; Shore ve Shore, 1995: 151) özellikle yaptıkları işten ve iş dışından gelen istekleri yerine getirmekte zorlanan işgörenler için önemli görülmektedir (Eisenberger vd., 1990: 56). Eisenberger ve arkadaşları (1986: 500) tarafından algılanan örgütsel destek, kurumdaki iş görenlerin katılımına önem verilmesi, iyiliğinin önemszenmesine yönelik algılar olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Örgütsel destek, bireyin, örgüt tarafından kendisine ne kadar destek verildiğini hissetmesi ve düşünmesi anlamına da gelmekte olup, algı temelli bir kavramdır (Yoshimura, 2003: 10).

Sinizm, bir düşünce ve yaşam biçimi olarak Antik Yunan'da ortaya çıkmıştır (Brandes, 1997: 7). Antik Yunan felsefi düşüncesi olan "sinik" (kinik) sözcüğünün orijini, aşağı yukarı M.Ö. 500'lü yıllara dayanmaktadır (Mantere ve Martinsuo, 2001: 4; Metzger, 2004: 24). Örgütsel sinizm ile ilgili alanyazın incelendiğinde çeşitli tanımların yapıldığı ve kuramsal temellerinin oluşturulduğu görülmüştür. Dean ve diğerlerine (1998: 345) göre örgütsel sinizm kavramı; atfetme kuramı, beklenti kuramı, sosyal değişim kuramı, tutum kuramı, sosyal güdülenme kuramı ve duygusal olaylar kuramının temellerine dayanmakta ve örgütün dürüstlükten ve bütünlükten mahrum kalma düşüncesiyle, fertlerin çalıştıkları kurumlarına yönelik olumsuz tutumdur. Kurumsal sinizm kavramı, kurumlardaki aşağılayıcı ve eleştirici davranışta bulunma eğilimindeki inanç ve duyguları da kapsamaktadır. Kurumsal sinizm, kuruma yönelik olarak gizli ya da açık bir şekilde yapılan sert tepkiler ve olumsuz duygular olarak tarif edilmektedir. Dean ve diğerlerinin (1998:345) yapmış oldukları bu tanıma göre, bu kavramın tutumla ilişkili bir tarafının olduğu da söylenebilir.

Bu araştırmanın problem cümlesi, "ortaokullarda görev yapan öğretmenlerin, algıladıkları örgütsel destek ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasında bir ilişki var mıdır?" şeklinde tanımlanmıştır. Araştırmada, aşağıda belirtilen sorulara yanıt bulmaya çalışılmıştır.

1. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algılarının düzeyi nedir?
2. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları, alt boyutları arasında anlamlı bir farklılığa yol açmakta mıdır?
3. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları; örgütsel destek ve adalet, kişisel ve mesleki gelişim ve örgütsel sahiplenme alt boyutları ve ölçeğin tamamında; medeni durum, yaş, mesleki kıdem, cinsiyet, çalışma yeri, unvan, branş ve çalıştığınız kurumdan ayrılmayı düşünme değişkenleri açısından fark var mıdır?

4. Öğretmenlerin kurumsal sinizm tutumlarının düzeyi nedir?
5. Öğretmenlerin kurumsal sinizm tutumları, alt boyutları arasında anlamlı bir farklılığa yol açmakta mıdır?
6. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumları; bilişsel, duyuşsal ve davranışsal alt boyutları ve tamamında; medeni durum, mesleki kıdem, cinsiyet, branş, yaş, unvan, çalışma yeri ve çalıştığınız kurumdan ayrılmayı düşünme değişkenlerine göre farklılaşmakta mıdır?
7. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları, örgütsel sinizm tutumlarının yordayıcısı mıdır?

YÖNTEM

Bu çalışmada, tarama tipi araştırma ve tarama tipi araştırmalardan ise ilişkisel tarama tipi araştırma uygulanmıştır. Tarama araştırmaları halen varolan bir durumu varolduğu şekliyle ya da geçmişteki durumunu betimlemeyi amaçlayan araştırmalardır (Karasar, 2009: 77). İlişkisel tarama araştırmaları ise, iki ve daha çok sayıdaki değişken arasında birlikte değişimin varlığını ya da derecesini belirlemeyi amaçlayan araştırmalardır (Karasar, 2009: 81).

Araştırmanın ana kütlesi, Elazığ merkezindeki 55 ortaokulda, 2016-2017 eğitim-öğretim yılında görev yapan toplam 1602 öğretmendir. Tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemiyle bu okullardan belirlenen 13 okulda görev yapan 389 öğretmene veri toplama aracı dağıtılmıştır. Ancak 319 öğretmene ait veri toplama aracı değerlendirmeye alınmıştır. Örneklemin büyüklüğünü saptamak için Krejcie ve Morgan (1970) tarafından hesaplanan çizelgeden faydalanılmıştır (Krejcie ve Morgan, 1970:607). Ölçme aracı üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölümde olgusal sorular (9 adet), ikinci bölümde Kalağan'ın (2009) geliştirdiği ve araştırmacı tarafından uygulanacak evrene uyarlanan ölçme aracı (29 madde) ve üçüncü bölümde de Brandes, Dharwadkar ve Dean'in (1999) geliştirmiş olduğu 13 maddelik ve araştırmacı tarafından açıklayıcı faktör analizi yapılan Örgütsel Sinizm Ölçeğine ait maddeler bulunmaktadır. Ölçme aracı; hiç katılmıyorum (1), katılmıyorum (2), kısmen katılıyorum (3), katılıyorum (4) ve tamamen katılıyorum (5), şeklinde derecelendirilmiştir. Algılanan örgütsel destek envanteri (ADE) üç faktörlüdür. Faktörlere verilen isimler şunlardır: İlk faktöre "Örgütsel destek ve adalet", ikinci faktöre "Kişisel ve mesleki gelişim", üçüncü faktöre "Örgütsel sahiplenme" isimleri verilmiştir. Örgütsel sinizm ölçeği üç faktörlüdür. Faktörlere verilen isimler şunlardır: İlk faktöre "Bilişsel", ikinci faktöre "Duyuşsal" ve üçüncü faktöre de "Davranışsal" boyut adı verilmiştir.

BULGULAR

Ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel destek ve adalet, örgütsel sahiplenme alt boyutları ve ölçeğin tamamına ilişkin algıları katılıyorum düzeyinde iken, kişisel ve mesleki gelişim alt boyutuna ilişkin algıları kısmen katılıyorum düzeyindedir. Örgütsel destek ve adaletle ile kişisel ve mesleki gelişim arasında $r=0,568$, $p<0.01$ ile orta ve olumlu bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Alt boyutların ve ölçeğin tamamında değişkenlere göre öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmamaktadır. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları, bütün alt boyutlarda yaş ve unvan değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. 1-2 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algılarının 3-7 ve 13-17 yıl; 8-12 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek

algılarının ise, 13-17 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerden daha yüksek olduğu ve farkların anlamlı olduğu bulunmuştur. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumlarının düzeyleri; sırasıyla davranışsal, bilişsel ve duyuşsal alt boyut şeklinde belirlenmiştir. Bilişsel tutum ile duyuşsal tutum arasında $r=0,698$, $p<0.01$ yüksek ve olumlu seviyede bir ilişki ortaya çıkmıştır. Öğretmenlerin medeni durum, cinsiyet, branş ve çalışma yeri değişkenlerinin örgütsel sinizm tutumlarına etkisinin olmadığı ortaya çıkmıştır. 3-7 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumları, 13-17 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumlarından yüksek çıkmıştır.

TARTIŞMA VE SONUÇ

Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları alt boyutlara göre farklılık göstermektedir ve orta ve düşük düzeyde kalmaktadır. Öğretmenler kişisel ve mesleki gelişimlerinin en düşük düzeyde desteklendiğini düşünmektedirler. Kalağan'ın (2009) yaptığı araştırmaya göre, araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel desteği en yüksek akademik danışmanlık alt boyutunda, en düşük ise, gelişme fırsatı alt boyutunda algıladıkları saptanmıştır. Gelişme alt boyutlarındaki sonuçlar benzerlik göstermektedir. Öğretmenlerinin örgütsel destek algıları; örgütsel destek ve adalet, kişisel ve mesleki gelişim ve örgütsel sahiplenme alt boyutları ve ölçeğin tamamında; cinsiyet, medeni durum, branş ve çalıştıkları yer değişkenleri için farklılık göstermemektedir. Cinsiyet değişkeni için, Foley ve diğerleri (2005: 247), Fuller ve diğerleri (2006:337), Tansky ve Cohen (2001:293), Yokuş (2006:59) ve Kalağan'ın (2009: 143) yaptığı araştırmaların bulguları benzerlik göstermektedir. Medeni durum değişkeni için de, Foley ve diğerlerinin (2005: 247) çalışmalarındaki bulguları destekleyici niteliktedir.

Çalıştığınız kurumdan ayrılmayı düşünüyor musunuz değişkeni bakımından, örgütsel destek ve adalet alt boyutunda hayır grubundaki öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algı puanları, evet grubu ve kısmen grubu öğretmenlerin puanlarından daha yüksektir. Kişisel ve mesleki gelişim alt boyutunda evet grubundaki öğretmenlerin puanları hayır grubu öğretmenlerin puanlarından daha düşüktür. Örgütsel sahiplenme alt boyutunda evet grubundaki öğretmenlerin puanları hayır grubundaki öğretmenlerin puanlarından daha düşüktür. Çalıştığı kurumdan ayrılmayı düşünmeyen öğretmenler, ayrılmayı düşünen ve kısmen düşünen öğretmenlere göre alt boyutlardaki örgütsel desteği daha yüksek düzeyde algılamaktadırlar. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda da, örgütsel desteğin tüm alt boyutlarında çalıştığı kurumdan ayrılmayı düşünmeyen araştırma görevlilerinin aritmetik ortalamaları diğer gruptakilere göre daha yüksektir. Bulgular, işten ayrılma eğilimi olan işgörenlerin örgütsel destek algılarının, işten ayrılma eğilimi olmayanlara göre daha düşük olduğunu belirten Yüksel'in (2006) araştırma bulgusuyla benzerdir.

Mesleki kıdem değişkenine göre; 1-2 yıl ile 8-12 yıl kıdeme sahip öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algıları, diğer kıdemlerdeki öğretmenlerden daha yüksek ve anlamlıdır. Aday öğretmenler, mesleğe yeni başlamaları nedeniyle istekli ve heyecanlı olabilirler. Bununla birlikte adaylık sürecinde yetiştirilmelerinde okulun bütün personelinin sorumluluk bilincinde davranması beklenir. Bundan dolayı okuldan destek gördükleri ve uzun süreli haksız bir tutum ya da davranışla karşılaşmadıkları söylenebilir. Mesleğin ilk yıllarındaki mesleğe bağlanmanın arttığı, bir düzen kurma ve bunu devam ettirme isteğinin olduğu (Super, 1968; Çoban, 2016: 143) düşüncesi de

öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algılarını yükseltmiş olabilir. Öğretmenlerin cinsiyet ve medeni durum değişkenlerine göre, örgütsel sinizm algıları arasında fark yoktur.

Bu araştırmanın bulgusuna göre, öğretmenlerin branşları ile örgütsel sinizmleri arasında anlamlı bir fark ortaya çıkmamıştır. Kalağan ve Güzeller (2010) yaptıkları çalışmada, fen bilimleri branşında olan öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumları düzeyi yüksek çıkmıştır. Sonuçlar farklıdır. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumlarında, bütün alt boyutlarda yaş ve unvan değişkenlerine göre anlamlı farklılık gözlenmemiştir. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda da, alt boyutların hepsinde araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel sinizmin tutumlarında, yaş değişkeni bakımından anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığı gözlenmiştir. Araştırmanın yaş ile ilgili bulgusu, çeşitli araştırmaların bulgularıyla da benzerdir (Andersson ve Bateman,1997:460; Bernerth ve diğerleri, 2007:317; Bommer ve diğerleri, 2005:743; Efilti ve diğerleri, 2008:12; Erdost ve diğerleri, 2007:519; Fero, 2005:34; Kalağan,ve Güzeller 2010: 92; James, 2007:97; Tokgöz ve Yılmaz, 2008:302).

Mesleki kıdem değişkenine göre, öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumları sadece davranışsal alt boyutta anlamlı çıkmıştır. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda ise, hizmet süresi değişkenine göre, araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel sinizm tutumları sadece bilişsel alt boyutta anlamlı çıkmıştır. Sonuçlar farklıdır. Nartgün ve Kalay (2014) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda, öğretmenlerin örgütsel özdeşleşme, örgütsel destek ve örgütsel sinizm düzeylerinde, hizmet yılı fark oluşturmadığı saptanmıştır. Kalağan ve Güzeller (2010) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucuna göre, öğretmenlerin kıdemleri ile örgütsel sinizmleri arasında bir ilişki vardır. Bu bulgu, James (2005) ve Naus (2007)'un araştırmalarının bulgusu ile benzerdir. Ayrıca, O'Connel, Holzman ve Armandi'nin (1986) araştırmalarında, örgütsel sinizm ile hizmet yılı arasında ilişki ortaya çıkmıştır.

Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutum düzeyleri en düşük duyuşsal alt boyutta, en yüksek ise, davranışsal alt boyutta yer almıştır. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda, araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel sinizm tutumları da, en düşük duyuşsal alt boyutta, en yüksek ise, bilişsel alt boyutta yer almıştır. Sonuçlar farklıdır. Öğretmenlerin bilişsel, duyuşsal ve davranışsal sinizm tutumlarının birbirini orta ve yüksek düzeyde etkilediği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucuna göre de, bilişsel, duyuşsal ve davranışsal alt boyutlar arasında orta seviyede pozitif doğrusal bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Sonuçlar da benzerdir.

Araştırma sonuçlarına göre; cinsiyet, medeni durum, branş ve çalışma yeri değişkenleriyle öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasında ilişki yoktur. Alanyazında, cinsiyet ile örgütsel sinizm arasında bir ilişki olmadığını belirten benzer araştırmalar da yer almaktadır (Andersson ve Bateman, 1997: 460; Bernerth ve diğerleri, 2007: 317; Bommer ve diğerleri, 2005: 743; Efilti ve diğerleri, 2008: 11; Erdost ve diğerleri, 2007: 522; Fero, 2005: 34; Güzeller ve Kalağan, 2008: 92; James, 2005: 97; Kalağan, 2009: 157; Tokgöz ve Yılmaz, 2008: 302). Alt boyutların tamamında medeni durum değişkenine göre, örgütsel sinizm tutumlarında fark yoktur. Bu bulgu, Efilti ve diğerleri (2008: 11) ile Erdost ve diğerlerinin (2007: 522) çalışmalarındaki bulguları destekler niteliktedir. Ancak Kalağan, (2009: 157) tarafından yapılan araştırmada bilişsel ve duyuşsal sinizm alt boyutları hariç davranışsal alt boyutta anlamlı farklılık ortaya çıkmıştır.

Çalıştığı kurumdan ayrılmayı kısmen düşünen ve ayrılmayı düşünen öğretmenlerin bu alt boyutlardaki örgütsel sinizm tutumları, ayrılmayı düşünmeyen öğretmenlere göre daha yüksektir. Kalağan, (2009: 164) tarafından yapılan araştırmada ise, bütün alt boyutlarda çalıştığı kurumdan ayrılmayı kısmen düşünen ve ayrılmayı düşünen araştırma görevlilerinin bu boyutlardaki örgütsel sinizm tutumları, ayrılmayı düşünmeyen araştırma görevlilerine göre daha yüksek düzeyde çıkmıştır. Sonuçlar benzerdir. Öğretmenlerin kurumlarından ayrılmayı düşünme durumu örgütsel sinizmi etkilemektedir. Okullarından ayrılmayı düşünen öğretmenlerin, okullarına karşı olumsuz bir tutum içerisinde olduğu söylenebilir. Bu da onların okullarına karşı örgütsel sinizm tutumlarını yükseltebilir.

Bilişsel, duyuşsal ve davranışsal sinizm ile örgütsel sahiplenme arasında orta düzeyde negatif doğrusal bir ilişki ortaya çıkmıştır. Kalağan, (2009) yaptığı çalışmada, örgütsel sinizm alt boyutları arasında orta düzeyde negatif doğrusal bir ilişki olduğunu saptamıştır. Sonuçlar benzerdir. Öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek olarak algıladıkları; örgütsel sahiplenme, örgütsel destek ve adalet alt boyutlarının, bilişsel ve duyuşsal sinizm üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olduğu; Örgütsel sahiplenme değişkeni ise, davranışsal sinizm üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahiptir. Kalağan, (2009) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucuna göre de, araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel destek algılarının, örgütsel sinizm alt boyutları ile ilişkisinin olduğu saptanmıştır. Sonuçlar benzerlik göstermektedir. Nartgün ve Kalay (2014) tarafından yapılan araştırma sonucunda, öğretmenlerin, örgütsel sinizm ile örgütsel destek algıları arasında ise herhangi bir ilişki bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ortaokul, örgütsel destek algısı, örgütsel sinizm.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, L.M. & Bateman, T.S. (1997). Cynicism in the Workplace: Some Causes and Effects. *The Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 449-470.
- Bateman, T. S., Sakano, T. & Fujita, M. (1992). Roger, Me and My Attitude: Film Propaganda and Cynicism Toward Corporate Leadership. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (5), 768-771.
- Bernerth, J.B., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S. and Walker, H.J. (2007). Justice, Cynicism, and Commitment: A Study of Important Organizational Change Variables. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43 (3), 303-326.
- Bommer, W.H., Rich, G.A. and 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.
- Brandes, P.M (1997). *Organizational Cynicism: Its Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences*. (Unpublished Doctorate Dissertation) The University of Cincinnati.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri (4th ed.)*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi

- Cartwright, S. and Holmes, N. (2006). The Meaning of Work: The Challenge of Regaining Employee Engagement and Reducing Cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16 (2), 199–208.
- Dean Jr, J.W., Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational Cynicism . *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 341-352.
- Delken, M. (2004). *Organizational Cynicism: A Study among Call Centers* (Dissertation of Master of Economics). Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, University of Maastricht, Maastricht.
- Eaton, J.A. (2000). *A Social Motivation Approach to Organizational Cynicism*. Dissertation of Master of Arts, Faculty of Graduate Studies, York University, Toronto.
- Efiltili, S., Gönen, Y. ve Öztürk, F. (2008). Örgütsel Sinizm: Akdeniz Üniversitesinde Görev Yapan Yönetici Sekreterler Üzerinde Bir Alan Araştırması. *7th National Bureau Management and Secretarial Congress, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey: 1-14*.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington R., Hutchison S. & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7, 500–507.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment and Innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51–59.
- Erdost, H.E., Karacaoğlu, K. & Reyhanoğlu, M. (2007). Örgütsel Sinizm Kavramı ve ilgili Ölçeklerin Türkiye’deki Bir Firmada Test Edilmesi. *15th National Management and Organization Congress Report Book, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey: 514-524*.
- Fero, H. C. (2005). *Flow and Cynicism in the Workplace* (Dissertation of Doctorate of Philosophy). Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California.
- Foley, S., Hang-Yue, N. & Lui, S. (2005). The Effects of Work Stressors, Perceived Organizational Support, and Gender on Work-Family Conflict in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 22 (3), 237–256.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tahtam R.L. & Black W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Fifth ed.), Pearson Education Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, 112.
- James, M. S. L. (2005). *Antecedents and Consequences of Cynicism in Organizations: An Examination of the Potential Positive and Negative Effects On School Systems*. (Dissertation of Doctorate of Philosophy), The Florida State University.
- Kalağan, G. (2009). *Araştırma Görevlilerinin Örgütsel Destek Algıları İle Örgütsel Sinizm Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki* (Dissertation of Master of Arts). Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Sciences.
- Kalağan, G. & Güzeller, C. O. (2010). Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Sinizm Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *Pamukkale University, Journal of Faculty of Education*, 27, 83-97.
- Karasar, N. (2009). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. Kavramlar, İlkeler, Teknikler* (4th ed.), Ankara, Turkey: Nobel Publishing.
- Loi, R., Hang-Yue, N. & Foley, S. (2006). “Linking Employees’ Justice Perceptions to Organizational Commitment and Intention to Leave: The Mediating Role of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79:101–120.

- Mirvis, P.H. and Kanter, D.L. (1991). Beyond Demography: A Psychographic Profile of The Workforce. *Human Resource Management*, 30 (1), 45-68.
- Nartgün, Ş. S. Kalay, M. (2014). Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Destek, Örgütsel Özdeşleşme İle Örgütsel Sinizm Düzeylerine İlişkin Görüşleri. *Turkish Studies -International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*. 9(2), 1361-1376.
- Naus, A. J. A. M. (2007). *Organizational Cynicism on The Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences of Employee Cynicism Toward The Employing Organization*. (Dissertation of Doctorate of Philosophy), Maastricht University, Maastricht.
- Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003b). Algılanan Örgütsel Destek İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Dokuz Eylul University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Journal* , 18(2), 113-130.
- 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.
- Schaffer, M.A., & Harrison, D.A. (2001). Struggling for Balance Amid Turbulence on International Assignments: Work-family Conflict, Support, and Commitment, *Journal of Management*, 27(1), 99-121.
- Shore, L. M., & Shore, T. H. (1995). Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Justice. In R. S. Cropanzano ve K. M. Kacmar (Eds.), *Organizational Politics, Justice, and Support: Managing the Social Climate of the Workplace* (149–164). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Şencan, H. (2005). *Sosyal ve Davranışsal Ölçümlerde Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik*. Ankara, Turkey: Seçkin Printing House.
- Tokgöz, N. & Yılmaz, H. (2008). Örgütsel Sinizm: Eskişehir ve Alanya'daki Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2), 238-305.
- Tansky, W., & Cohen, D.J. (2001). The Relationship between Organizational Support, Employee Development, and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12 (3), 285-300.
- 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.
- Yoshimura, K. E. (2003). *Employee Traits, Perceived Organizational Support, Supervisory Communication, Affective Commitment and Intent to Leave: Group Differences* (Degree of Masters of Science), North Carolina State University, NC.
- Yüksel, İ. (2006). Örgütsel Destek Algısı ve Belirleyicilerinin İşten Ayrılma Eğilim ile İlişkisi. *Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business*, 35(1), 7-32.
- Zagenczyk, T.J., (2001). *A Social Influence Analysis of Perceived Organizational Support* (Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy). The Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh; Pennsylvania, PA.