

# ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN EGYPTIAN PUBLIC PRIMARY EDUCATION: WHEN SPRING YIELDS BLACK FLOWERS

**Mohamed MOUSA**

*Estonian Business School,  
Lauteri 3, Tallinn, Estonia  
Mohamed.mousa@ebs.ee*

## **Abstract**

Over the last two decades, organizational cynicism has become a buzzword in today's managerial academic life. The concept reflects the negative feelings employees have toward their workplaces, and it provides interpretations for many unwanted employee behaviors. Many managerial disciplines like leadership, human resources management and organizational behavior have devoted a considerable space for it within their curricula. As organizational commitment determines all employee-employer ties, this concept has attracted much attention in both academic and practical management arenas. Accordingly, and by using quantitative analysis, this study explores the relationship between organizational cynicism dimensions and organizational commitment approaches in the context of public primary schools in Menoufia, Egypt. Correlation and regression results show a negative association between the cynicism dimensions and approaches of organizational commitment.

**Keywords:** Organizational cynicism, Cognitive cynicism, Affective cynicism, Behavioral cynicism, Organizational commitment.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Owing to the fact that human resources are the most valuable assets an organization relies on to survive (Qian & Daniels, 2008), employee- organization relationship has found a place in business literature over the last thirty years (Aydin & Akdag, 2016). Accordingly, many studies have focused on organizational behavior aspects such as organizational cynicism, organizational citizenship behavior, employee inclusion, involvement and so on (Johnson & O'Leary- Kelly, 2003; Naus, Ad Van Iterson & Roe, 2007; Mousa & Alas, 2016).

Organizational cynicism is a premier organizational issue that has recently gained a popularity in business literature as a result of the cut-throat competition and subsequently the excessive amounts of stress an employee may face (Yasin & Khalid, 2015; Nazir, Ahmad, Nawab & Shah, 2016 and Khan, Naseem & Masood, 2016). Organizational cynicism describes the negative attitudes employees have towards their colleagues, occupations and organizations (Delken, 2005; Kocoglu, 2014 and Simha, Elloy & Huang, 2014). Admittedly, cynical employees believe that the organizations they work in lack principles of equality, sincerity, honesty,

integrity, and transparency (Ozler & Atalay, 2011). Accordingly, cynics have feelings of distrust, hopelessness, insecurity, and disturbance (Khan, 2014).

Kaifi (2013) affirms that cynicism provides interpretation for many organizational phenomena like organizational psychological withdrawals, employee mental departure from work duties by day dreaming or cyber-loafing, organizational physical withdrawal, and employee's physical departure from his workplace by absenteeism or late arrival to work. This may help explain why many studies have devoted considerable interest in examining the relationship between cynicism and other organizational behavior aspects such as job stress (Kocoglu, 2014), job burnout (Simha, Elloy & Huang, 2014), organizational cynicism (Tukelturk, 2012), work related quality of life (Yasin & Khalid, 2015) and turnover intention (Nazir, Ahmad, Nawab & Shah, 2016).

Apparently, the topic of organizational cynicism has become of great importance for many scientific disciplines like sociology, psychology, philosophy, political science and management in many if not all Western countries. However, this topic has not been paid its due attention in Egypt and other Arabian countries, which is why the author of this paper has chosen to focus on it.

Due to its impact on employees' level of absenteeism, rate of turnover, intention to leave and many other unwanted occupational behavior, organizational commitment has gained a currency in management academic literature since 1970 (Chang, 1999 and Rajendran & Raduan, 2005). Mousa & Alas (2016) maintain that a full understanding for the concept "organizational commitment" and its consequences can interpret employees' irrationality, irresponsibility, inefficiency and misuse of power. Haim (2007) and Sharma & Sinha (2015) affirm that the significance of organizational commitment emanates from its ability to investigate the degree of employees' current and future organizational membership.

Daniel & Jardon (2015) and Alas & Mousa (2016) point out that the earliest study on organizational commitment focused on addressing employees' Affective ties to their organization. Moreover, the concept has expanded to include all employee-employer relationships (Abidin, Muda, Hasan & Salleh, 2010). That's why many managerial fields such as organization behavior, leadership and human resources management devote a tremendous space for examining this concept and its consequences (Fry, 2003 and Ahiauzu & Asawo, 2012).

Education is often seen as a paradigm on which many developing nations depend to accelerate their potential growth (Alzaroo & Hunt, 2003). Egypt, one of developing nations that has employed education as a mechanism for attaining both social and economic development (Mahrous & Kortam, 2012), is currently facing a major challenge that may negatively affect its educational system. A rising percentage of teachers are leaving their jobs in public schools in search for better job opportunities whether in private centers or in Arab gulf countries (Mousa & Alas, 2016).

In a qualitative study made by Mousa and Alas in 2016, teachers claim that besides their low salaries, they don't have any sense of involvement, adaptability, inclusion, and security. Moreover, they don't have any influence on decision making process at their schools. Accordingly, they have a feeling of distrust and anger towards their schools.

Considering the above and given the fact that the public schools are the main destination for children from low and middle-income Egyptian families, this study seeks to investigate the association between organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) and organizational commitment approaches (affective, continuance and normative) in the context of public primary schools in Menoufia, Egypt.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### ***2.1 Organizational cynicism***

Despite the fact that Dean et al. (1998) see that the term "Cynicism" is originally derived from the ancient Greek word "kyon" which mean "dog", a study made by Nazir, Ahmad, Nawab and Shah (2016) indicates that cynicism probably comes from "cynosarges" which was an institute of cynics outside Athens, the capital of Greece.

The term cynicism was often used by ancient Greeks to describe the beliefs of skepticism, disbelief, pessimism, disappointment and scorn (Andersson, 1996). The same is elaborated by Delken (2005) when stating that the earliest Greek cynics were used to criticizing their institutions and state. By the same token, Guastello and Rieke (1992) pointed out that cynicism worked as a philosophy for some ancient Greeks.

In defining cynicism, both Andersson & Bateman (1997) and Leung et al. (2010) differentiate between social cynicism which represents a disbelief or negative feelings toward a person, group, ideology or even a state and organizational cynicism. The specific researchable aspect of the present study is based on the definition offered by Dean et al. (1998) of cynicism as "a negative attitude toward one's organization" (p. 345). It is also "a pessimistic approach shaped by an individual to his or her company" (Yasin & Khalid, 2015, p. 569). Accordingly, cynical employees believe that their co-workers are selfish, and the organizations they work in lack values of honesty, justice, morality and integrity (Ince & Turan, 2011). Consequently, cynics often have feelings of mistrust, anger, insecurity, disappointment and hopelessness when dealing with their colleagues and subsequently organization (Abraham, 2000).

One of the most important definitions for organizational cynicism is what was written by Delken (2005) who considered it as "an attitude of rejection of the employing organization, or part of it, as a viable psychological contract partner" (p. 10). This definition confirms both the psychological contract theory, according to which employees rely on their previous experience with their organization to create their prospective expectations, and the affective events theory based on which work events can create employees' positive or negative attitude

toward their work and provide a comprehensive basis for the interpretation of organizational cynicism (Kocoglu, 2014 and Khan, Naseem & Masood, 2016).

Reichers, Wanous & Austin (1997) and Tukelturk et al. (2012) articulate that the main factors influencing organizational cynicism are lack of recognition, rising organizational complexity, low work autonomy, poor communication, big gaps of salaries, conflict roles, feeling of nepotism, existence of bias, feeling of ostracism, disagreement with organizational values, unachievable organizational goals, too much work loads, absence of adequate leadership skills and inadequate social support.

Delken (2005) identifies the following five main forms of organizational cynicism:

- Cynicism about organizational change: refers to the reaction perceived due to change in policies, procedures and / or executive personnel.
- Employee cynicism: describes the attitudes caused by psychological contract violation.
- Occupational cynicism: describes the attitudes mainly generated from role conflict and/ or role ambiguity.
- Personality cynicism: describes negative feelings toward all human behavior.
- Societal cynicism: describes citizens' distrust of their government and subsequently institutions.

Needless to say organizational cynicism has received pronounced attention nowadays. The rationale behind this is the significant negative outcomes caused by the existence of cynicism. Barefoot et al. (1989) mentions that cynical employees are the barriers that prevent an organization from achieving its goals. Moreover, many studies assure the relationship between cynicism and some critical key organizational problems such as job burnout, turnover intentions, absenteeism, low cynicism level, less citizenship behavior and so on (Aydin & Akdag, 2016).

Clearly, the studies of Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky (2005) and Kaifi (2013) point that the concept "organizational cynicism" includes three dimensions:

- The cognitive dimension: reflects employees' belief that their organization lacks integrity, justice, honesty and transparency. Accordingly, employees feel that their personal values are not consistent with those of the organization.
- The affective dimension: reflects employees' negative affective reaction (anger and disgust) towards their organization.
- The behavioral dimension: reflects employees' negative behavioral tendencies (such as powerful negative criticism) toward their organization.

**2.2 Organizational commitment**

In 1960, the USA witnesses a large debate about why corporate managers share Affective bonds with their workplaces while university professors do not (Staw, 2007 included in Smith & Hitt, 2007). This debate was the real starting point for all the followed discourse about organizational commitment. Gouldner (1958) distinguishes between cosmopolitans whose level of organizational loyalty is low while their level of commitment to their role skills is high, and local organizational members whose level of organizational loyalty is high while their level of commitment to role skills is low. Etzioni (1961) introduces three types of organizational member's involvement:

- Moral: reflects members' positive attitudes towards their organization because of the belief of its values and objectives.
- Calculative: reflects members' mutual exchangeable relationship with their organization. They give something in return for some rewards such as salary.
- Alignative: reflects members' negative attitudes towards their organization because of the constraints (e.g. stress, work overloads, inequality and etc.) they face.

Since this time, employees' commitment to their organization has been devoted a great attention not only in the field of organizational behavior but also in human resources management, leadership and strategic management (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Early studies on organizational commitment have focused on assessing employees' level of Affective attachment to their employer (Becker, 1960). This assessment known as "the attitudinal perspective on commitment" and conceptualized by Porter, Steers and Boulian (1974, p. 604) as "an attachment to the organization, characterized by an intention to remain in it, an identification with the values and goals; and a willingness to exert an extra effort on its behalf". In 1982, Mowday, Porter and Steers made the calculative perspective on commitment which indicates that employee's continuance of his membership within his organization depends mostly on the costs and benefits of leaving it. The tri-dimensional perspective on commitment was introduced by both Allen and Meyer (1990) and according to this perspective, the concept of organizational commitment is divided into three approaches:

- Affective commitment  
This refers to an employee's Affective attachment to, integration with, and involvement with his or her organization (Bryant et al., 2007). Enriquez et al. (2001) elaborate that organizational objectives, vision, and the level of freedom that employees enjoy are three determinants for the level of employee affective commitment. Perry (2004) points out that promoting healthy, friendly and supportive discussions with supervisors may positively affect the level of an employee's affective commitment.
- Continuance commitment

This refers to an employee's perceived costs of leaving his or her organization (Bryant et al, 2007). Becker (1960) indicates that employees invest time, effort, health, money, and so on in their organizations. Such investments strongly affect their decisions and/or intentions to leave or remain in their organizations. Accordingly, Sharma & Sinha (2015) maintain that an increase in an employee's age and tenure within organizations raises his or her perceived cost of leaving it. Employees may also think about their pension, knowledge, job security, and unused vacations upon considering the decision to leave their jobs (Sharma & Sinha, 2015).

- Normative Commitment

This reflects an employee's obligation to stay in his organization (Bryant et al, 2007). Organizational culture, rewards, punishments, and employee autonomy play a vital role in deciding the level of normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Chang, 2002; Haar & Spell, 2004, and Sharma & Sinha, 2015).

Given what has preceded, Porter et al. (1974, p. 604) define organizational commitment as "the strength of an individual identification with and involvement in a particular organization". Allen and Meyer (2000) consider it a psychological state that reduces an employee's likelihood to leave his/her organization, whereas Haim (2007) sees commitment as employees' rational behavior to protect their occupations and benefits. Li, Ahlstrom, and Ashkanasy (2010) highlight that only organizations that have highly committed employees can compete and prosper because they clearly do their best efforts to fulfill their obligations towards their organization. Accordingly, the struggles of absenteeism, turnover, intentions to leave, being careless when doing duties and so on are, to a large degree absent if the level of employees' commitment is high (Kuruuzum et al, 2009). Accordingly, Atak (2009) determines that the main indicators of organizational commitment are not only to believe in organizational mission but also to exert an extra effort in order for organizational success.

### **2.3 Before and after 2011, Egypt and its spring**

Owing to its history, strategic location, number of population, military power and its ownership of the Suez Canal, the main waterway for oil and other world's commodities, Egypt is often perceived as one of the leading countries in the Arab region, Middle East, Africa, and the Mediterranean region as well. This country stretches from border with Sudan to the south to the Mediterranean Sea to the north, Libya to the west to Gaza strip to the east.

#### **2.3.1 Egypt before Arab spring**

Because of his right to veto legislature, his ability to appoint the prime minister, as well as his position not only as a president but also as a commander-in-chief of both armed forces and police, Hosni Mubarak ruled in a presidency era characterized by authoritarianism. Worthy to mention that the bad economic performance and the failure of all trials implemented to boost the Egyptian economy were the main features of this era (Alas & Mousa,

2016). Zoubir (2000) indicates that the unemployment and the low growth rate were the main reasons for the rise of religious extremism and socio-cultural tensions.

### ***2.3.2 Egypt after Arab spring***

The Egyptian scene in 2011 witnessed so many changes, starting from a revolution made by millions of Egyptians who called for their political, social and economic rights, passing through a fundamental jump in national leadership for more than three times, and ending by an open ended situation ready for any new scenario. Currently, the rising and diminishing role of Islamic parties, slowdown economic performance, weekly if not daily violent attacks against Christians, absence of socio-political freedom, gender discrimination, high unemployment rate, and removal of young people from the political life are considered phenomena of daily Egyptian life nowadays (Mousa & Alas, 2016). Indeed, the world expects something to happen in this country but no one can accurately expect the type, range, time, and consequences of the expected event.

## **3. RESEARCH DESIGN**

### ***3.1 Conceptual Framework***

The conceptual framework of this study is based on a review of previous research studies that have been conducted to demonstrate the link between organizational culture and workplace spirituality. In this article, the proposed independent variables are: Involvement, Consistency, Adaptability, Mission and Knowledge Sharing. Organizational commitment approaches - affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment - function as the dependent variables.

### ***3.2 Survey Instruments***

A set questionnaire is used to collect the primary data of this research. Its questions are based on well-established existing models with some modifications made to match this study. The questionnaire used in this study contains three main sections:

- **Demographic Variables:** This includes questions about the personal information of the targeted respondents such as gender, age, marital status, level of income, and religion.
- **Organizational Cynicism:** Based on Dean et al. (1998) three dimensional model of organizational cynicism, this study will examine the cognitive, affective and behavioral factors with three subscales to cover each of these researchable points.

- Organizational Commitment: is based on Allen and Mayer's (1990) three dimensional model of organizational commitment. This covers the three approaches of organizational commitment: affective, continuance and normative. This section also includes three subscales, each of which has eight items.

### **3.3 Hypotheses**

Following are the main hypotheses of this study:

- There is a negative statistical relationship between the organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) and affective commitment.
- There is a negative statistical relationship between the organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) and continuance commitment.
- There is a negative statistical relationship between the organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) and normative commitment.

### **3.4 Scope of the study**

The population pool of this study is teachers who are working in public primary schools in Menoufia province in Egypt. Teachers in this province were chosen as a sample for this study for ease of access by the researcher. The researcher used stratified random sampling by dividing the population into homogenous subgroups and then taking a random sample from each subgroup. This ensures that each subgroup is represented in the chosen samples. Teachers in Egyptian public schools are classified into five categories: junior teachers, first class teachers, alpha first class teachers, expert teachers, and senior teachers. Since, it is difficult to determine the size of the population, 200 sets of questionnaires were distributed to the targeted respondents. It is needless to say that the questionnaires were delivered in Arabic - the native language of all targeted respondents - in order to motivate them to respond.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

SPSS Pearson correlation was used to test hypotheses testing and provide normal descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation

## **4. RESEARCH FINDINGS**

As previous stated, the researcher distributed 200 sets of questionnaires and received responses from 150 teachers. Using stratified random sampling, the researcher formed the following profiles of respondents (Table 1).



TABLE 1 - RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

| Demographic Variables    | Items              | Count |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| a) Gender                | Male               | 123   |
|                          | Female             | 27    |
| b) Age                   | below 25 years     | 15    |
|                          | 26-30 years        | 30    |
|                          | 31-35 years        | 30    |
|                          | 36-40 years        | 25    |
|                          | 41-45 years        | 20    |
|                          | 46-50 years        | 20    |
|                          | More than 50 years | 10    |
| c) Marital States        | Single             | 40    |
|                          | Married            | 74    |
|                          | Other              | 36    |
| d) Level of Education    | Bachelor           | 100   |
|                          | Bachelor + Diploma | 48    |
|                          | Master             | 2     |
| e) Level of Income       | EGP 1200           | 15    |
|                          | EGP 1300-2500      | 30    |
|                          | EGP 2500-4000      | 53    |
|                          | EGP 4000-5500      | 40    |
|                          | Above 5500         | 12    |
| f) Organizational tenure | Less than 1 year   | 3     |
|                          | 1-3 years          | 12    |
|                          | 4-6 years          | 60    |
|                          | 7-9 years          | 45    |
|                          | 10-12 years        | 20    |
|                          | Above 15 years     | 10    |
| g) Religion              | Muslim             | 145   |
|                          | Christian          | 5     |
| h) Work Bases            | Full time          | 150   |
|                          | Part time          | 0     |

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF THE MEAN SCORE ANALYSIS

| Scale name                | Mean    | Standard deviation |
|---------------------------|---------|--------------------|
| Organizational Commitment | 3.62250 | 0.49197            |
| Affective Commitment      | 3.73333 | 0.50825            |
| Continuance Commitment    | 3.35500 | 0.54363            |
| Normative Commitment      | 3.79083 | 0.58746            |
| Organizational Cynicism   | 3.6633  | 0.6946             |
| Cognitive cynicism        | 3.5150  | 1.0064             |
| Affective cynicism        | 3.8867  | 0.6135             |
| Behavioral cynicism       | 3.5883  | 0.8121             |

**Reliability Analysis**

The Cronbach alpha is used to assess the internal consistency of each of the variables used in the study. As depicted in Table 2, all variables have adequate levels of internal consistency and meet the acceptable standard of 0.60 (Sekaran, 2003). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is 0.701 (Table 3).

TABLE 3 - RELIABILITY ANALYSIS

| Scale name                | Number of items | Coefficient alpha values |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Organizational Commitment | 24              | 0.904                    |
| Affective commitment      | 8               | 0.771                    |
| Continuance commitment    | 8               | 0.760                    |
| Normative commitment      | 8               | 0.801                    |
| Organizational Cynicism   | 12              | 0.869                    |
| Cognitive cynicism        | 4               | 0.779                    |
| Affective cynicism        | 4               | 0.732                    |
| Behavioral cynicism       | 4               | 0.743                    |
| Total                     | 36              | 0.701                    |

**Hypothesis 1**

The analysis results in the Pearson coefficient of - 0.556, and the value are highly significant (P= 0.0). There is a negative correlation between cognitive cynicism and teachers' affective commitment. The result (R2= 0.309, P= 0.0) suggests that when a belief of integrity absence exists, there is a 30.9 % decrease in teachers' sense of affective commitment. The analysis results in the Pearson coefficient of - 0.607, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0). This correlation coefficient proves that affective cynicism strongly affects teachers' affective commitment. The result (R2= 0.368, P= 0.0) shows when affective cynicism demonstrates, a 36.8% decrease teachers' affective commitment is yielded. The analysis results in the Pearson coefficient of -0.468, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0), and this shows that there is negative statistical relationship between behavioral cynicism and affective commitment. The result (R2= 0.219, P= 0.00) shows that when criticizing is employed, a 21.9 % decrease in teachers' level of affective commitment is attained (See table 4).

TABLE 4 - ANOVA FOR AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

|                     |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Cognitive cynicism  | Regression | 46.570         | 1   | 46.570      | 66.061 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 104.334        | 148 | .705        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 150.904        | 149 |             |        |      |
| Affective cynicism  | Regression | 20.646         | 1   | 20.646      | 86.249 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 35.427         | 148 | .239        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 56.073         | 149 |             |        |      |
| Behavioral cynicism | Regression | 21.565         | 1   | 21.565      | 41.611 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 76.702         | 148 | .518        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 98.267         | 149 |             |        |      |

TABLE 5 - MULTIPLE CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

|                        |                     | r     | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | SE of the estimate |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Affective Commitment   | Cognitive cynicism  | -.556 | .309           | .304                    | .83962             |
|                        | Affective cynicism  | -.607 | .368           | .364                    | .48926             |
|                        | Behavioral cynicism | -.468 | .219           | .214                    | .71990             |
| Continuance Commitment | Cognitive cynicism  | -.479 | .229           | .224                    | .88637             |
|                        | Affective cynicism  | -.450 | .202           | .197                    | .54981             |
|                        | Behavioral cynicism | -.450 | .202           | .197                    | .54981             |
| Normative Commitment   | Cognitive cynicism  | -.176 | .031           | .025                    | .99395             |
|                        | Affective cynicism  | -.425 | .181           | .175                    | .55709             |
|                        | Behavioral cynicism | -.223 | .050           | .044                    | .79424             |

**Hypothesis 2**

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of -0.479, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0). This result indicates that cognitive cynicism negatively affects continuance commitment. The result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.229, P= 0.0) suggests that when a belief of dishonesty exists, there is a 22.9 % decrease in teachers' continuance commitment. The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of -0.450, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0). This result proves that affective cynicism can negatively affect continuance commitment. The result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.202, P= 0.0) suggests that when teachers dislike his school, the result is a 20.2% decrease in the level of teachers' continuance commitment. The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of -0.425, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0), thus showing a significant effect for behavioral cynicism on the level of continuance commitment. The result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.181, P= 0.0) shows that when teachers align with behavioral cynicism, there is a 18.1% decrease in their continuance commitment (See table 6 and 5)

TABLE 6 - ANOVA FOR CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT

|                     |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Cognitive cynicism  | Regression | 34.628         | 1   | 34.628      | 44.076 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 116.276        | 148 | .786        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 150.904        | 149 |             |        |      |
| Emotional cynicism  | Regression | 11.334         | 1   | 11.334      | 37.493 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 44.739         | 148 | .302        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 56.073         | 149 |             |        |      |
| Behavioral cynicism | Regression | 17.746         | 1   | 17.746      | 32.617 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | 80.521         | 148 | .544        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 98.267         | 149 |             |        |      |

**Hypothesis 3**

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of -0.176, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0). This correlation coefficient implies that cognitive cynicism negatively affects teachers' normative commitment. Specifically, the result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.031, P= 0.0) suggests that when cognitive cynicism is felt; there is a 3.1% decrease in teachers' normative commitment. The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of - 0.425, and the value is highly significant (P=0.0). This correlation coefficient implies that affective cynicism negatively affects teachers' normative commitment. The result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.181, P= 0.0) suggests that when affective cynicism exists, there is a 18.1% decrease in teachers' normative commitment. The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of - 0.223, and the value is highly significant (P= 0.0). This result shows a negative correlation between behavioral cynicism and teachers' normative commitment. The result (R<sup>2</sup>= 0.050, P= 0.0) suggests that when behavioral cynicism is employed, there is a 5 % decrease in teachers' normative commitment (See table 7 and 5).

TABLE 7 - ANOVA FOR NORMATIVE COMMITMENT

|                     |            | Sum of Squares | df   | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|---------------------|------------|----------------|------|-------------|--------|------|
| Cognitive cynicism  | Regression | 4.690          | 1    | 4.690       | 4.747  | .031 |
|                     | Residual   | 146.214        | 148  | .988        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 150.904        | 149  |             |        |      |
| Emotional cynicism  | Regression | 5.570          | .298 |             | 18.693 | .000 |
|                     | Residual   | -.444          | .078 | -.425       | -5.717 |      |
|                     | Total      | 5.570          | .298 |             | 18.693 |      |
| Behavioral cynicism | Regression | 4.907          | 1    | 4.907       | 7.779  | .006 |
|                     | Residual   | 93.360         | 148  | .631        |        |      |
|                     | Total      | 98.267         | 149  |             |        |      |

**Findings:** Since all organizational cynicism dimensions have a negative correlation with affective commitment, the first hypothesis is fully supported. The results show that affective cynicism (0.368) has the strongest cultural effect on teachers' affective commitment. all organizational cynicism dimensions have a negative correlation with continuance commitment. Accordingly, hypothesis 2 is fully accepted. The results also show that cognitive cynicism (0.229) has the strongest effect on continuance commitment. All organizational cynicism dimensions have a negative correlation with teachers' normative commitment, so hypothesis 3 is accepted. The results show that affective cynicism (0.181) has the strongest effect on teachers' normative commitment.

**5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

To conclude, the present study reports on the investigation of the relationship between cognitive, affective and behavioral cynicism on the one hand and the three approaches of organizational commitment (affective, affective and normative) on the other. The findings assist in creating a much better understanding of both cynicism dimensions and commitment approaches in the context of public primary school education in Egypt. Moreover, the study has added information to management literature considering the rareness of studies investigating the relationship between cynicism and commitment not only in Egypt but also in the Middle East. The findings have demonstrated a negative correlation between the three dimensions of organizational cynicism (cognitive, affective and behavioral) and the three approaches of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative). Affective cynicism has emerged to be the most dominant variable in predicting both teachers' affective and normative commitment, whereas cognitive cynicism has appeared to be the most dominant variable in predicting teachers' continuance commitment.

Given the main factors influencing cynicism (e.g. lack of recognition, rising organizational complexity, low work autonomy, poor communication, big gaps of salaries, conflict roles, feeling of nepotism, existence of bias, feeling of ostracism, disagreement with organizational values, unachievable organizational goals, work overloads, absence of adequate leadership skills and inadequate social support), school administrations have to rethink their current style of management and leadership as it is illogical to expect teachers' level of devotion and loyalty to be high in a climate of distrust, hopelessness and insecurity (Reichers et al, 1997 & Tukelturk et al., 2012). School administrations also have to work side by side with the Egyptian ministry of education because the cynicism teachers struggle with may be social in that it may reflect a disbelief or negative feelings toward a person, group, ideology or even a state, or organizational in that it reflects a negative attitude toward one's organization (Andersson & Bateman, 1997 & Leung et al., 2010). Even though the current study focuses on the organizational dimension, the author cannot deny the significance of the second one here.

Referring to the results of Alas & Mousa (2016) and Mousa & Alas (2016), relying on open, persuasive, interactive, well-planned, formal and informal communication is highly recommended as a step for school administrations to disseminate a schools' vision, direction and objectives. It is a dynamic to keep teachers feel that they are a part of their schools, the matter that motivates them to have good emotions towards their workplace. Training can also be utilized to ensure teachers' full access to resources and information needed to get their jobs accomplished. These two mechanisms play a role in lowering teachers' cynicism.

Finally, this research may be subject to criticism because of its inability to provide enough variability as the researcher focused mainly on a single province, despite the fact that it is the one of the biggest in his country, Egypt. Moreover, the researcher overlooked some moderating variables such as engagement, satisfaction, and/or inclusion of teachers. For future studies, the researcher suggests that the same hypothesis be tested with

school administrators and other employees in public schools, a matter that may yield different results. It is also recommended that the same research question be tested in other settings such as private schools, universities, and businesses to determine whether or not it would lead to similar results.

## REFERENCES

- Abidin, S. N. S. Z., Muda, M. S., Hasan, F. A. and Salleh, A. M. M. (2010). Organizational commitment in Malaysian public sector. *IJMS* 17 (1), 107-128.
- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, 126 (3), 269-292.
- Ahiau, A. & Asawo, S.P. (2012). Impact of Clear and Compelling Vision on Workers' Commitment in Nigerian Organizations: An examination of Workplace Spirituality. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 9 (6), 113-124.
- Alas, R. & Mousa, M. (2016). Cultural diversity and business schools' curricula: a case from Egypt. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14 (2), 40-47.
- Alas, R. & Mousa, M. (2016). Organizational culture and workplace spirituality. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Management and Technology*, 5 (3), 1-9.
- Allen, N. & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (2000). *Construct validation in organizational behavior research: the case of organizational commitment*. In Guftin, R.D and Helmes, E. Problems and solutions in Human Assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson at Seventy, Kluwer, Norwell, MA, 285-314.
- Alzaroo, S. & Hunt, G. (2003). Education in the context of conflict and instability: the Palestinian case. *Social Policy and Administration*, 37 (2), 165-180.
- Andersson, L.M. (1996). Employee cynicism: an examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49 (11), 1395- 1418.
- Andersson; Lynne, M. & Bateman, T. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace, some causes and effects. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 18, 449- 469.
- Atak, M. (2009). *The relation between a learning organization and organizational commitment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ataturk University, institute of social science.
- Aydin, M. & Akdag, G. (2016). The relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational cynicism among hotel employees in southeastern Anatolia region of Turkey. *Eurasian Journal of Business and Management*, 4 (4), 81- 89.
- Bateman, T. & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 84- 92.
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66 (1), 32- 40.
- Bryant, S., Moshavi, D. & Nguyen, T. (2007). Afield study on organizational commitment, professional commitment and peer mentoring. *Database for Advances in Information Systems*, 38 (2), 61- 74.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment. The socialization of managers in work organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 533- 546.

- Chang, E. (1999). Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 43 (10), 433- 448.
- Chang, E. (2002). Distributive Justice and organizational commitment revisited: moderation by layoff in the case of Korean employees. *Human Resources Management*, 41 (2), 261- 270.
- Dean, J. W.' Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, 3 (2), 341-352.
- Delken, M. (2005). *Organizational cynicism: a study among call centers*. Master thesis. University of Maastricht. The Netherlands.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14 (6), 693-727.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1985). Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles- I. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2: 281-306.
- Guastello, S. J. & Rieke, M. L. (1992). A study of cynicism, personality and work values. *Journal of Psychology*, 126, 37- 48.
- Haim, A. B. (2007). Rethinking organizational commitment in relation to perceived organizational power and perceived employment alternatives. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7 (2), 203- 217.
- Hargreaves, E. (2001). Profiles of educational assessment systems world-wide: Assessment in Egypt. *Assessment in Education*, 8 (2), 247-260.
- Harr, J. & Spell, C. (2004). Programme knowledge and value of work. Family practice and organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 15 (6), 1040- 1055.
- Ince, M. & Turan, S. (2011). Organizational cynicism as a factor that affects organizational change in the process of globalization and an application in Karaman's public institutions. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 37, 104- 121.
- Information about teachers in Egypt: <http://www.elfagr.org/1816427#> , <http://www.shbabmisr.com/mt~116331>
- Johnson, J.L. & O'leary- Kelly, A. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24.
- Kaifi, B. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior: managing and leading organizations*. Tamarac, FL: Lulumina Press.
- Kaur, J. & Sharma, S. K. (2015). Measuring organizational commitment: scale validation for Indian financial services sector. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, XIV (4), 28- 51.
- Khan, M. A. (2014) organizational cynicism and employee turnover intention: evidence from banking sector in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Science*, 8 (1), 30- 41.
- Khan, R.; Naseem, A. & Masood, S. A. (2016). Effect of Continuance Cynicism and Organizational Cynicism on Employess Satisfaction in Engineering Organizations. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 7 (4), 141- 147.
- Kocoglu, M. (2014). Cynicism as a mediator of relations between job stress and work alienation: a study from a developing country- Turkey. *Global Business and Management Research: an International Journal*, 6 (1), 2- 11.
- Kundu, S.C. (2001). Managing Cross- Cultural Diversity: A challenge for present and future organizations. *Delhi Business Review*, 2 (2), 1-8.

- Kuruuzum, A., Cetin, E. I. & Irmak, S. (2008). Path analysis of organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction in Turkish hospitality industry. *Tourism Review*, 64 (1), 4-16.
- Li, y., Ahlstrom, D. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2010). A multilevel model of affect and organizational commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27, 193- 213.
- Luthans. (1989). *Organizational behavior (Fifth Edition)*. McGraw Hill Series in Management.
- Meyer, J. & Allen, J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace - Theory research and application*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J. & Allen, N. (1991). A three - component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1 (1), 61- 89.
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Organizational Commitment: A Case Study of Egyptian Teachers Post Revolution. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 7 (4), 33- 42.
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Uncertainty and Teachers' organizational commitment in Egyptian Public Schools. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8 (20), 38-47.
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: A study on the public school Teachers in Menoufia (Egypt). *African Journal of Business Management*, 10 (10), 247- 255.
- Mousa, M., & Alas, R. (2016). Cultural diversity and organizational commitment: A study on Teachers of primary Public Schools in Menoufia (Egypt). *International Business Research*, 9 (7), 154- 163.
- Mowday, R., Steer, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14 (2), 224- 247.
- Naqshabandi, M. M., Kaur, S., Sehgal, R., and Subramaniam, I. D. (2015). Organizational Culture Profiles of Malaysian high- tech Industries. *Asia- Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 7 (1), 2- 19.
- Naus, F.; Ad Van Iterson; Roe, R. (2007) organizational cynicism: extending the exit, voice, loyalty and....., *Human Relations*, 60 (5), 1395- 1418.
- Nazir, T.; Ahmad, U. N. B.; Nawab, S.& Shah, S. (2016). Mediating role of organizational cynicism in relationship between role stressors and turnover intention: evidence from healthcare sector of Pakistan. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6 (2), 199- 204.
- Ozler, D. E. & Atalay, C. G. (2011). A research to determine the relationship between organizational cynicism and burnout levels of employees in health sector. *Business and Management Review*, 1 (4), 26- 38.
- Porter, L. W., Steer, R. M., Mowday, R. & Boutin, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 (2), 603- 609.
- Qian, Y & Daniels, T. (2008). A communication model of employee cynicism toward organizational change. *Corporate Communication: an International Journal*, 13 (3), 319- 332.
- Rajendran, M. & Raduan, C. R. (2005). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment among Malaysian engineers. *American Journal of Applied Science*, 2 (6), 1095- 1100.
- Reichers, A.; Wanous, J.; & Austin, J. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11 (1), 48- 59.
- Sekar, U. (2003). *Research methods for business. A skill building approach (4th ed.)*. United States of America: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sharma, P. & Sinha, V. (2015). The influence of occupational rank on organizational commitment of faculty members. *Management*, 20 (2), 71- 91.



- Simha, A.; Elloy, D. F. & Huang, H. (2014). The moderated relationship between job burnout and organizational cynicism. *Management Decisions*, 52 (3), 482- 504.
- Smith, K. G. & Hitt, M. A. (2007). *Great minds in management: the process of theory development*. Oxford.
- Stanley, D.; Meyer, J. & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19, 429- 459.
- Tsui, A.; Egan, T. & O'Reilly, C. (1992). Being different: relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549- 579.
- Tukelturk, S. A. (2012). Psychological contract breaches and organizational cynicism at hotels. *The Young Economists Journal*, 460- 479.
- Yasin, T. & Khalid, S. (2015). Organizational cynicism, work related quality of life and organizational cynicism in employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Science* 9 (2), 568- 582.
- Zoubir, Y. (2000). Doing Business in Egypt. *Thunderbird International Business Reviews*, 42 (2), 329-347.