THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKAHOLISM LEVELS OF TEACHERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM

Mehmet Akif HELVACI[1i],
Orbay BAŞARAN[2]
[1]Prof. Dr., Uşak University,
Uşak, Turkey
[2]Instructor, Air NCO Vocational
HE School, İzmir, Turkey

Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between workaholism and organizational cynicism levels of teachers formally commissioned in public and private pre-school, primary, secondary and high schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education in Gaziemir, İzmir. This research is a descriptive correlational survey model. The sample of the study consisted of 367 teachers working in the 2018-2019 Academic Year in Gaziemir district of İzmir and they were selected by simple random sampling. As a data collection instrument; to examine workaholism levels of teachers, 4-point Likert-type, 25-item and four-dimensional "Workaholism Scale" developed by Robinson (1989) and was adapted into Turkish by Apaydın (2011) was used. In order to investigate organizational cynicism levels of teachers, 5-point Likert-type, 13-item and three-dimensional "Organizational Cynicism Scale" adapted into Turkish by Kalağan (2009) was used. The data were analyzed with SPSS 24.0 statistics program. Frequency and percentage distribution, Independent groups t-test, ANOVA, Tukey-HSD test, Kruskal Wallis H Test and Pearson correlation analysis were used in the analysis of the data. Within the scope of the research; whether teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels and sub-dimensions are statistically differentiated according to the independent variables gender, seniority, service year, school type, school level and branch of teachers or not; whether there is a relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels and sub-dimensions were examined. In the light of the findings; it can be said that teachers who participated in the research were partly workaholics and not cynical towards their organizations. According to the correlation test results, there is a statistically significant, positive and low-level relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels. In this context, it was seen that organizational cynicism levels of teachers increase in a low-level as their workaholism levels increase. It was seen that teachers' workaholism levels did not differentiate according to teachers' seniority, type of school and branch independent variables; but partially differentiated according to teachers' gender, year of service and school level independent variables. Furthermore, it was seen that the level of organizational cynicism of teachers did not differentiate according to teachers' gender independent variable; partially differentiated according to teachers' seniority, year of service, school level and branch independent variables and differentiated according to the school type independent variable.

Keywords: Workaholism, workaholic, cynicism, organizational cynicism, school

[i]Correspondence e-mail: mehmetakif.helvaci@usak.edu.tr, orbaybasaran@msn.com

1. Introduction

The person turns from the consuming to the producing one while working. Jobholders find a more reliable position in the society and thus have the opportunity to improve their social environment. By participating in meetings, seminars or forums related to their fields of study, they make new friends and become free. In this context, the importance of work can be summarized as working and having a job is at a noteworthy centre in an individual's life. Work enables people to continue their lives more effortlessly and comfortably by allowing them to fulfil their social, economic and divine needs. Individuals meet the needs of themselves and their families by creating economic value and earning money in their working lives (Yıldırım, 2007). The role of work in human life has been conceptualized in various ways throughout history: from a curse (Ancient Greece) to the methods of humanity to compare itself to the divine (Renaissance); it extends from the act of self-realization (Marx) to the act of self-rejection (Freud) (Hardy, 1990). Sevimli and İşcan (2005) defined work as an effort in the organization that takes place in a certain time period, develops some relations by nature and creates products and services for a fee. The way of performing high performance in many areas such as occupational and socioeconomic where development is sustained depends on the individual's self-realization. Today, the person's reputation and career are based on professional qualifications or the ability of troubleshooting than others; more and more people see their job as a high spot in their life (Bayraktaroğlu & Dosaliyeva, 2016). Klimova and Barabanschikova (2015) states that this aptitude cannot be perceived as simply bad because the work increases self-confidence. On the contrary, heavy working rhythm, increasing duties and responsibilities in working life can adversely affect employee behaviour. From this standpoint, work can become a means rather than an end for the individual. If this process is foreseen, the negative actions may lessen the organization's member performance and drag the individual towards professional deformation. One of these types of professional deformation is workaholism.

Oates (1971); Seybold and Salomone (1994) view workaholism as an addiction. They state that the importance of workaholism must be recognized by individuals and organizations. Organizational cynicism, like workaholism is one of the factors to be considered in educational organizations. Cynicism is derived from the concept of "cynic" that appeared in Ancient Greece as a philosophical model of thought in 500 BC (Kasalak and Aksu, 2014). Cynics, following the individual not the organization is the natural unit of human life, believed that the "cherished institutions" (e.g. state or religious authorities) were non-natural and redundant (Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar, 1998). Cynics clearly despised such institutions and humour was the cynics' favourite argument (Mack, 1993). Reichers and Wanous (1997) defined organizational cynicism as a negative attitude that develops as a result of improper exploitation of the organization or the individual representing the organization.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Workaholism

Wayne Oates (1971) defined the term workaholism for the first time as "uninterrupted or uncontrollable need for individuals to deal with their work such that harms their health, happiness, relations with people and their social lives" (McMillan, O'Driscoll, Marsh and Brady, 2001). Since then, researches on workaholism has been ongoing around disputes surrounding how the structure should be defined and measured. For instance; workaholism is defined as an addiction (Oates,

1971; Killinger, 1991; Ng, Sorensen & Feldman, 2007; Porter, 1996; Robinson, 1996), as a pathological incident (Fassel, 1990), as an ongoing behaviour (high work driven and work involvement and low working enjoyment) in many organizations (Naughton, 1987; Spence and Robbins, 1992; Scott, Moore and Miceli, 1997; Buelens ve Poelmans, 2004) and as a syndrome (Vodanovich and Piotrowski, 2006) (Douglas ve Morris, 2006).

The most widely used definition of workaholism was developed by Spence and Robbins (1992) (Kanai, Wakabayashi and Fling, 1996; Bonebright et al., 2000; Burke, 2000). Authors states that a workaholic is highly addicted person on the job and spends a lot of time at work. Workaholics experience acturience or coercion not because of external demands or pleasure in their work but caused by an inner pressure that leads to feelings of distress and guilt when not working (Spence and Robbins, 1992). Workaholism is pathological, which means an individual is addicted to working process and this becomes an increasingly fatal disease (Fassel, 1990). According to the author; the employee's non-business (personal) life is so deeply hooked on work that personal life becomes unmanageable. Porter (1996) defines workaholism as an excessive work involvement based on the instincts of neglecting other areas of life and pursuing behaviour beyond the organization's requirements. On the contrary, Machlowitz (1980) states that the distinguishing characteristic of workaholics is not their spent time at work, but their attitude towards work. She argues that the workaholism is motivated not by material income but by "divine satisfaction" from responsibility, purpose, opportunity and recognition (Seybold and Salomone, 1994). Workaholism is the individual's dedication of fixed and considerable time to work-related activities that do not result from external needs (Snir & Harpaz, 2004). Vodanovich and Piotrowski (2006) expanded the previous definitions and conceptualized workaholism as a syndrome that progressed at ever worse stages. In the early stages; workaholic behaviours arise as a result of individual differences, responsibilities and stress. At this stage, there are workaholic attitudes, but they do not interrupt the daily work. In the later stages, these behaviours intensify to the point of intervention in the individual's life and this cycle repeats. When the syndrome is fully manifested, work strengthens the behaviour, consumes the individual life and renders it dysfunctional. At this last stage; workaholic syndrome causes the employee to neglect all other aspects of life, including family, social relationships and individual health. In an effort to reconcile these miscellaneous perspectives, common characteristics of all these definitions can be listed as follows: (a) the feeling of being forced to work due to inner pressure, (b) having thoughts about the work, even when out of work, (c) regardless of the negative consequences (e.g. marital breakdown) to work beyond organizational or basic economic requirements.

In theory and practice, workaholism and commitment to work can often be confused. Work commitment can be defined as positive, satisfying and work-related attitude characterized by energy, dedication and commitment" (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002). Authors states that work commitment is a state of mind that is composed of dimensions of vigor, dedication and absorption and provides intrinsic satisfaction for work. Work commitment is the affective and intellectual commitment of the employee to the organization or the amount of the employees' voluntary effort in their organizations (Saks, 2006). While workaholism is associated with negative consequences, commitment to work is often linked to positive ones. For instance, workaholics experience more interpersonal conflict at the workplace, are less satisfied with their jobs, have more work-family conflict, and their social relations outside of work are weaker than non-workaholic employees. In addition, their life satisfaction is low and they experience a high

level of workload and health complaints (Scott, Moore ve Miceli, 1997). In contrast, committed employees are more satisfied with their jobs and are more dedicated to their organization, take more initiative, perform better, have less intention to severance, and show less absenteeism at work. In addition, committed employees take time to socialize, deal with hobbies and volunteer work, have high life satisfaction, good mental and physical health (Schaufeli, Bakker and Van Rhenen, 2009).

2.2. Organizational Cynicism

Cynicism has historical roots that go back to ancient Greek literature. It was originally derived from the Greek word "kyon" (dog) (Dean et al., 1998). Cynical believed that social convention was not natural, and that this lifestyle adopted by the overall society should be avoided as much as possible on behalf of independence and self-sufficiency that characterizes a good life (Brandes et al., 1998). Cynicals rejected everything on behalf of the world materialism and adopted a modest model of living. They severely criticize people's selfishness and political order, and in doing so they are not part of the life model they criticized (Helvacı, 2013). Ancient Greek cynicals had adopted high moral standards and mercilessly ridiculed those who could not provide these virtues (Dudley, 1937). The first researches defined cynicism as dislike and suspicion for others (Cook & Medley, 1954). Cynicism describes a general or specific attitude that shows disappointment, hopelessness, and anger towards an individual, group, or organization (Andersson and Bateman, 1997). Last definitions of cynicism are characterized by scepticism, distrust, negativity and doubt (Erdost et al., 2007). Today, cynics do not find it beneficial to adhere to ethical values strongly; on the contrary, they detach themselves from the "evils" that they believe are approved by the society (Kanter & Mirvis, 1989). Cynics can undermine leaders, organizations, and their practices (Goldfarb, 1991).

Organizational cynicism has been associated with a number of negative factors such as indifference, severance, alienation, hopelessness, lack of confidence in others, scepticism, frustration, poor performance, interpersonal conflicts, absenteeism, burnout (Andersson, 1996). Brandes et al. (1998) defined organizational cynicism as an unfavourable attitude towards the organization with three dimensions: (1) the belief that the organization's lack of integrity, (2) negative feelings towards the organization, and (3) sarcastic and critical attitude towards the organization. Organizational cynicism is a complex structure that includes three aspects of human actions (affective, cognitive and behavioural) (Arslan, 2018). The affective dimension consists of negative beliefs and feelings such as anger, disrespect, and shame (Abraham, 2000). Cynicism is not a compassionate judgment about the organization, it may include strong emotional responses. The cognitive dimension explains that a person experiencing cynicism displays unreliable behaviours (e.g. telling a lie or engaging in deceptive practices) (Brown & Gregan, 2008). Organizational cynics believe that organizational activities do not comply with principles such as fairness, honesty and sincerity. They believe that these principles are often sacrificed to organizational benefits and that unprincipled behaviours are standard. The behavioural dimension of organizational cynicism can trigger pessimism, resulting in complete despair. This tendency promotes aggressive behaviours that negatively affect motivation and organizational commitment. Organizational cynics may show a predisposition to make pessimistic predictions about the future action process of the organization. They may think that an important organizational enterprise will be abandoned as soon as it is costly (Reichers, Wanous ve Austin, 1997). The behavioural dimension that turns the cynicism of employees explicitly or implicitly into action is the key for

conceptualizing such as worsening hostile drives, alienation, psychological burnout and severance, loss of faith in those who lead change, or insecurity towards a person, group, ideology or organization. It was stated in the study of Bommer et al. (2005) that the results of the behavioural dimension were exacerbated due to the perception of advocacy and sense of injustice in the organization. In addition, organizational cynicism can be defined by employees as a form of self-defence, a way to face frustrated or disappointing events (Reichers et al., 1997). Organizational cynicism is a peculiar attitude that sees the work as oppressive, dissatisfying and worthless effort (Stern, Stone, Hopkins, and McMillion, 1990). A research including the relationship between organizational cynicism and work values has defined cynicism as a specific negative working attitude and showed that organizational cynicism is not associated with a stable personality trait (Guastello et al., 1992). Similarly, another research has defined organizational cynicism as an attitude of pessimism and despair caused by repeated exposure to mismanaged organizational policies (Wanous et al., 1994). Most studies that examine organizational cynicism propose that cynicism has a significant negative and sustained effect on individual and organizational effectiveness. Thus, organizational cynicism is associated with reducing organizational citizenship behaviour, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, motivation and intention to change (Rubin et al., 2009).

3. Research Objective

When we look at the results of workaholism from a temporal perspective, it can be expected that results of being a workaholic will be more negative in the long term. In particular, job and career satisfaction can fluctuate very quickly in work environments and organizations, and therefore the increase in workaholic behaviour can lead to short-term positive results for teachers themselves. However, in longer term, ongoing perfectionism, distrust of others, poor mental and physical health of workaholics can negatively affect the proper functioning of their own work, the quality of teamwork, the communication and morale quality in the working groups of the organization. Another important concept for educational organizations is cynicism. Cynicism is a congenital personality trait and reflects negative views on human behaviour. Organizational cynicism is a negative attitude that a person gained as a result of his experiences against his organization. While cynicism focuses on individual causes, organizational cynicism focuses on intra-organizational causes.

As can be understood from the definitions and explanations given, it is evaluated that the findings obtained from this research will provide practical data for all staff working in educational organizations. Furthermore, when literature is examined, the relationship between workaholism and organizational cynicism focuses not on educational organizations but on business and other sectors. In local literature, it was observed that organizational cynicism and other variables (e.g. burnout, organizational commitment, communication skills, perception of organizational justice) were studied in educational organizations, but workaholism and organizational cynicism were not.

In the research, teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels are discussed. It is evaluated that studying the relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels will contribute to the literature. In this context, answers of the following subproblems were sought:

1. Do the workaholism levels of teachers differ by gender, year of seniority, years of service in the organization they work in, school type, school level and branch variables?

2. Do the organizational cynicism levels of teachers differ by gender, year of seniority, years of service in the organization they work in, school type, school level and branch variables?

3. Is there a relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels?

4. Material and Method

In this section, material about the research model, population and sample selection, data collection tool, data analysis, validity and reliability studies of the research are given.

4.1. Research Model

This research is a descriptive correlational survey model since it is a study to designate the relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels. Descriptive relational survey model is a research model that describes the relationship between the variables that cause this situation and the degree of this effect and relationship (Kaya, Balay and Göçen, 2012).

4.2. Population and Sample

The population of this research consists of teachers working in public and private pre-school, primary, secondary and high schools affiliated to the Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education in Gaziemir district of İzmir province in 2018-2019 Academic Year. School administrators, with multigrade classrooms, guidance research centres, special education teachers, science and art centres were not included in the research population as a limitation. In a consequence, the realistic population was used. Altunışık et al. (2005) define realistic population as the population that the researcher creates by taking certain constraints into account. After the limitation, 44 schools and 1364 teachers constitute the population of the research. In sample selection, theoretical sample size chart was used. Balcı (2011) stated that the sample size required for 95% confidence level, a=.05 significance level and 5% tolerance level will be at least 300 in the studies with 5000-10000 population. Thus, the sample of the research consists of 367 teachers selected with simple random sampling model.

4.3. Data Collection Instruments

As a data collection instrument; to investigate workaholism levels of teachers 4-point Likert-type, 25-item and four-dimensional "Workaholism Scale (WS)" developed by Robinson (1989) and was adapted into Turkish by Apaydın (2011) was used. In order to investigate organizational cynicism levels of teachers, 5-point Likert-type, 13-item and three-dimensional "Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS)" adapted into Turkish by Kalağan (2009) was used.

Exploratory factor analysis was applied to ensure the construct validity of the Workaholism Scale. The factor analysis was decided to be interpreted based on the results of KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy) and Bartlett Sphericity Test. KMO tests the suitability of the relationships between the variables and sample data in creating a dimension and its value varies 0-1. The high KMO value indicates that each variable in the scale can be estimated perfectly by other variables, and the acceptable lower limit for sampling adequacy is 0.50 (Şencan, 2005). Bartlett Sphericity Test is a test that determines whether there is a sufficient relationship between variables. In this test, p value less than .05 means that there is a sufficient relationship between variables to apply exploratory factor analysis (Sipahi, Yurtkoru, and Zinc, 2006).

In Workaholism Scale (WS), 4-point Likert scale was used to determine the reactions to the items. This scale is listed as "never=1, sometimes=2, often=3, always=4". Four dimensions of the measuring instrument; "compulsive tendencies" consisting of 9 items, "control" consisting of 7 items, "impaired communication/self-absorption" consisting of 5 items, and "self-worth" consisting of 2 items. Apaydın (2011, p.115) stated that as a result of confirmatory factor analysis, items 1, 8 and 14 in the scale were removed from the analysis and the four-factor structure of the scale was confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis. WS score value range is: 1.00-1.75=never, 1.76-2.49=sometimes, 2.50-3.24=often, 3.25-4.00=always. The KMO value calculated for the interpretation of the factor analysis was found as .87 and the Bartlett value as 2174,850. Both KMO and Barlett values show that WS has validity. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis of the data on the WS, it was observed that it was a 4-dimensional scale with a factor load of over .40. These results are compatible with the results of Apaydın (2011), who adapted the scale to Turkish. In addition, the reliability of the scale was examined with an internal consistency coefficient. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found as .81 on compulsive tendency, as .79 on control, as .83 on impaired communication/self-absorption and as .86 on self-worth sub-dimensions. Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was .86.

In Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS), 5-point Likert scale was used to determine the reactions to the items. This scale is listed as "strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, partly agree=3, agree=4", strongly agree=5". Three dimensions of the measuring instrument; "cognitive" consisting of 5 items, "affective" consisting of 4 items, and "behavioural" consisting of 4 items. OCS score value range is: 1.00-1.79=strongly disagree, 1.80-2.59=disagree, 2.60-3.59=partly agree, 3.40-4.19=agree, and 4.20–5.00=strongly agree. The KMO value calculated for the interpretation of the factor analysis was found as .92 and the Bartlett value as 4038,609. OCS has a high level of validity since the values higher than 0,90 for KMO value are considered to be excellent (Kalağan, 2009). As a result of the exploratory factor analysis of the data on the OCS, it was observed that it was a 3-dimensional scale with a factor load of over .40. These results are compatible with the results of Kalağan (2009), who adapted the scale to Turkish. In addition, the reliability of the scale was examined with an internal consistency coefficient. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found as .76 on cognitive and affective, and as .80 on behavioural sub-dimensions. Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the scale was calculated as .83. All these results show that Workaholism Scale (WS) and Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS) are valid and reliable.

4.4. Data Analyze

The scale used in this research consists of three parts. In the first part, demographic characteristics of teachers are included; in the second part, Workaholism Scale and in the third part there is Organizational Cynicism Scale. SPSS 24.0 program was used to obtain the frequency and percentage values of the demographic information of the participants in the first section, whether there is a significant difference between the demographic information with the second and third sections, and the correlation between each other. The level of significance in analyses was tested at .05 and the findings were presented in tabular form. In addition, parametric tests can be used when the skewness and kurtosis values are between +2.00 and -2.00 or when they are very close to the normal distribution. In this context, skewness and kurtosis values, stem-and-leaf plot and box plot graphics were examined and it was determined that the data were normally distributed. For this reason, parametric tests were used in the analysis of the data. In cases where parametric

test assumptions were not met, nonparametric tests were used. According to the demographic characteristics of the participants independent samples t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Kruskal Wallis H test were used to compare the scores obtained for the workaholism and organizational cynicism variables discussed in the study. Tukey was preferred as the post-hoc test. In nonparametric tests, paired comparison test with Bonferroni correction method was used. Correlation (r) analysis was conducted to study the relationship between workaholism and organizational cynicism and their sub-dimensions.

5. Findings

Within the scope of this research, frequency and percentage distributions of the variables are given firstly in Table 1.

Table 1. Statistical Distribution and Descriptive Analysis of Teachers' Demographic Information (n=367)

Variable		f	%
Gender	Female	298	81,2
	Male	69	18,8
Year of Seniority	1-5 year	62	16,9
	6-10 year	59	16,1
	11-15 year	69	18,8
	16-20 year	49	13,4
	21 years and above	128	34,9
Year of Service in the Organization	1-5 year	211	57,5
	6-10 year	101	27,5
	11-15 year	35	9,5
	16-20 year	11	3,0
	21 years and above	9	2,5
School Type	Public School	226	61,6
	Private School	141	38,4
School Level	Pre-school	31	8,4
	Primary	119	32,4
	Secondary	87	23,7
	High School	130	35,4
Branch	Classroom Teacher	115	31,3
	Branch Teacher	252	68,7
TOTAL		**367**	**100**

When Table 1 is analyzed; it can be said that female teachers constitute the majority of the sample (n=298; 81.2%). When the distribution of teachers according to their years of seniority are examined, it shows that the teachers who have seniority of 21 years and above (n=128; 34.9%) constitute the majority but every seniority group is reached. It is seen that the majority of the sample group (n=211; 57.5%) consists of teachers whose service year is 1 to 5 years. It can be said that the number of teachers working in public schools (n=226; 61.6%) is the majority. When the distribution of teachers according to the level of the schools they work in is examined, it can be said that the distribution is homogeneous except for the pre-school level (n=31; 8.4%). When the distribution of teachers according to their branch is analyzed, it is seen that branch teachers are the majority (n=252; 68.7%). The main reason for this situation is that secondary and high school teachers are branch teachers and therefore they constitute the majority.

In the following section, there are findings and comments regarding the mean and standard deviation of the responses by teachers to the 25 items of Workaholism Scale (WS).

Table 2: Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the WS

Dimensions	Workaholism Scale Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
Control	2. I get impatient when I have to wait for someone else or when something takes too long, such as long, slow-moving lines.	2,84	,832
	4. I get irritated when I am interrupted while I am in the middle of sth.	2,48	,823
	11. Things do not seem to move fast enough or get done fast enough for me.	2,19	,715
	12. I lose my temper when things don't go my way or work out to suit me.	1,60	,743
	16. I get angry when people don't meet my standards of perfection.	1,65	,746
	17. I get upset when I am in situations where I cannot be in control.	2,35	,767
	22. I get upset with myself for making even the smallest mistake.	2,58	,907
Self-worth	9. It is important that I see the concrete results of what I do.	3,48	,648
	10. I am more interested in the final result of my work than in the process.	2,33	,880
Compulsive Tendencies	3. I seem to be in a hurry and racing against the clock.	2,48	,914
	5. I stay busy and keep many irons in the fire.	2,63	,759
	6. I find myself doing two or three things at one time such as eating lunch and writing a memo, while talking on the phone.	2,67	,766
	7. I overly commit myself by biting off more than I can chew.	2,30	,828
	15. I find myself continuing to work after my co-workers have called it quits.	1,83	,667
	18. I put myself under pressure with self-imposed deadlines when I work	2,28	,810
	19. It is hard for me to relax when I am not working.	2,25	,897
	20. I spend more time working than on socializing with friends, on hobbies, or on leisure activities.	2,36	,872
Impaired Communic. (Self-absorption)	13. I ask the same question over again, without realizing it, after I've already been given the answer once.	1,60	,653
	21. I dive into projects to get a head start before all phases have been finalized.	1,63	,759
	23. I put more thought, time, and energy into my work than I do into my relationships with friends and loved ones.	2,24	,874
	24. I forget, ignore, or minimize birthdays, reunions, anniversaries, holidays.	1,57	,746
	25. I make important decisions before I have all the facts and have a chance to think them through thoroughly.	1,43	,627
General Average		**2,26**	**,40**

When Table 2 is analyzed, it is seen that teachers' responses to the Workaholism Scale have a general arithmetic mean of $\bar{x}$=2.26 and this mean corresponds to the "sometimes" idea in the WS score value range scale. In return for this value, it can be said that the teachers working in Gaziemir district of İzmir province and participating in the research are "partially workaholic". Scale item 9 "It is important that I see the concrete results of what I do" has the highest average value ($\bar{x}$=3,48) and the item 25 "I make important decisions before I have all the facts and have a chance to think them through thoroughly" has the lowest average value ($\bar{x}$=1,43). According to these findings, teachers want to see the concrete, visible results of their activities at school and it is seen that teachers make important decisions after detailed planning.

Mean and the standard deviation values of the responses regarding the sub-dimensions of control, self-worth, compulsive tendencies, and impaired communication of the WS are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the Sub-Dimensions of WS

Sub-Dimensions of WS	$\bar{x}$	Skewness	Kurtosis	SD
Control	2,24	,519	-,265	,52
Self-worth	2,90	,015	-,332	,60
Compulsive tendencies	2,35	,154	-,103	,52
Impaired communication (Self-absorption)	1,69	,764	,845	,45
Workaholism (General)	2,26	,321	,100	,40

When Table 3 is analyzed, mean of *control* is $\bar{x}$=2.24 in "sometimes"; *self-worth* is $\bar{x}$=2.90 in "often"; *compulsive tendencies* is $\bar{x}$=2.35 in "sometimes"; *impaired communication* is $\bar{x}$=1.69 in "never" value ranges. In this regard, it is seen that *self-worth* has the highest and "*impaired communication*" has the lowest mean among the four sub-dimensions. In the light of these data, it can be said that teachers in schools are concerned with the outcome of the work rather than the process to get concrete feedback, but they avoid behaviours that may cause communication failure.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the gender independent variable. Findings show that in control ($\bar{x}$=2.25) and self-worth ($\bar{x}$=2.92) sub-dimensions female teachers' scores are higher than male teachers, but this difference is not statistically significant (p>,05). However, in compulsive tendencies ($\bar{x}$=2.41) sub-dimension, this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In impaired communication ($\bar{x}$=1,67) sub-dimension female teachers' scores are lower than male teachers but this difference is not statistically significant (p>,05). When the distribution of the opinions of teachers about general workaholism female teachers' scores ($\bar{x}$=2.28) are higher than male teachers and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, it can be said that the gender difference in teachers has partially changed the opinions of teachers about workaholism and sub-dimensions.

One-way ANOVA analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the year of seniority variable. Findings show that the highest score belongs to teachers with seniority of 21 years and above ($\bar{x}$=2.32) and the lowest score belongs to teachers with seniority of 1-5 years ($\bar{x}$=2.18). However, these differences in workaholism and sub-dimensions within the year of seniority variable are not statistically significant (p>,05). In other words, as teachers' seniority years change, their views on workaholism do not differ.

Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the year of service in the organization. Findings show that teachers' score values differ in terms of control, compulsive tendencies sub-dimensions and general workaholism (p<, 05). In order to determine this difference between groups with statistically difference, paired comparison test was conducted.

Table 4: Paired Comparison Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Groups

Dependant Variable	(I) Year of Service in The Organization	(J) Year of Service in The Organization	Statistics	S.E.	p
Control	6-10 Year	1-5 Year	-42,218	12,786	**,010****
Compulsive tendencies	6-10 Year	1-5 Year	-39,179	12,798	**,022***
Workaholism (General)	6-10 Year	1-5 Year	-39,785	-3,099	**,019***

*<0,05; **<0,01

When Table 4 is analyzed; in the control sub-dimension; teachers who have 6-10 years (MR=211.05) of service at the school have higher scores than teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=168.83). In the compulsive tendencies sub-dimension; teachers who have 6-10 years (MR=212.25) of service at the school have higher scores than the teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=173.07). In Workaholism (General), teachers who have 6-10 years (MR=210,34) of service at the school have higher scores than teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=170,55) and all of three differences are statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, it can be said that as the years of service at the school change, teachers' thoughts about workaholism and sub-dimensions differ partially.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the school type variable. Findings show that the scores of teachers working in public schools ($\bar{x}$=1.73) are higher than teachers working in private schools ($\bar{x}$=1.63) and this difference is statistically significant only in impaired communication sub-dimension (p<.05). As the working status of teachers changes in public or private school, their views on workaholism and its sub-dimensions do not differ.

One-way ANOVA analysis was applied to determine if there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the school level variable. Later, Tukey HSD test was conducted to determine the difference between the groups with statistically differences and the findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Tukey HSD Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Groups

Dependant Variable	(I) Level	(J) Level	Average Score Difference (I-J)	S.E.	p
Control	High School	Primary School	,18920	,06484	**,020***
Impaired communication	High School	Pre-School	,25032	,08986	**,029***

*<0,05

When Table 5 is analyzed findings show that in the control sub-dimension, the score of teachers working at high school ($\bar{x}$ =2.34) level is higher than the teachers working at primary school ($\bar{x}$ =2.15) level and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In addition, scores of teachers working at high school ($\bar{x}$ =1.76) level are higher than that of pre-school ($\bar{x}$ =1.51) teachers, and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, it can be said that as teachers' working levels of school change, their opinions about workaholism and sub-dimensions do not differ.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the workaholism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the branch variable. Findings show that branch teachers' ($\bar{x}$=2.26) scores are same with the classroom teachers scores, but this is not statistically significant (p>,05). In other words, it can be said that as teachers' branches change, their opinions about workaholism and sub-dimensions do not differ.

In the following section, there are findings and comments regarding the mean and standard deviation of the responses by teachers to the 13 items of Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS).

Table 6: Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the OCS

Dimensions	Organizational Cynicism Scale Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
Cognitive	1. I believe that my company says one thing and does another.	2,28	1,01
	2. My company's policies, goals, and practices seem to have little in common	2,07	0,87
	3. If an application was said to be done in my company, I'd be more sceptical whether it would happen or not.	2,02	0,92
	4. My company expects one thing of its employees, but rewards another.	2,11	0,96
	5. In my company I see very little resemblance between the events that are going to be done and the events which are done.	2,06	0,91
Affective	6. When I think about my company, I get angry.	1,56	0,75
	7. When I think about my company, I experience aggravation.	1,49	0,72
	8. When I think about my company, I experience tension.	1,56	0,80
	9. When I think about my company, I feel a sense of anxiety.	1,63	0,86
Behavioral	10. I complain about what is going on at work to my friends at the outside.	1,96	0,99
	11. We look at each other in a meaningful way with my colleagues when my institution and its employees are mentioned.	2,01	1,01
	12. I talk with others about how work is being carried out in the company.	2,54	1,12
	13. I criticize the practices and policies of my company to people outside the organization.	2,15	1,01
TOTAL		**1,96**	**0,68**

When Table 6 is analyzed, it is seen that teachers' responses to the Organizational Cynicism Scale have a general arithmetic mean of $\bar{x}$=1.96 and this mean corresponds to the "disagree" in the OCS score value range scale. In return for this value, it can be said that the teachers working in Gaziemir district of İzmir province and participating in the research are "not cynical" towards their organizations. Scale item 12 "I talk with others about how work is being carried out in the organization" has the highest average value ($\bar{x}$=2,54) and the item 7 "When I think about my company, I experience aggravation" has the lowest average value ($\bar{x}$=1,49). According to these findings, teachers do not experience aggravation when they think about the organization they work for while sharing how their work activities are carried out at school.

Mean and the standard deviation values of the responses regarding the sub-dimensions of cognitive, affective, and behavioural of the OCS are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of the Sub-Dimensions of OCS

Sub-Dimensions of OCS	$\bar{x}$	Skewness	Kurtosis	SD
Cognitive	2,11	,632	,221	0,79
Affective	1,56	1,434	2,133	0,74
Behavioural	2,16	,431	-,291	0,84
Organizational Cynicism (General)	1,96	,780	,390	0,68

When Table 7 is analyzed, mean of cognitive is $\bar{x}$=2.11 in "disagree"; affective is $\bar{x}$=1.56 in "strongly disagree" and behavioural is $\bar{x}$=2.16 in "disagree" value ranges. In the light of these data, teachers show their possible cynical attitudes towards their organizations by complaining to their friends outside the organization about what is happening at work, by looking at the people they work with in a meaningful way, by talking about how things are done in their organizations

with people outside the organization, by criticizing practices and policies of their organizations, in other words with their behaviours.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the gender independent variable. Findings show that for cognitive sub-dimension, male teachers' scores ($\bar{x}$=2.31) are higher than female teachers ($\bar{x}$=2.06) and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). There is no statistically significant difference for other two sub-dimensions and general organizational cynicism (p>,05). In other words, it can be said that being a male or a female teacher does not differ their opinions about organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions.

One-way ANOVA analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the year of seniority variable. Findings show that teachers' scores differ in terms of cognitive, affective sub-dimensions and general organizational cynicism (p<,05). Later, Tukey HSD test was conducted to determine the difference between the groups with statistically differences and the findings are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Tukey HSD Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Groups

Dependant Variable	(I) Year of Seniority	(J) Year of Seniority	Average Score Difference (I-J)	S.E.	p
Cognitive	21 years and above	1-5 year	,44229*	,11914	**,000****
		6-10 year	,49838*	,12116	**,000****
Affective	21 years and above	6-10 year	,34454*	,11422	**,020***
Organizational Cynicism (General)	21 years and above	1-5 year	,32553*	,10376	**,020***
		6-10 year	,41061*	,10552	**,000****

*<0,05; **<0,01

When Table 8 is analyzed findings show in the cognitive sub-dimension, teachers who have 21 years and above seniority ($\bar{x}$=2.34) have higher scores than both 1-5 years ($\bar{x}$=1.90) and 6-10 years ($\bar{x}$=1.84) of seniority and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In affective sub-dimension, teachers who have 21 years and above seniority ($\bar{x}$=1.73) have higher scores than 6-10 years ($\bar{x}$=1.39) of seniority and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In organizational cynicism (general), teachers who have 21 years and above seniority ($\bar{x}$=2.14) have higher scores than both 1-5 years ($\bar{x}$=1.81) and 6-10 years ($\bar{x}$=1.73) of seniority and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, as teachers' years of seniority change, their thoughts about organizational cynicism differ partially.

Kruskal Wallis H test was applied to determine if there is a significant difference according to the organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the year of service in the organization. Findings show that teachers' score values differ in all three sub-dimensions (cognitive, affective, behavioural) and general organizational cynicism (p<,05). In order to determine this difference between groups with statistically difference, paired comparison test was conducted.

Table 9: Paired Comparison Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Groups

Dependant Variable	(I) Year of Service in The Organization	(J) Year of Service in The Organization	Statistics	S.E.	p
Cognitive	11-15 Year	1-5 Year	-,65,377	12,766	**,007***
Affective	11-15 Year	1-5 Year	-54,524	17,794	**,022***
Behavioural	-	-	-	-	**No Difference**
Organizational Cynicism (Gen.)	11-15 Year	1-5 Year	-65,181	19,356	**,008****

*<0,05; **<0,01

When Table 9 is analyzed; in the cognitive sub-dimension; teachers who have 11-15 years (MR=232,50) of service at the school have higher scores than teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=167,12). In the affective sub-dimension; teachers who have 11-15 years (MR=227,13) of service at the school have higher scores than the teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=172,60). In behavioural sub-dimension; teachers who have 11-15 years (MR=229,47) of service at the school have higher scores than all others but the results of the paired comparisons test were not significant. In organizational cynicism (general), teachers who have 11-15 years (MR=236,71) of service at the school have higher scores than teachers who have a service year of 1-5 years (MR=171,53) and all of three differences are statistically significant ($p<,05$). In other words, as teachers' years of service at the school change, their thoughts about organizational cynicism and its sub-dimensions differ partially.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to the organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the school type variable.

Table 10: Independent T-Test Results of Teachers' OC Levels According to School Type Variable

Variable	School Type	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	t	p
Cognitive	Public	226	2,21	0,79	3,256	**,001****
	Private	141	1,94	0,76	3,290	
Affective	Public	226	1,65	0,74	3,042	**,003****
	Private	141	1,41	0,71	3,076	
Behavioural	Public	226	2,28	0,79	3,436	**,001****
	Private	141	1,98	0,88	3,356	
Organizational Cynicism (General)	Public	226	2,06	0,68	3,765	**,000****
	Private	141	1,79	0,67	3,777	

**<0,01

When Table 10 is analyzed, findings show that teachers' opinions about organizational cynicism and its sub-dimensions differ as their working status changes in public or private schools.

One-way ANOVA analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the school level variable. Later, Tukey HSD test was conducted to determine the difference between the groups with statistically differences and the findings are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Tukey HSD Test Results Regarding the Difference Between Groups

Dependant Variable	(I) Level	(J) Level	Average Score Difference (I-J)	S.E.	p
Cognitive	Secondary	Pre-school	,45821[*]	0,16006	**,020***
	High School	Pre-school	,66104[*]	0,15295	**,000****
		Primary	,39392[*]	0,09708	**,000****
Affective	High School	Pre-school	,50924[*]	0,14266	**,000****
		Primary	,39546[*]	0,09055	**,000****
Behavioural	High School	Pre-school	,61036[*]	0,16495	**,000****
Organizational Cynicism (General)	Secondary	Pre-school	,41833[*]	0,13822	**,010***
	High School	Pre-school	,59874[*]	0,13208	**,000****
		Primary	,35454[*]	0,08384	**,000****

*<0,05; **<0,01

When Table 11 is analyzed, findings show that in the cognitive sub-dimension, teachers who work at the secondary level school ($\bar{x}$=2.14) have higher scores than teachers who work at the level of pre-school ($\bar{x}$=1.68). Scores of teachers working at high school level ($\bar{x}$=2.34) are higher than both pre-school ($\bar{x}$=1.68) and primary school ($\bar{x}$=1.94) teachers, and these differences are statistically significant (p<,05). In affective sub-dimension; scores of teachers working at high school ($\bar{x}$=1.77) level are higher than both pre-school ($\bar{x}$=1.26) and primary school ($\bar{x}$=1.37) teachers, and these differences are statistically significant (p<,05). In behavioural sub-dimension; the scores of teachers working at high school level ($\bar{x}$=2.34) are higher than the teachers working at preschool level ($\bar{x}$=1.73) and this difference is statistically significant (p<,05). When the distribution of teachers' scores for general organizational cynicism is examined; the score of teachers working at secondary school ($\bar{x}$=1.98) level is higher than the teachers working at pre-school level ($\bar{x}$=1.57). Scores of teachers working at high school level ($\bar{x}$=2.16) are higher than both pre-school ($\bar{x}$=1.57) and primary school ($\bar{x}$=1.81) levels, and these differences are statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, as teachers' school levels change, their opinions about organizational cynicism and its sub-dimensions differ partially.

Independent t-test analysis was applied to determine whether there is a significant difference according to organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions levels of teachers and the branch variable. Findings show that for all sub-dimensions (cognitive, affective, behavioural) and organizational cynicism (general) branch teachers' scores are higher than the classroom teachers scores (respectively: $\bar{x}$=2.20; $\bar{x}$=1.65; $\bar{x}$=2.22; $\bar{x}$=2.03) and these are statistically significant (p<,05). In other words, it can be said being a classroom or a branch teacher partially changed the opinions about organizational cynicism and its sub-dimensions.

In the following section, there are findings and comments regarding the third sub-problem "Is there a relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels?" Pearson Correlation Analysis was used for the findings of this last sub-problem of the study. Correlation is a statistical technique that is used to measure and describe a relationship between two variables and their sizes, directions and importance. The Pearson coefficient is indicated by the symbol "r". The number "r" ranges from "-1" to "+1". The value approaching +1 indicates the

perfection of the positive relationship; approaching -1 indicates the excellence of the negative relationship. If the value is "0.00" it means that there is no relationship between these variables. Relationship level "0.00-0.29" has low level of relationship; "0.30-0.70" has moderate level of relationship; "0.71-0.99" has strong relationship; "1.00" has perfect relationship (Köklü et al., 2006).

Correlation analysis were examined with Workaholism (control, self-worth, compulsive tendencies, impaired communication/self-absorption) and Organizational Cynicism (cognitive, affective, behavioural) and the findings are given in Table 12.

Table 12: Correlation Analysis Results of Teachers' Workaholism and Organizational Cynicism Levels

		Control	Self-Worth	Compulsive Tendencies	Impaired Communic. / Self-absorption	Workaholism (General)	Cognitive	Affective	Behavioural	Organizational Cynicism (General)
Control	r	1								
	p									
Self-Worth	r	,407**	1							
	p	,000								
Compulsive Tendencies	r	,594**	,284**	1						
	p	,000	,000							
Impaired Communic. / Self-absorption	r	,455**	,252**	,481**	1					
	p	,000	,000	,000						
Workaholism (General)	r	,819**	,688**	,779**	,700**	1				
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000					
Cognitive	r	,324**	,031	,144**	,257**	,243**	1			
	p	,000	,548	,006	,000	,000				
Affective	r	,300**	-,056	,098	,213**	,173**	,663**	1		
	p	,000	0,289	,061	,000	,001	,000			
Behavioural	r	,216**	-,028	0,085	,193**	,146**	,609**	,612**	1	
	p	,000	0,586	,102	,000	,005	,000	,000		
Organizational Cynicism (General)	r	,321**	-,019	,126*	,254**	,215**	,873**	,865**	,864**	1
	p	,000	,710	,016	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	

*<0,05; **<0,01

As stated by the data in Table 12, there is a statistically significant, positive and low-level relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels (r=0.215, p<,01). According to the correlation coefficient r value, it is seen that this relationship is low (r=0.00-0.29 low level). Accordingly, as teachers' workaholism behaviours increase their organizational cynicism levels increase at a low level. Additionally, when the relationship between the sub-dimensions of workaholism and the organizational cynicism is examined;

In regards to *Control* sub-dimension; there is a statistically significant, positive and moderate relationship between general organizational cynicism (r=0.321, p<01), cognitive dimension (r=0.342, p<,01), and affective dimension (r=0,300, p<,01) but this significant and

positive relation is at low-level between the behavioural dimension (r=0,216, p<,01). Thus, it can be said that as the control behaviour of teachers increases also organizational cynicism increases at a medium level.

In regards to *Self-Worth* sub-dimension; there is a statistically insignificant, negative and low-level relationship between general organizational cynicism (r=-0,019, p>,01), affective dimension (r=-0,056, p>,01), and behavioural dimension (r=-0,028, p>,01). However, there is a statistically insignificant, positive and moderate level relationship between cognitive dimension (r=0,031, p>,01). Thus, it can be said that as teachers' self-worth behaviour increases also organizational cynicism decreases at a low level.

In regards to *Compulsive Tendencies* sub-dimension; there is a statistically significant, positive and low-level relationship between general organizational cynicism (r=0,126, p<,01) and cognitive dimension (r=0,144, p<,01). However, there is a statistically insignificant, positive and low-level relationship between affective dimension (r=0,098, p>,01) and behavioural dimension (r=0,085, p>,01). Thus, it can be said that as teachers' compulsive tendencies increases also organizational cynicism increases at a low level.

In regards to *Impaired Communication/Self-absorption* sub-dimension; there is a statistically significant, positive and low-level relationship between general organizational cynicism (r=0,254, p<,01), cognitive dimension (r=0,257, p<,01), affective dimension (r=0,213, p<,01), and behavioural dimension (r=0,193, p<,01). Thus, it can be said that as teachers' impaired communication/self-absorption behaviour increases also organizational cynicism increases at a low level.

6. Results and Discussion

According to teachers' responses to the Workaholism Scale, the results were found to correspond to the "sometimes" value range. Thereafter, it can be said that the teachers participating in the research are partially workaholics. In addition, it was observed that the mean values of the control and compulsive tendencies dimensions were in "sometimes" value range, the mean value of the self-worth dimension was in the "often" value range, and the mean value of the impaired communication/self-absorption dimension was in "never" value range. In turn, it can be said that teachers in schools are concerned with outcomes of the work rather than the process to get concrete feedback, but they avoid behaviours that may cause communication failure. When we look at the independent variables of the workaholism; it can be said that the gender difference in teachers and the years of service at the school have partially changed their opinions. However, teachers' seniority years, working status of teachers in public or private schools, working levels of school and being a classroom or branch teacher do not differ their opinions about workaholism and sub-dimensions. In the research, differentiating of the results of teachers' workaholism levels in terms of gender and other variables show consistency with the researches by Mucevher et al. (2017), Burke (2000), Burke, Koyuncu, and Fiksenbaum (2008), Harpaz and Snir (2003). Özdemir (2013) stated that primary school classroom teachers have a high level of workaholism. Bardakçı and Baloğlu (2012) stated that the workaholic tendencies of school administrators do not change according to the organization and branch variables, but according to age and seniority. Apaydın (2011) stated that faculty has often workaholic tendencies. Winburn, Reysen, Suddeath and

Perryman (2017) stated that school counsellors working in high schools have a significantly higher tendency to workaholism than primary or secondary levels.

According to teachers' responses to the Organizational Cynicism Scale, the results were found to correspond to the "disagree" value range. Thereafter, it can be said that the teachers participating in the research are "not cynical" towards their schools. In addition, it was observed that the mean values of the cognitive and behavioural dimensions were in "disagree" value range, the mean value of the affective dimension was in "strongly disagree" value range. In other words, teachers do not experience cynicism to their schools they work for. When we look at the independent variables of the organizational cynicism; it can be said that the gender difference in teachers do not differ their opinions about organizational cynicism and sub-dimensions. However, teachers' seniority years, years of service at the school, working levels of school, and being a classroom or branch teacher partially changed their opinions. Working status of teachers in public or private schools differ their opinions. Findings of the research show consistency with the literature. Kalağan and Güzeller (2010) stated that there is a significant relationship between the level of organizational cynicism of teachers and their branches, professional seniorities, educational status and the type of school they work in. Kahveci and Demirtaş (2015) stated that teachers' perceptions of organizational cynicism were "low", and their perceptions of organizational cynicism differed significantly in terms of age, marital status, seniority years, years of service at the school and school type variables.

According to the relationship between teachers' workaholism and organizational cynicism levels, there is a statistically significant, positive and low-level correlation. For control dimension, relationship is at a medium level; for self-worth, compulsive tendencies, and impaired communication/self-absorption dimensions relationship is at low level. There is no study in any field (education, economics, health, etc.) in the foreign and local literature, which directly examines the relationship between workaholism and organizational cynicism. Subtitles and dimensions of the researches are related to the antecedents and successors of workaholism and organizational cynicism. Innanen, Tolvanen and Salmela-Aro (2014) revealed that burnout is significantly associated with cynicism. According to Bakker and Oerlemans (2011), negative indicators of personal well-being in the workplace are burnout and workaholism. Burke and Matthiesen (2004) state that workaholics show more negative emotions and cynicism towards their organizations. Green, Walkey and Taylor (1991) call cynicism as "the core of burnout".

7. Recommendations

a) Since the increased workaholic behaviours of teachers increase their cynical attitudes towards the school, coaching training can be planned for teachers about working effectively and efficiently instead of working long hours.

b) It can be reminded that the sensitive behaviours of the administrators should be continuous since teachers' desire to see the concrete results of their activities at school will motivate them and encourage them for further studies.

c) The distribution of duties can be made by the administration in the way that teachers allocate time and energy for their out-of-school lives as much as they do for their work at school.

d) Other researches related to the possible causes and consequences of work dependency and organizational cynicism can be carried out throughout Izmir and other provinces.

e) The population of this study was limited to teachers. In another study, a more comprehensive study can be designed by expanding the scope of the population and including administrative staff in.

References

Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs,* 126(3), 269-292.

Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yildirim, E. (2005). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri. *Sakarya Kitabevi, Adapazarı*.

Andersson, L. (1996). Employee cynicism: an examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations, 49*, s. 1395-1418.

Andersson, L., & Bateman , T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 18, s. 449-470.

Apaydın, Ç. (2011). Öğretim üyelerinin işe bağımlılık düzeyi ile iş-yaşam dengesi ve iş-aile yaşam dengesi arasındaki ilişki. *Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Politikası Anabilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.*

Arslan, N. (2018). Öğretmenlerin informal iletişim düzeylerinin örgütsel sinizm ile ilişkisi (Master's thesis, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı).

Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. (2011). Subjective well-being in organizations. *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship*, 178-189.

Balcı, A. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeler*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Bardakçı, S., & Baloğlu, M. (2012). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan okul yöneticilerinin işkoliklik eğilimleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 37(164).

Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Dosaliyeva, D. (2016). İşkolikliğin örgütsel bağlılık üzerindeki etkisi: bankacılık sektöründe bir araştırma. *Journal of Social Sciences Institute/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(11).

Bommer, W.H., Rıch, G.A., Rubın, R.S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change:Longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26

Bonebright, C.A., Daniel, L. C. and Ankenmann, R. D. (2000). The relationship of workaholism with work-life conflict, life satisfaction, and purpose in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 47(4), 469- 477.

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

Brown, M., Gregan, C. (2008). Cynicism: The role of employee involvement. *Human Resource Management, 47 (49, 667-686. Ss*

Burke, R. J. (2000). Workaholism in organizations: psychological and physical well-being consequences. *Stress Medicine*, 16, 11–16.

Burke, R. J., Koyuncu, M., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2008). Workaholism, work and extra-work satisfactions and psychological well-being among professors in Turkey. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 15(4), 353-366.

Burke, R. J., & Matthiesen, S. (2004). Workaholism among Norwegian journalists: Antecedents and consequences. *Stress and Health*, *20*(5), 301-308.

Cook, W. W., & Medley, D. M. (1954). Proposed hostility and parasaic virtue scales for the mmpı. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 38*, s. 414-418.

Dean, J. W., Brandes P. and Dharwadkar, R. (1998), Organizational cynicism, Academy of Management Review, 23: 2, 341-52.

Douglas, Evan & Morris, Robyn. (2006). Workaholic, or Just Hard Worker? Career Development International. 11. 10.1108/13620430610683043.

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

Erdost, H. E., Karacaoğlu, K., & Reyhanoğlu, M. (2007). Örgütsel sinizm kavramı ve ilgili ölçeklerin Türkiye'deki bir firmada test edilmesi. 15. *Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*, 514-524.

Fassel, D. (1990). Working ourselves to death: The high cost of workaholism, the rewards of recovery. Harper San Francisco.

Goldfarb, J. (1991). *The Cynical Society.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Green, D. E., Walkey, F. H., & Taylor, A. J. (1991). The three-factor structure of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A multicultural, multinational confirmatory study. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *6*(3), 453.

Guastello, S. J., Rieke, M. L., Guastello, D. D., & Billings, S. W. (1992). A study of cynicism,personality, and work values. *Journal of Psychology, 126*, s. 37-48.

Hardy, L. (1990). The fabric of this world: inquiries into calling, career choice, and the design of human work. *Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans*

Helvacı, M. A. (2013). Örgütsel Sinizm. H. B. Memduhoğlu ve K. Yılmaz (Ed.), *Yönetimde Yeni Yaklaşımlar İçinde*, 383-297. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

Innanen, H., Tolvanen, A., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2014). Burnout, work engagement and workaholism among highly educated employees: Profiles, antecedents and outcomes. *Burnout Research*, *1*(1), 38-49.

Kahveci, G., Demirtaş, Z. (2015). İlkokul, ortaokul ve lise öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sinisizm algılarının incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14 (52). DOI: 10.17755/esosder.01813

Kalağan, G. (2009). Araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel destek algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki. *Yüksek Lisans tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.*

Kalağan, G., & Güzeller, C. O. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel sinizm düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 27, 83-97.

Kanai, A., Wakabayashi, M. and Fling, S. (1996). Workaholism among employess in Japanese corporations: an examination based on the Japanesen version of the workaholism scales. *Japanese Psychological Research,* 38, 192- 203.

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

Kasalak, G., & Aksu, M. (2014). Araştırma görevlilerinin algıladıkları örgütsel desteğin örgütsel sinizm ile ilişkisi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *14*(1), 115-133.

Kaya, A., Balay, R., & Göçen, A. (2012). The level of teachers' knowing, application and training need on alternative assessment and evaluation techniques. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(2), 1229-1259.

Klimova, O.A. ve Barabanschikova, V. V. (2015). Profesyonel deformasyon olarak bir işkoliklik önleme programı geliştirilmesi.*Razrabotka Programı Uluslararası Gençlik Bilim Forumu LOMONOSOV-2015*. MAKS Press, 1-2.

Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk, Ş., & Çokluk-Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2007). Sosyal Bilimler İçin.

Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics, living with them, working with them*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Mack, B. L. (1993). *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins.* New York: Harper Collins.

McMillan, L., O'Driscoll, M., Marsh, N., Brady, E. (2001), Understanding workaholism: data synthesis, theoretical critique, and future design strategies, *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8, ss. 69-91

Mucevher, M. H., Akçakanat, T., & Demirgil, Z. (2017). İşkolikliğin kuşaklara göre karşılaştırılması: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi akademisyenleri üzerine bir araştırma. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(3), 135-155.

Oates, W. (1971). *Confessions of a workaholic*. New York: World.

Özdemir, H. (2013). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin işkoliklik eğilimlerinin incelenmesi. *Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Bilim Dalı.Yüksek Lisans Tezi.*

Porter, G. (1996). Organizational impact of workaholism: suggestions for researching negative outcomes of excessive work. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 1(1), 70.

Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive, 11(1)*, s. 48-59.

Rubin, R. S., Dierdorff, E. C., Bommer, W. H., & Baldwin, T. T. (2009). Do leaders reap what they sow? Leader and employee outcomes of leader organizational cynicism about change. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 680-688.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*.

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(7), 893-917.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3(1), 71-92.

Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S. and Miceli, M. P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, 50, 287- 4,314.

Sevimli, F, İşcan, Ö. (2005). Bireysel ve iş ortamına ait etkenler açısından iş doyumu. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi, 5 (1)*, 55-64.

Seybold, K. C., & Salomone, P. R. (1994). Understanding workaholism: a review of causes and counseling approaches. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73(1), 4-9.

Spence, J. T., & Robbins, A. S. (1992). Workaholism: definition, measurement, and preliminary results. *Journal of personality assessment*, *58*(1), 160-178.

Snir,R., & Harpaz, I. (2004). Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*.

Stern, D., Stone, J. R., Hopkins, C., & McMillion, M. (1990). Quality of students' work experience and orientation toward work. *Youth and Society, 22*, s. 263-282.

Vodanovich, S. J., & Piotrowski, C. (2006). Workaholism: A critical but neglected factor in OD. *Organization Development Journal*, *24*(2).

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Austin, J. T. (1994). Organizational cynicism: an initial study. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, s. 269-273.

Winburn, A., Reysen, R., Suddeath, E., & Perryman, M. (2017). Working beyond the bell: school counselors and workaholism tendencies. *Professional School Counseling*. doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18775137

Yıldırım, F. (2007). İş doyumu ile örgütsel adalet ilişkisi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi, 62(01), 253-278.*