

The Correlation between Leadership Styles and Organizational Cynicism: Which Leadership Style is Best for Schools?

Bahar Dogan*, Barış Yıldız

Ministry of National Education, Istanbul, Turkey

Corresponding author: Bahar Dogan, E-mail: bahardoganeyd@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: June 31, 2023

Accepted: September 22, 2023

Published: October 31, 2023

Volume: 11 Issue: 4

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between school administrators' multi-factor leadership styles and organizational cynicism perceptions. In this research, correlational research method being one of the quantitative research methods was used. The population of this research consists of school principals and vice principals working in public schools in the districts of Avcilar, Basaksehir, Bahcelievler, Bakirkoy, Beylikduzu and Esenyurt. The sample consists of 184 school principals and vice principals who were reached through convenience sample method. Multi-Factor Leadership Scale (MFLS), Organizational Cynicism Scale (OCS) and demographic information form were used in process of gathering data. In the process of data collection, online forms of the scales were applied to participants. The SPSS program was preferred to analyze the data of this research and descriptive statistics, Mann-Whitney U Test, Kruskal Wallis Test and Spearman Correlation Coefficient Test were conducted. Findings demonstrated in this study that there was a moderate negative correlation between transformational leadership and organizational cynicism; a moderate positive correlation between laissez faire leadership and organizational cynicism. To prevent or reduce the negative beliefs and effects of school administrators on the educational organization, it can be ensured that the transformational leadership style is understood with both conceptual and exemplary behavior models and human resources policies can be produced in the administration. Instead of persisting traditional school administrator, transformational leadership style should embrace in schools.

Key words: Laissez-faire leadership, Leadership Styles, Organizational Cynicism, School, School Administrator, Transactional Leadership, Transformational Leadership

INTRODUCTION

The world on which has turned into business life, is changing rapidly. Therefore, there is the lack of leaders and administrators who have adequacy and new knowledge in this field to strengthen potential human resources with communication, encouragement, and teamwork (Bayrak, 2001; Cadwell, 2004; Holcombe et al., 2023; Hunt et al., 2000; Plešnik & Bukovec, 2019). It is important to know that no one is a born leader. Instead of managing people, leaders have to guide people (Drucker, 2001, p. 31). The leadership style determines the quality of an organization (Mahzan & Nordin, 2021; Van der Mescht & Tyala, 2008). Transformational, transactional, charismatic, and virtual leadership styles appear as current leadership theories that are frequently searched (Kamaran, 2012, p.83). On the other hand, the common point of research in the field of leadership is that there is no single ideal leadership style, it shows situationally variable while differing leadership styles and theories (Denmark, 1993; Plešnik & Bukovec, 2019).

Leadership styles of school administrators have a significant effect on teachers' attitudes towards the school, especially their perceived organizational cynicism levels (Rashid et al., 2004). While organizational cynicism prevents the realization of trust and creativity for educators and school organization, it is an attitude of the employees who are exposed to subjective and irrational behavior ignoring mission of ensuring student' development around the intended gains in all aspects, because of the corruption of the principles of accountability, objectivity, and fairness.

Delken (2004) defines organizational cynicism in five basic categories:

1. Cynicism refers to the perceived reaction due to changes in policies, regulations, procedures or managerial personnel in process of organizational change.
2. Employee' perception of cynicism is descriptive of the attitudes originated from psychological contract violations.
3. Professional cynicism mainly defines attitudes arising from role conflict and/or obscurity.
4. Personality cynicism defines negative feelings towards all human behavior.

5. Social cynicism defines citizens' distrust of their governments and then their institutions (Delken, 2004).

Organizational cynicism is an important issue for many fields of science such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, political science, organizational behavior, and administration (Mousa, 2018; Yasin & Khalid, 2015). It can be said that the high level of organizational cynicism perception of the employees creates a destructive, wearing, and toxic effect for the organizations. This research, which was developed based on the question of which leadership style can reduce or increase the perception of organizational cynicism, can reveal importance of leadership style in order to create a shared vision in the direction of the goals of education and achieve this vision, instead of the feelings of insecurity, loneliness and doubt rooted in the perception of high level of cynicism.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section, transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership and organizational cynicism are explained. To figure out which leadership styles reduce or increase the perception of organizational cynicism, research in this area is discussed.

Organizational Cynicism

Organizational cynicism can be defined as an attitude consisting of the components of perceived reactions, beliefs, and behavioral tendencies towards an organization (Dean et al., 1998). Organizational cynicism is defined as a situation that is believed in lack of integrative effect of the organization and values such as inclusiveness, integrity and intimacy are ignored for the sake of personal interests (Atwater et al., 2000). Cynicism appears as a type of self-defense to cope with the dissatisfied thoughts and feelings towards the actions of organization and administration (Abraham, 2000; Reichers, 1997). Dean et al. (1998) comprehensively clarified and categorized organizational cynicism. According to them, an employee's aversion to the organization includes in three dimensions: the belief that organization is destitute of honesty, humiliating, and critical tendencies towards organization (Dean et al., 1998). Andersson (1996) defines organizational cynicism as repugnance and suspect towards a person, a group, an ideology, social contract, or institution, as well as disappointment and hopelessness (Andersson, 1996). The concept of cynicism which may arise from individual or organizational characteristics, is comprises of cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions in the organizational context. Organizational cynicism based on Expectancy Theory, Attribution Theory, Attitude Theory, Social Change Theories, Emotional Events Theory and Social Motivation Theories, is divided into personality approaches, social/corporate cynicism, employee cynicism, professional cynicism, and organizational change cynicism (Dean et al., 1998; Kalagan & Guzeller, 2010). In the work of Atwater et al. (2000), they aimed to model organizational cynicism which includes a lack of organizational integration, a negative attitude towards the organization and is a tendency to engage in

critical and humiliating behavior. Some basic characteristics of cynics are as follows (Atwater et al., 2000):

1. Cynics see lying, pretending, and exploiting others as essential features of human beings.
2. Cynics think that people act selfishly while making their choices, that human behavior is inconsistent, and that human is unreliable.
3. Cynics generally assume that there are unseen motives behind the motion.
4. Cynics may have a feeling of bothering, disgusting and shaming when they are of the opinion on something in relation to the psychological object (person, organization, group, society, etc.).
5. Cynics can criticize with understandable statements on the subject of destitute of integrity and intimacy in the psychological object.
6. When cynics communicate with psychological object, they usually describe the events with their own interpretations and use a cynical humor.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership pioneered by Avolio and Bass (2004) is composed of four components called as charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. It is believed that these components help leaders in the process of making organizations more effective in developing school vision with the cooperation of everyone in the organizations (Kim, 2012; Liu, 2018; Mahzan & Nordin, 2021). It is emphasized that leader who is an excellent role model for his followers in the dimension of charisma, makes the right organizational decisions and gains trust and confidence of his followers (Bass, 1990; Van Dierendonck, 2011). Leadership in individualized consideration dimension is defined identifying challenges for employees, supporting them by empathizing with them, and maintaining communication. Employees need self-development and internal motivation regarding their duties. Followers are encouraged to think independently in the dimension of intellectual stimulation which means that leaders encourage creativity and risk-taking while revealing followers' suggestions and ideas. Inspirational motivation embodies optimism with leader's attractive and inspiring vision for followers. Optimistic and courageous followers conceive of the future and their proficiency, putting more effort into their field of study (Bass et al., 2003).

The transformational leadership process focuses on intrinsic motivation and establishing a link for the development of followers. Consequently, via this link, followers' capabilities, their motivation levels, and attitudes can be advanced to their goals that reach performance levels beyond their usual expectations, their values and beliefs can also be transformed (Li, 2022). A transformational leader will achieve a shared vision by involving everyone while regularly shaping strategic or other plans, providing a broad range of input, and encouraging everyone to think about a new and better future (Mlinarevic et al., 2022). A strong leader identity encourages employees to pursue their leader with respect to enthusiastic and taking a plunge, internally motivates those with high dialectical

thinking capacity to voice their opinions and act. In summary, transformational leaders lead or contribute to employees with intrinsic task motivation at work to move away from “knowing” to “doing”, thereby reinforce impact of dialectical thinking with creative performance (Chua et al., 2022).

Transactional Leadership

Bass (1985) conducted studies on transactional leadership, but his studies revealed that leadership styles did not meet needs. As result of this, he developed transactional leadership style. The focal point of transactional leadership style ground in the leader-follower relationship (Khan, 2017). This leadership style is divided in dimensions of contingent reward, management-by-exception active, management-by-exception passive and laissez faire leadership (Avolio et al., 1999). Transactional leaders target to contingent rewards by discovering perceptible requirements, goals and rewarding employees who achieve them. In management-by-exception active, leader manages his followers at a micro level and closely monitors followers’ performance and follows their mistakes, whereas leader is unaware of the problem and ir-resolute to mobilize until a serious problem come into existence or is voiced by others in management-by-exception passive (Bass, 1985; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Laissez Faire Leadership

In laissez faire leadership model which consists of dimensions of management based on passive expectancy and passive avoidant, leaders passively control working standards, avoid taking responsibility or making decisions, and do not use authority (Luo et al., 2013; Van der Vyver et al., 2020). Laissez faire leaders give the impression that administrative activities aren’t needed and leave their followers alone as single-handed. Leaders can fail to remember that have to solve a problem by reason of maintaining laissez faire leadership behaviors. This situation can give a rise of followers’ dissatisfaction. In this style of leadership, leaders are indifferent to work and do not exhibit effective leadership behavior (Baloğlu et al., 2009).

The Relationship between Leadership Styles of School Administrators and Perceptions of Organizational Cynicism

The leadership style is known as causes of negative behavior such as low productivity, low education quality and high turnover intention, lack of motivation, job satisfaction (Maheshwari, 2022) in educational environments (Rathakrishnan, Imm & Kok, 2016). Even if educators are more likely to achieve organizational goals when they have positive attitudes concerning the school, they cannot achieve to them if they have developed negative attitudes including perception of cynicism (İnandı & Gılıç, 2021). The perception of high level of organizational cynicism in educational organizations negatively affects productivity, development, organizational justice, self-efficacy, and participation in decisions. The basic structures that shape the attitudes and

beliefs of teachers towards the educational institutions are needed to study to be analyzed by explaining the reasons for tendency causing cynical behavior in terms of administrative, professional, organizational, and personal.

In accordance with the literature, there are many papers in the scope of employee cynicism which is a dimension of organizational cynicism (Gkorezis et al., 2014; Kaysi & Gurol, 2016; Pathak et al., 2023; Thomas & Gupta, 2018). There has not been any in-depth research in the literature regarding tendency of teachers displaying cynical behavior in educational organizations or between perceptions of their organizational cynicism and job satisfaction, organizational justice, burnout, dedication and alienation. In addition to all of these reasons, there is no in-depth research in the literature on what the factors that constitute the perception of organizational cynicism is. The aim of this research is to reveal relationship between MFLS of school administrators and their perceptions of OC. The importance of this research is that it reveals result that there is no or low level of perception of organizational cynicism in a school environment where successful leadership is strong. To this end, the following questions are answered:

- 1) Is there a significant difference according to school administrators’ perceptions of MFLS and demographic variables?
- 2) Is there a significant difference according to school administrators’ perceptions of OC and demographic variables?
- 3) Is there a significant correlation between MFLS and OC according to perceptions of school administrators?

METHOD

In this section, research design, population and sample, data collection tools, data collection and data analysis are clarified in the following subheadings.

Research Design

Quantitative studies reveal an objective meaning through collected data. Quantitative research starts with a problematic situation, including, hypothesis determination, literature knowledge, and analysis of quantitative data. The results revealed are predictive, explanatory, and confirming (Creswell, 2003, p. 153; Williams, 2007, p. 66). Survey research’s purpose is to collect data to reveal particular feature of a certain group (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012, p. 14). In this study, correlational research design which is one of quantitative research methods was used. The correlational research design is used to determine the extent to which two factors are related (Privitera, 2019, p.240). This research is a correlational survey model which aims to investigate the perceptions of school principals and vice principals working in public schools, in the scope of the MFLS and OC.

Study Group

The study group is determined as districts of Avcılar, Bahçelievler, Bakırköy, Basaksehir, Beylikduzu and

Esenyurt in Istanbul European Side. There are totally 1024 administrators in these districts. There are many approaches, and certain number of different formulas, for calculating the sample size for categorical data (Taherdoost, 2017). In this study the sample size formula was used as below. As a result of sample calculation of this population, the sample of this research consists of 184 school administrators (principals and vice principals) working in Istanbul in 2021-2022 academic year and selected by convenience sample method. This method helps to collect data quickly and easily. Convenience sampling provides opportunities in many aspects such as time, financial situation, location, accessibility to participants (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p.98). The following formula was used to determine the sample size:

$$n = \frac{p(100 - p)Z^2}{E^2}$$

where

n = Sample size

p = The percentage of sample having characteristic

z = Level of confidence

E = Margin of error

According to Table 1, 65% of the school administrators were female, and 35% were male. 43% of the participating school administrators were between the ages of 21-40, 57% were 41 and over. 59% of school administrators had graduate, and 41% had master' degree education. As the features of study group are checked, according to the length of service; it is noted that 22% of participants had 1-10 years of service, 39% had 11-20 years of service, and 40% had 21 and more years of service.

Data Collection Tools

Demographic information form, Multi Factor Leadership Styles Scale and Organizational Cynicism Scale scaled in 5-point Likert-type were used to reveal the relationship between MFLS of school administrators and their perceptions of OC in this paper.

Demographic information form

Demographic questions including participant's age, gender, education level and year of service were asked to participants. The main purpose of asking these questions is to obtain the relevance of demographic variables in the scope of MFLS and OC.

MFLS

MFLS developed by Avalio and Bass (2004) was adapted into Turkish by Aksu (2015) and its validity and reliability analyzes were performed. The scale consists of three dimensions and 34 items, namely transformational leadership (20 items), transactional leadership (7 items) and laissez faire leadership (7 items). Cronbach Alpha coefficients in the transformational leadership dimension.96; in the transactional leadership dimension.80 and in the laissez faire leadership dimension.84 was calculated by Aksu (2015). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for MFLS, and its dimensions

(transformational, transactional, laissez faire leadership) was respectively calculated as.84,.94,.71,.78 in this research. The items of the scale, which consists of 34 items in total, were scaled in five categories (5-Completely Agree, 4-Partly Agree, 3-Agree, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree).

OCS

OCS developed by Brandes et al. (1999) was adapted into Turkish and analyzed its validity and reliability by Karacaoğlu and İnce (2012). The scale consists of three dimensions and 13 items: cognitive (5 items), behavioral (4 items), and emotional (4 items). Cronbach's Alpha coefficients calculated by Karacaoğlu and İnce (2012) in the context of internal consistency to reveal the reliability of the scale were 0.91 for the whole scale and 0.94 (emotional), 0.87 (cognitive) and 0.82 (behavioral) for the sub-dimensions. In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for OCS, and its dimensions (cognitive, emotional, behavioral cynicism) was respectively calculated as.93,.89,.96,.75. OCS, which consists of 13 items in total, were scaled in five categories (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Undecided, 2-Disagree, 1-Strongly Disagree).

Data Collection

In this process, the application permission of the Demographic Information Form, MFLS Scale and OC Scale used in the research was obtained with the approval of the Governor's Office from the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education and approved by the Educational Sciences Ethics Committee of Istanbul Medeniyet University, dated 06/12/2021 and collected based on document numbered 2021/12-02.

The data within research were collected by sending online data collection tools to 184 school administrators working in public primary, secondary and high schools in Istanbul in the 2021-2022 academic year.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage values of the variables in research

Gender	<i>f</i>	%
Female	65	35.3
Male	119	64.7
Age		
21-40	79	42.9
41+	105	57.1
Education level		
Graduate	108	58.7
Master's degree	76	41.3
Years of service		
1-10	40	21.7
11-20	71	38.6
20+	73	39.7
Total	184	100

Data Analysis

SPSS 26.0 package program was used to analyze the data. In order to test the normality distribution of the MFLS and OC scales, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied and the Kurtosis-Skewness values and the data obtained from the Q-Q plot graph were examined. As the Kurtosis-Skewness values were not between -1.5 and +1.5 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013) and the points on the plot graph did not show normality distribution; non-parametric methods were used in the analysis of the data. Consequently, data had non-normally distribution, Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal Wallis Test were implemented in the process of data analysis. Mann-Whitney U Test was used to determine the difference among which groups

were. Spearman Correlation Coefficient was tested to determine the relationship between school administrators' MFLS and perceptions of OC.

RESULTS

The demographic results are shown in Table 1. The results are presented following the order of the research questions.

Is there a significant difference between school administrators' MFLS/perceptions of OC and demographic variables?

As can be seen in Table 2, there was no significant difference in the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the difference

Table 2. Mann-whitney U test results of school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores according to gender variable

	Dimensions	Gender	N	M	U	z	p
Multi-Factor Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership	Female	65	98.87	3453.5	-1.200	.230
		Male	119	89.02			
	Transactional Leadership	Female	65	94.38	3745.0	-.356	.722
		Male	119	91.47			
	Laissez Faire Leadership	Female	65	82.68	3229.5	-1.856	.064
		Male	119	97.86			
	Total	Female	65	95.60	3661.0	-.584	.549
		Male	119	90.81			
Organizational Cynicism	Cognitive	Female	65	88.59	3613.5	-.743	.457
		Male	119	94.63			
	Emotional	Female	65	90.47	3735.5	-.411	.681
		Male	119	93.61			
	Behavioral	Female	65	89.28	3658.5	-.609	.542
		Male	119	94.26			
	Total	Female	65	89.32	3666.0	-.599	.559
		Male	119	94.24			

Table 3. Mann-whitney U test results of school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores according to age variable

	Dimensions	Age Group	N	M	U	z	p
Multi-Factor Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership	21-40	79	90.10	3958.0	-.530	.596
		41+	105	94.30			
	Transactional Leadership	21-40	79	84.35	3503.5	-.1809	.070
		41+	105	98.63			
	Laissez Faire Leadership	21-40	79	98.32	3687.5	-.1292	.196
		41+	105	88.12			
	Total	21-40	79	90.23	3968.5	-.501	.616
		41+	105	94.20			
Organizational Cynicism	Cognitive	21-40	79	89.01	3871.5	-.780	.435
		41+	105	95.13			
	Emotional	21-40	79	88.41	3824.5	-.971	.331
		41+	105	95.58			
	Behavioral	21-40	79	93.14	4097.0	-.142	.887
		41+	105	92.02			
	Total	21-40	79	90.29	3973.0	-.488	.625
		41+	105	94.16			

Table 4. Mann-whitney U test results of school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores according to education level variable

	Dimensions	Education Level	N	M	U	z	p
Multi-Factor Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership	Graduate	108	87.99	3617.0	-1.370	.171
		Master' Degree	76	98.91			
	Transactional Leadership	Graduate	108	90.01	3835.5	-.758	.448
		Master' Degree	76	96.03			
	Laissez Faire Leadership	Graduate	108	91.58	4005.0	-.280	.780
		Master' Degree	76	93.80			
Total	Graduate	108	87.19	3530.0	-1.615	.762	
	Master' Degree	76	100.05				
Organizational Cynicism	Cognitive	Graduate	108	96.22	3702.5	-1.141	.254
		Master' Degree	76	87.22			
	Emotional	Graduate	108	86.91	3500.5	-1.824	.068
		Master' Degree	76	100.44			
	Behavioral	Graduate	108	91.92	4041.0	-.178	.859
		Master' Degree	76	93.33			
Total	Graduate	108	91.50	3996.50	-.303	.106	
	Master' Degree	76	93.91				

Table 5. Kruskal wallis test results of school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores according to years of service variable

	Dimensions	Years of Service	N	M	SD	χ^2	p	Mann-Whitney U Test
Multi-Factor Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership	1-10	40	92.89	2	.009	.995	
		11-20	71	92.75				
		21+	73	92.04				
	Transactional Leadership	1-10	40	93.78	2	3.621	.164	
		11-20	71	83.65				
		21+	73	100.40				
	Laissez Faire Leadership	1-10	40	88.74	2	.259	.879	
		11-20	71	93.73				
		21+	73	93.37				
Total	1-10	40	93.19	2	.370	.831		
	11-20	71	89.61					
	21+	73	94.94					
Organizational Cynicism	Cognitive	1-10	40	79.04	2	6.333	.042*	.02*
		11-20	71	88.53				
		21+	73	103.74				
	Emotional	1-10	40	89.46	2	.396	.820	
		11-20	71	91.21				
		21+	73	95.42				
	Behavioral	1-10	40	82.70	2	3.664	.160	
		11-20	71	89.82				
		21+	73	100.47				
Total	1-10	40	82.55	2	3.575	.167		
	11-20	71	89.25					
	21+	73	101.11					

of School Administrators' MFLS and OC Scores according to gender ($p > .05$).

As can be seen in Table 3, there was no significant difference in the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the

Table 6. Spearman correlation coefficient results between MFLS and OCS scores

Dimensions		Organizational Cynicism	Cognitive	Emotional	Behavioral	Total
Multi-Factor Leadership Styles	Transformational Leadership	-.51**	-.46**	-.45**	-.43**	-.40**
	Transactional Leadership	-.28**	-.29**	-.18*	-.27**	
	Laissez Faire Leadership	.49**	.43**	.41**	-.43**	
			-.37**	.33**	-.33**	

difference of School Administrators' MFLS and OC Scale Scores according to age ($p > .05$).

As can be seen in Table 4, there was no significant difference in the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test on the difference of School Administrators' MFLS and OCS Scores according to education level ($p > .05$).

As seen in Table 5, according to findings of the Kruskal Wallis Test regarding the differentiation of school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores according to the variable of years of service, it is noticed that there is a significant difference between the cognitive dimension of the OCS and the variable of years of service ($\chi^2 = 6.333, p < .05$). Mann-Whitney U Test used in cases of non-normally distribution was applied to find out which groups cause this difference. According to the results of the test, there was significant difference among the groups between 1-10 and 21+ years of service ($p < .05$).

According to the perceptions of school administrators is there a significant correlation between MFLS and OC?

As seen in Table 6, when the correlation between school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores is calculated as a moderate negative correlation ($r = -.40, p < .000$); the correlation ($r = -.51, p < .000$) between transformational leadership and OC is a moderate negative; a weak negative correlation between transactional leadership and OC ($r = -.28, p < .000$); a moderate positive ($r = .49, p < .000$) correlation between laissez faire leadership and OC. On the other hand, when correlation between the dimensions of MFLS and OC is examined; there has a moderate negative correlation between cognitive dimension ($r = -.46, p < .000$); emotional dimension ($r = -.45, p < .000$) and behavioral dimension ($r = -.43, p < .000$) and transformational leadership styles; a weak negative correlation between cognitive dimension ($r = -.29, p < .000$); emotional dimension ($r = -.18, p < .000$); behavioral dimension ($r = -.27, p < .000$) and transactional leadership styles. There has also a moderate positive correlation between cognitive dimension ($r = .43, p < .000$); emotional dimension ($r = .41, p < .000$); behavioral dimension ($r = -.43, p < .000$) and laissez faire leadership style.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the findings of this research, no significant difference was observed between MFLS or OC and aforementioned demographic variables of school administrators. There are studies supporting this finding in the literature (Abu-Tineh et al., 2009; Kilic & Toker, 2020). It can be

concluded that the finding which demographic variables do not make a significant difference in school administrators' perceptions of organizational cynicism and multifactorial leadership styles suggests that the relationship between leadership styles and organizational cynicism of the participants is based on a phenomenological and cultural basis. Also in this study, when the correlation between school administrators' MFLS and OCS scores was examined, there was a moderate negative correlation. In their study of Qian and Jian (2020), it was revealed that leaders should pay attention to their own behavior instead of blaming, questioning and changing the employees' attitudes in order to reduce organizational cynicism (Quian & Jian, 2020). The leader's clear, direct and justifiable communicational style can also reduce the level of educators' perception of organizational cynicism. Mousa (2018) states that the organizational communication performed on active as a paradigm to discover and recruit the optimistic staff member, will reduce the negative effects of cynicism in the workplace and also promote a more productive work environment (Mousa, 2018). It can be said that a school where an effective leadership style dominates the school culture, management and decision-making processes creates a solid bridge between internal and external stakeholders, all stakeholders show regard to their education policies and the purpose of the school's existence is realized. Otherwise, a moderate negative correlation between transformational leadership and OC was found out. In their paper, Pathak et al. (2023) note that transformational leadership is a significant moderator effect on the relationship between organizational learning ability and job satisfaction (Pathak et al., 2023). Transformational leadership style provides a positive school atmosphere, high motivation and self-confidence (Güçlü et al., 2017). The reason why the transformational leadership style reduces the perception of organizational cynicism, it can be shown that the leader creates an inspiring motivation environment for employees, creates a perception of trust, interest and consistency by making the right decisions. Transformational leaders imagine that the future inevitably changes in line with unnumerous needs, multi-dimensionally decide that how it should be. On the contrary, it can be seen that in an organization where the level of organizational cynicism is high, as strategic decisions for school development are not taken, there is no ideal of planning for the future. As stated by the findings of this research, there is a moderate positive correlation between laissez faire leadership and OC. It has been found that the laissez faire style increases the perception of organizational cynicism. Bommer et al. (2005) revealed that leadership style is associated with the perception of organizational cynicism

(Bommer et al., 2005). One of the results of this research is moderate positive correlation between cognitive, emotional, behavioral cynicism and laissez faire leadership style. The typical characteristics of laissez faire leaders are that they are physically or mentally nowhere, in where or when are immediately needed and act negligently against major crises (DeRue et al., 2011). As a result, employees can be expected to show cognitive, emotional and behavioral reactions of lack of organizational trust and commitment in response to these typical behaviors. Ozgenel and Hidioglu (2019) revealed that when school administrators' laissez faire practices increased, teachers' organizational cynicism attitudes also increased (Ozgenel & Hidioglu, 2019). Laissez faire leaders who are unaccessible by their subordinates when support is needed, and who act passively at critical times, are insensitive to their employees and the organization (Skogstad et al., 2014). Laissez faire leaders play an ambiguous, confrontational (inadequate explanations, inconsistent demands) role and show a state of constant inactivity. As a result, psychological burnout of employees reaches serious behavioral and psychological dimensions (Leary & Miller, 2021). These dimensions for employees may be inevitable to see negative situations such as stress, bullying, conflict etc. It is not difficult for an educational organization, in which information is produced and produced information constantly affects and shapes the environment and society as output, to transform the social structure in an undesired way in line with inconsistent with the goals of development, scientificness, innovation and creativity. It may not be sufficient to take advantage of authority of the political power to appoint laissez faire leaders as school administrator and to cause continuation their duties with the intent of transforming the schools into the transmission center of the aforementioned desired goals.

As a result of this research, the transformational leadership style moderates the participating in this study school administrators' perception of cognitive cynicism, emotional cynicism and behavioral cynicism. According to Güçlü et al. (2017), principals exhibiting transformational leadership style in schools can create a more positive communication environment by reducing teachers' negative emotions (Güçlü et al., 2017). School administrators' perceptions of emotional cynicism are associated with various negative emotions experienced by employees about their organizations. In organizational cynicism, it is seen that employees are not only limited to some negative thoughts about their organization, but also experience a set of negative feelings against the organization (Işık, 2014). According to cynics, the most distinctive features of the organization are perceived as insecurity, inconsistency, subjectiveness, incompetence and self-interest (Kilic & Toker, 2020).

In order to prevent or reduce the negative beliefs and attitudes of school administrators on the educational organization, it can be ensured that the conceptual frameworks and exemplary behavior models in the topic of transformational leadership style is understood by them and human resources policies are actualized to make suggestions to replace the traditional school administration with the transformational leadership style in the administration. The professional

development of school administrators can be transformed according to the win-win principle in terms of school-manager-teacher-student, with executive education which includes an in-dept understanding related to dimensions of charisma, individual interest, intellectual courage and inspiring motivation. It should be discussed in the fact that this transformation may take place within the school, but may not be sustainable in cases where it is not adopted by the elements that generate upper and intermediate system.

This research can highlight to next studies in terms of revealing and analyzing factors which affect where organizational cynicism prevents effective leadership styles, also researchers can examine in deeply by using qualitative research methods. The leadership styles except of transformational, transactional and laissez faire leadership (e.g. authentic, toxic, instructional, ethic leadership) can be studied by researchers in order to reveal the degree of organizational cynicism and the features of negative school in schools.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Tineh, A. M., Khasawneh, S. A., & Omary, A. A. (2009). Kouzes and Posner's transformational leadership model in practice: The case of Jordanian schools. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 7(3), 265-283.
- Aksu, A. (2015). *Adaptation of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire into Turkish*. VII. European Conference on Social Behavioral Sciences, September 3-6, Belgrade, Serbia.
- Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11), 1395-1418.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire (TM)*. CA., Inc. Mind Garden.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-462.
- Baloğlu, N., Karadağ, E., & Gavuz, Ş. (2009). Okul müdürlerinin çok faktörlü liderlik stillerinin yetki devrine etkisi: Bir doğrusal ve yapısal eşitlik modelleme çalışması. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(2), 457-479.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations* (1st ed.). Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(90\)90061-S](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S)
- Bass, B., M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Bayrak, N. (2001). *İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin liderlik özellikleri* [Yüksek lisans tezi] Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskisehir.
- Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. A., & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change: Longitudinal effects of

- transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 26(7), 733-753. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.342>
- Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Dean, J. W. (1999). Does organizational cynicism matter? Employee and supervisor perspectives on work outcomes. *Eastern Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2(1), 150-153.
- Büyükoztürk, S., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, O. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (12. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Cadwell, C. M. (2004). *Leadership skills for managers* (4th ed.). American Mgmt Assn.
- Chua, R. Y., Lim, J. H., & Wiruchnipawan, W. (2022). Unlocking the creativity potential of dialectical thinking: Field investigations of the comparative effects of transformational and transactional leadership styles. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 56(2), 258-273. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.528>
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 341-352.
- Delken, M. (2004). *Organizational cynicism: A study among call centers* [Unpublished Master Thesis]. University of Maastricht, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Maastricht.
- Denmark, F. L. (1993). Women, leadership, and empowerment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17(3), 343-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1993.tb00491.x>
- Drucker, P. (2001). Knowledge worker productivity. *California Management Review*, 41(2), 45-49.
- İnandı, Y., & Giliç, F. (2021). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and organizational cynicism from teachers' perspectives. *South African Journal of Education*, 41(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v41n1a1825>
- Gkorezis, P., Petridou E., & Xanthiakos, P. (2014). Leader positive humor and organizational cynicism: LMX as a mediator. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 35(4), 305-315. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2012-0086>
- Güçlü, N., Kalkan, F., & Dağlı, E. (2017). The relationship between leadership styles of school principals and organizational cynicism based on the perceptions of vocational and technical high school teachers. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(1), 177-192.
- Holcombe, E., Harper, J., Ueda, N., Kezar, A., Dizon, J. P. M., & Vigil, D. (2023). *Capacity building for shared equity leadership: Approaches and considerations for the work*. American Council on Education, Pullias Center for Higher Education, NY. <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Shared-Equity-Leadership-Capacity.pdf>
- Hunt, O., Tourish, D., & Hargie, O. (2000). The communication experiences of education managers: Identifying strengths, weaknesses, and critical incidents. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 14(3), 120-129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540010322393>.
- İşık, O. G. (2014). Organizational cynicism a study among advertising agencies. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22(1), 130-151. <https://doi.org/10.31123/akil.441950>.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-768. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>.
- Karacaoğlu, K., & İnce, F. (2012). Reliability and validity of the Turkish version of Brandes, Dharwadkar, And Dean's (1999) organizational cynicism scale: The case of organized industrial zone, Kayseri. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(3), 77-92.
- Kaysi, F., & Gürol, A. (2016). Assessment of views of teachers about their teaching profession. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları*, 5(2), 230-240.
- Khan, N. (2017). Adaptive or transactional leadership in current higher education: A brief comparison. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(3), 178-183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i3.3294>.
- Kılıç, S., & Toker, K. (2020). Analyzing the relationship between organizational justice and organizational cynicism. *Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi*, 15(58), 288-303.
- Kim, H. (2012). Transformational leadership and organisational citizenship behavior in the public sector in South Korea: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Local Government Studies*, 38(6), 867-892. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2012.707617>.
- Kumarani, M. (2012). *Leadership in libraries: A focus on ethnic-minority librarians*. Oxford, England, Chandos Publishing.
- Leary, T., & Miller, M. (2021). The toxic relationship between laissez-faire leadership and employee burnout: No longer a well-kept secret. *International Leadership Journal*, 13(2), 3-15.
- Li, Y. (2022). A review of empirical research on transformational school leadership in China (2010-2019). *ECNU Review of Education*, 5(1), 156-184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531120942242>.
- Liu, P. (2018). Transformational leadership research in China (2005-2015). *Chinese Education & Society*, 51(5), 372-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2018.1510690>.
- Luo, Z., Wang, Y., & Marnburg, E. (2013). Testing the structure and effects of full range leadership theory in the context of China's Hotel Industry. *Journal of Hospitality, Marketing and Management*, 22(6), 656-677. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2012.708959>.
- Maheshwari, G. (2022). Influence of teacher-perceived transformational and transactional school leadership on teachers' job satisfaction and performance: A case of Vietnam. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 21(4), 876-890. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2020.1866020>

- Mahzan, F. A., & Nordin, N. M. (2021). The relationship between transformational leadership practiced and the level of job satisfaction among lecturers in MARA Professional College, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(3), 154-161. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14511>.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th. Ed.). CA: John Wiley & Son.
- Mlinarevic, V., Tokic Zec, R., & Cvjeticanin, A. (2022). A model of transformational leadership in the organisational culture of preschool institution. *CEPS Journal*, 12(3), 103-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1159>.
- Mousa, M. (2018). The effect of cultural diversity challenges on organizational cynicism dimensions. *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 9(3), 280-300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JGR-06-2017-0037>.
- Özgenel, M., & Hıdıroğlu, A. (2019). An attitude that arises according to leadership styles: Organizational cynicism. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(2), 1003-1043. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29299/kefad.2019.20.02.015>.
- Pathak, D., Madan, P., & Srivastava, S. (2023). Examining the inter-relationship between leadership styles, organisational learning capability and job satisfaction: An empirical study of Indian IT companies. *International Journal of Learning and Change*, 15(1), 51-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJLC.2023.127717>.
- Plešnik, J., & Bukovec, B. (2019). Styles of educational leadership and building blocks for a successful leadership model in primary schools. *Challenges of the Future*, 4(4), 303-316.
- Privitera, G. J. (2022). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences* (3rd Ed.). New York, Sage.
- Qian, Y., & Jian, G. (2020). Ethical leadership and organizational cynicism: The mediating role of leader-member exchange and organizational identification. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 25(2), 207-226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-06-2019-0069>.
- Rashid, Z. A., Sambasivan, M., & Rahman, A. A. (2004). The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 161-179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437730410521831>.
- Rathakrishnan, T., Imm, N. S., & Kok, T. K. (2016). Turn-over intentions of lecturers in private universities in Malaysia. *Social Sciences & Humanities*, 24, 129-146.
- Taherdoost, H. (2017). Determining sample size; how to calculate survey sample size. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems*, 2, 237-239.
- Thomas, N., & Gupta, S. (2018). Organizational cynicism-what every manager needs to know. *Development and Learning in Organizations*, 32(2), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-01-2017-0005>.
- Van der Mescht, H., & Tyala, Z. (2008). School principals' perceptions of team management: A multiple casestudy of secondary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(2), 221-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15700/saje.v28n2a172>.
- Van der Vyver, C. P., Kok, T., & Conley, L. N. (2020). The relationship between teachers' professional wellbeing and principals' leadership behaviour to improve teacher retention. *Perspectives in Education*, 38(2), 86-102.
- Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Williams, C. (2007). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research (JBER)*, 5(3), 65-72. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v5i3.2532>.
- Yasin, T., & Khalid, S. (2015). Organizational cynicism, work related quality of life and organizational commitment in employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 9(2), 568-582.