

# "İŞ, GÜÇ" ENDÜSTRİ İLİŞKİLERİ VE İNSAN KAYNAKLARI DERGİSİ

"IS, GUC" INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCES JOURNAL

2018 Cilt/Vol: 20/Num:3 Sayfa/Page: 21-48

***Editörler Kurulu / Executive Editorial Group***

Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)  
K. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)  
Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

***Editör / Editor in Chief***

Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

***Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board***

Doç. Dr. Erdem Cam (ÇAŞGEM)  
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zerrin Fırat (Uludağ University)  
Prof. Dr. Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)  
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)  
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)  
Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli University)  
Doç. Dr. Gözde Yılmaz (Marmara University)  
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Memet Zencirkıran (Uludağ University)

***Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board***

Prof. Dr. Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)  
Prof. Dr. Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)  
Prof. Dr. Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)  
Prof. Dr. Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)  
Prof. Dr. Alan Geare (University of Otago- Yeni Zelanda)  
Prof. Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)  
Prof. Dr. George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)  
Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (University of San Francisco-ABD)  
Prof. Dr. Mustafa Özbilgin (Brunel University-UK)  
Assoc. Prof. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)  
Prof. Dr. Işık Urla Zeytinoğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)

***Ulusal Danışma Kurulu / National Advisory Board***

Prof. Dr. Yusuf Alper (Uludağ University)  
Prof. Dr. Veysel Bozkurt (İstanbul University)  
Prof. Dr. Toker Dereli (Işık University)  
Prof. Dr. Nihat Erdoğan (İstanbul Şehir University)  
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Makal (Ankara University)  
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)  
Prof. Dr. Nadir Suğur (Anadolu University)  
Prof. Dr. Nursel Telman (Maltepe University)  
Prof. Dr. Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul University)  
Prof. Dr. Engin Yıldırım (Anayasa Mahkemesi)  
Prof. Dr. Arzu Wasti (Sabancı University)

---

*İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, yılda dört kez yayınlanan hakemli, bilimsel elektronik dergidir. Çalışma hayatına ilişkin makalelere yer verilen derginin temel amacı, belirlenen alanda akademik gelişime ve paylaşım katkıda bulunmaktadır. "İş, Güç," Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 'Türkçe' ve 'İngilizce' olarak iki dilde makale yayınlanmaktadır.*

*"Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is peer-reviewed, quarterly and electronic open sources journal. "Is, Güc" covers all aspects of working life and aims sharing new developments in industrial relations and human resources also adding values on related disciplines. "Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is published Turkish or English language.*

## TARANDIĞIMIZ INDEXLER



Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir.  
Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.

All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the authors.  
The published contents in the articles cannot be used without being cited

“İş, Güç” Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi - © 2000- 2018

“Is, Güc” The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources - © 2000- 2018

# İÇİNDEKİLER

YIL: 2018 / CİLT: 20 SAYI: 3

SIRA	MAKALE BAŞLIĞI	SAYFA NUMARALARI
1	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Selver YILDIZ BAĞDOĞAN, “Algılanan Örgütsel Destek, Psikolojik İyi Oluş ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Arasındaki İlişkilerin Değerlendirilmesi” DOI: 10.4026/isguc.466669	5
2	Prof. Dr. Yasin BOYLU, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa YILDIRIM, “The Relationship of Psychological Contract Breach Between Organizational Trust and Organizational Cynicism: A Study in Hotels” DOI: 10.4026/isguc.466674	25
3	Dr. Burcu ÖNGEN BİLİR, Arş. Gör. Ulviye TÜFEKÇİ YAMAN, Prof. Dr. Serpil AYTAÇ, “İşe İlişkin Duyguların İşten Ayrılma Niyetine Etkisinin Yapısal Eşitlik Modeli ile İncelenmesi” DOI: 10.4026/isguc.466681	53
4	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Oğuz BAŞOL, “OECD Ülkelerinde Yaşam Tatmini Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme” DOI: 10.4026/isguc.466684	71
5	Doç. Dr. Sema POLATÇI, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa KARACA, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali BAYRAM, “The Effects of Leader Member Exchange on Burnout and Job Satisfaction: A Research on Teachers” DOI: 10.4026/isguc.466690	91

# THE RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTRACT BREACH BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM: A STUDY IN HOTELS

*Prof. Dr. Yasin Boylu*

*(Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi- Turizm Fakültesi)*

*Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Mustafa Yıldırım*

*(Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat Üniversitesi- İşletme Fakültesi)*

## ÖZET

**B**u araştırmada, otel işletmesi çalışanlarının psikolojik sözleşme ihlal algıları ile örgütsel güven ve örgütsel sinizm düzeylerini tespit ederek, üç olgu arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemek amaçlanmıştır. Bu kapsamda, Antalya ilinde faaliyet gösteren beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde çalışan 761 kişi üzerinde bir saha araştırması gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler anket tekniği ile toplanarak bilgisayar ortamına aktarılmış ve istatistik paket programları aracılığıyla analiz edilmiştir. Betimsel istatistikler için frekans analizi, nedensel ilişkileri tespit etmek için de çoklu ve hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri ile Sobel testi yapılmıştır. Çalışanların psikolojik sözleşme ihlal algılarının, örgütsel güven ve sinizm düzeylerinin orta düzeyde olduğu saptanmıştır. Yapılan regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre; psikolojik sözleşme ihlal algılarının örgütsel güven üzerinde negatif, örgütsel sinizm üzerinde ise pozitif bir etkiye sahip olduğu görülmüş; örgütsel güvenin örgütsel sinizmi negatif yönde ve anlamlı düzeyde etkilediği belirlenmiştir. Son olarak psikolojik sözleşme ihlalinin örgütsel sinizme etkisinde, örgütsel güvenin aracı değişken olduğu belirlenmiştir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Psikolojik Sözleşme İhlali, Örgütsel Güven, Örgütsel Sinizm, Otel İşletmeleri

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the levels of psychological contract breach perception of hotel business employees along with their organizational trust and organizational cynicism and to detect the pattern of relations among those three concepts. For this purpose, a field research study was conducted on totally 761 employees working in five-star hotel businesses within Antalya province. Research data collected by the survey technique has been transferred to a computer and subjected to analysis via statistical software packages. Frequency analysis is utilized for descriptive statistics while multiple and hierarchical regression analyses along with Sobel test are performed to determine causality relationships. Perceptions of psychological contract breach, organizational trust and cynicism levels for employees are found to be moderate. According to the performed regression analysis results; perception of the psychological contract breach has a negative impact on the organizational trust, while positively affecting the organizational cynicism. It is also determined that the organizational trust has a negative and significant effect on the organizational cynicism. On the other hand, the organizational trust determined to act as a mediator variable for the impact of psychological contract breach on the organizational cynicism.

**Keyword:** Psychological contract breach, Organizational trust, Organizational cynicism, Hotel Business

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Change and transformation in the employment relationships, as one of the outcomes revealed by the transition process from Fordism to post-Fordism, have also differentiate the organizational structures and operations of businesses. Those changes that lead to more flexible, superficial and temporary employer-employee relationship in particular, have been decisive in the size of the mutual obligations and expectations and have also brought some problems with them. Psychological contract breach (except for formal contracts) has emerged in the mental dimension are shown as complications posed by the decrease occurred in the organizational trust and cynical approaches in terms of negative attitudes towards the organization and the transformation of the mentioned employment relationships. In this study, the overall structure of the employment relationships in hotel businesses are aimed to be brought for consideration due to both elasticity and seasonality features of the employment structure. As part of this objective, a research study is conducted on the psychological contract breach perception of 761 employees working in five-star hotel businesses in Antalya province with the most intensely experienced coastal tourism activities in Turkey along in order to determine the levels of organizational trust and organizational cynicism. However, it is aimed to determine the relationship between patterns of referred cases.

## 1.1. The Psychological Contract

While evolutions in the scope of the organizations cause the differentiation of their structures and operations, the characteristics of the employer-employee relationship encounter fundamental changes (De Vos, Buyens and Schalke, 2005, p. 41). Particularly, flexibility of working hours outside the formal intervals, expansion of workspace beyond the written contract limits (Heuvel and Schalke, 2009, p. 290), and establishment of administrative and technical infrastructure which enables the execution of certain works at home (Guest, 2004, p. 541) account for the evolution of the employment structure. On the other hand, organizational and administrative decisions are also subjected to differentiation due to competitiveness conditions that make adaptability of market conditions difficult. No matter how hard the organizations try to exist in this process with downsizing and / or restructuring strategies, these efforts have resulted in a conflict of interest between employee and employer (Klehe,

Zikic, Van Vianen and De Pater, 2011, p. 217). For instance, fulfillment/nonfulfillment of certain commitments given to employees in good faith due to mentioned market conditions can lead to breaches in the contract between employer-employee (Restubog, Bordia, and Tang, 2006, p. 300). According to Guest (2004); on such non-static conditions, mutual obligations of the organizations and the employees are required to be monitored constantly in terms of their scope and nature and the relationship between employee and employer has been changed by the inactivation of the employment relationship. This transformation conditions led to a new form and content of business contracts between employee-employer. As a result, mutual contracts between employer and employee began to be assessed in two different formats, such as written and unwritten (Herriot, Manning and Kidd, 1997, p. 156) and the concept of the psychological contract have emerged. In general, the psychological contracts are viewed as the basis of reciprocity principle through which expectations that influence the development and nature of the bilateral relations in the studies of Argyris (1960, 1964, 1969), Levinson (1962) and Scheiner (1965) (Hiltrop, 1995, p. 287). The most important feature of these expectations between employer-employee; are being a mental contract developed within the framework of unwritten and implicit expectations (Herriot, Manning, and Kidd, 1997, p. 151; Koh, Ang and Straub, 2004, p. 358; Walker, 2010, p. 315). Along with the ongoing studies in the literature, the psychological contract has been one of the most highlighted issues in the field of organizational behavior since the 1990s. Especially, Rousseau's conceptual and empirical works (1989, 1990, 1995) have led to this research (Sels et al, 2004, p. 463). Rousseau's (1989) definition of psychological contract in his first study conducted on the subject seems to be in line with the conceptual framework of the previous research studies. Thus, the psychological contract is based on a belief that expectations of the parties would be realized upon the fulfillment of mutual obligations. Having the faith on the realization of the benefits to be obtained from the other party while one of the parties fulfills its liabilities is the key issue here (Rousseau, 1989, p. 123). Nonetheless, the concept of psychological contract in Rousseau's (1989) theory has been evaluated in the context of individuals' subjective beliefs rather than the nature of the mutual relationship between the individual and the organization. According to the theory, the formation of the psychological contract does not necessitate a solid consensus between the individual and the organization. Therefore, Rousseau's (1989) study on the subject has criticized Argyris (1960), Levinson (1962) and Schein (1965) for the emphasis on the relationship's nature (Roehling, 1997, p. 213). Robinson and Rousseau (1994) have conceptualized the psychological contract as a phenomenon which includes mutual obligations between the employers - employees by enabling subjective expectations within the framework of these obligations (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994, p. 255). At that stage, the mutual trust is defined as the fundamental dynamics of the psychological contract. According to Turney and Feldman (2000, p. 26); the level of trust between the employer - employee is the most crucial issue in the formation of the psychological contract. This trust issue is constituted in the context of mutual explicit / implicit promises given to each party. The psychological contract is also described as the expectations of the employees from the employing organization in terms of their rights and obligations. Employees have trust towards their employers for which they work with the expectation of earning something in return and they also have trust to the fulfillment of their expectations. However, the employees may also have a judgment that the contract is breached in cases of injustice and unfair treatments in the workplace. Ultimately, the employees fulfilling their obligations may feel that their trust towards the organization has been abused when they cannot find what they hope for (Ermongkonehai, 2010, p. 129). Another definition of the psychological contract expresses it as the



mutual liabilities and commitments of the individuals and the organization based on perception and implications (Guest and Conway, 2002, p. 22). Thus, it would be possible to say that the focal point of the psychological contract consists of obligations that the actors attribute to each other in the subjective sense (Guest, 2004, p. 545). In general, the psychological contract is defined as unwritten beliefs occurring between the employing organization and its employees along with organizational policy decisions and implementations on the fulfillment of the expectations attributed to the other party.

## 1.2. Perception of Psychological Contract Breach

Research studies conducted on the psychological contract appear to be mostly focused on the two issues since the 1990s. The first one is about changing the overall nature of the psychological contract; and the second is about the decline in mutual loyalty between organizations and their members (Sparrow, 1996; Hall and Moss, 1998; Martin, Staines and Pater, 1998; Turnley et al., 2003). When considered in terms of organizational results, the importance of the psychological contract breach has increased and, in general, the research studies concerning its impacts on organizational behavior have been diversified (Kickul et al., 2002, p. 78). The psychological contracts consisting of certain obligations of the organization in exchange for the employees' effort (Ng and Feldman, 2008, p. 269; Conway, Guest and Trenberth, 2011, p. 267; Richard et al., 2009, p. 818; Turnley and Feldman, 1999, p. 368) are rendered as breached in case of the non-fulfillment of those obligations (Blancero and Johnson, 2001, p. 318; Conway and Briner, 2002, p. 289). Therefore, the psychological contract breach is perceived as a quality inversely related to organizational support (Emmerick, Euwe, and Bakker, 2007, p. 154). The existence of organizational support enables the fulfillment of the expectations; while, the individuals may have a belief that the contract is breached in the absence of such support (Blancero and Johnson, 2001, p. 318). In the literature, it is emphasized that the psychological contract is based on the commitments related to the future benefits to be acquired by the individuals as the results of their efforts and/or investments. In parallel with that notion, the perceived commitments are seen to be regarded as the focal point for the identification of the psychological contract (Roehling, 1997, p. 206). Indeed, the psychological contract breach is caused by the failure to keep the promises made on such issues as payments, long-term job security, improvement and career opportunities (Kickul, 2001, p. 292).

## 1.3. Organizational Trust

Trust, as one of the primary elements in the relations among groups or organizations, has been a factor of importance that provides organizational unity through cooperation and solidarity (Halis, Gökğöz and Yaşar, 2007, p. 191). Trust in the leaders has been the focus of the first research studies on the subject (Lambert et al., 2012, p. 938). The subsequent studies pointed out the role of trust in managerial efficiency, its contribution to organizational citizenship and its impacts on business performance (Dirks, 2000, p. 1005). Organizational trust has been conceptualized by employees in terms of a belief that the management would assume long-term goals and would have actions and intentions in favor of the cooperation (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990, p. 446). Accordingly, the notion that attitudes and behaviors would be as expected by either parties has become the determining factor for the level of trust (Huff and Kelley, 2003, p. 82). Shockley-Zalabak et al. (2000, p. 35) also defined the organizational trust as positive perceptions of the members pertaining to the results of organizational roles,

relations, expectations and mutual obligations. According to Doney, Cannon and Mullen (1998, p. 601); the organizational trust is the willingness to have confidence in all the elements of the organization and to become a member of it. Organizational trust is also a decisive element in integration with organizational goals, in ensuring cooperation and in exhibition of behaviors consistent with collective expectations. The organizational trust has affirmative impacts in cases of organizational uncertainties, sudden changes, and adverse circumstances such as organizational conflict and severance (Durdağ and Naktiyok, 2011, p. 14). Perception of being valued and cared about by an employing organization also enhance employees' trust that the organization will fulfill its obligations of recognizing and rewarding desired employee attitudes and behavior as long as the employees perform their job responsibilities (Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997, p. 83).

#### 1.4. Organizational Cynicism

The first studies related to cynicism that was shown as a result of negative organizational and individual behavior (Davis and Gardner, 2004, p. 442; Bommer et al., 2005, p. 736; Rubin, Dierdorff, Bommer and Baldwin, 2009, p. 680) have started with "Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory" laid down in 1940's, and continued their existence in later years along with Cook and Medley's work (1954) entitled "cynical hostility" (Helvacı, 2010, p. 388). With the research studies carried out in the following years, cynicism has been attempted to draw its theoretical framework of the organizational context (Goldner, Ritti and Ference, 1977; Kanter and Mirvis, 1989, 1991; Bateman et al., 1992; Wanous et al., 1994; Reichers et al., 1997; Dean et al., 1998) and it has become an important factor in organizational behavior literature. According to a definition, the organizational cynicism is described as an attitude emerged with negative feelings, thoughts and behaviors of the employees of an employing organization and as a response to a history of social and individual experiences that are subject to alter by environmental effects (James, 2005, p. 7). While Dean et al. (1998) described the organizational cynicism as a phenomenon formed by a belief that the organization lacks integrity which corresponds to the critical behaviors and derogatory negative emotions toward the employing organization (p. 345); Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly (2003) has conceptualized the term as the belief that the organization is devoid of integrity (p. 629). Another definition, however, referred the organizational cynicism as being a result of perceived injustice and insecurity (Bommer et al., 2005, p. 736), and the term is associated with frustration against managerial decisions and organizational practices (Pelletier and Bligh, 2008, p. 830). On the other hand, the organizational cynicism is emphasized as a result of a critical evaluation of the merits, motivational means and actions in the organization (Cole et al., 2006, p. 464). Therefore, the organizational sense of cynicism, unlike personal cynicism, emerges due to negative experiences in the organization and can include adverse reactions and all organizational elements (Wanous, Reichers and Austin, 2000, p. 136). Abraham (2000) stated the main characteristics of the employees that exhibit organizational cynicism behavior such as the complaints from organizational decision-making and implementation, underestimation of the organization and colleagues, engagement in continuous pessimistic predictions, quick disappointment in case of failure and sense of betrayal and pessimism. Cynical employees also tend to believe that organizational success criteria do not coincide with their individual expectations and interests. This cognitive perception leads to the development of a belief that the organization lacks consistency, and ultimately individuals neglect their organizational effort for a successful future (p. 270). Therefore, cynical individuals believe that

an average employee would never acquire the reward he/she deserved out of the organizational gains (Andersson and Bateman, 1997, p. 451).

## 2. THE AIM AND HYPOTHESES OF THE RESEARCH

The fundamental objective of this study is *to examine the causality relationship between the psychological contract breach perceptions of five-star hotel business employees and the level of their trust towards the employing organization and to detect whether this probable relationship affects the organizational cynicism attitudes*. The hypotheses developed in accordance with the basic aim of the study are justified under the social exchange theory.

The social exchange theory first emerged with the works of George Caspar Homans, have been developed with the contribution of such researchers as Peter M. Blau (1964) and Richard Emerson (1981) in the following years. According to Homans's theory (1961) which constitutes the basis of the question of "What is the main cause of the relationship among people?", the primary motivation behind the social behavior is based on the principles of Skinner's operant conditioning. Homans, considering these principles as "general explanatory proposition of all social sciences", refers to large-scale social phenomena as various combinations of basic social behavior which happen to be the pillar of complex institutions, social institutions and social classes (Berberoğlu, 2012, p. 165). Homans developed and listed several basic propositions for the social exchange theory, such as stimulus, success, value, deprivation-satiation, aggression-approval and rationality (Ritzer, 2012, pp. 283-285). According to Homans's exchange theory, large-scale social formations are being built with the outward expansion of the award capacity. In that sense, individual requirements are maintained as long as they are met and they begin to collapse when they are not met anymore (Berberoğlu, 2012, pp. 165-166).

In terms of employment relations, social exchange is associated with fair policies and practices of the organization and the nature of exchange is said to provide an obligation of exerting effort to be devolved on individuals in favor of organizational interests (Aryee, Budhwar and Chen, 2002, p. 268). The social exchange theory is evaluated for determining the motivations behind employee attitudes and behaviors within the context of organizational relations (Settoon, Bennett and Liden, 1996, p. 219; Deconinck, 2010, p. 1349; Lavelle, Rupp and Brockner, 2007, p. 845); as well as it has been utilized in research studies conducted in the field of psychological contract for evaluation of breach process between the employers-employees (Bal, Chiaburu and Jansen, 2010, p. 253; Walker, 2010, p. 315; Buch, Kuvaas and Dysvik, 2010, p. 94). It is possible to claim that the results from three cases of this research study can be associated in the context of social exchange theory. Indeed, social exchange theory comprises a basis for theories in psychological contract literature such as trust (Rousseau, 1989; Robinson and Morrison, 1995; Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Guest, 1998; Rousseau, 2000) which is considered one of the two facets involved in social exchange (DeConinck, 2010, s. 1349).

According to Gouldner (1960); relationships based on reciprocity is, up to a certain level, a norm shared by all cultures. According to the principle of reciprocity; if a service is provided for individual Y by individual X, individual Y is obligated to respond with certain attitude and behavior to individual X towards whom individual Y should feel gratitude. However, the parties may feel insecure if provisions of the trust are perceived as betrayal or abuse (Fukuyama, 2005, p. 242). In the context of the principle of reciprocity by Gouldner (1960), non-fulfillment of the organizational commitments may lead to changes in employee behavior, decline in work performance and decrease in organizational

contribution (Bal et al., 2010, p. 253). As a social exchange theorist, Blau (1968) outlined trust as the main factor within the continuity of the relationship between parties and the structure of social exchange that produces itself (Shapiro, 1987, p. 625; Kingshott, 2006, p. 724). According to this view; social exchange in organizational sense is based on a basic state of trust towards the parties to fulfill their obligations (Walker and Hutton, 2006, p. 434). Konovsky and Pugh (1994) established a relationship model among the variables of organizational justice, trust and organizational citizenship behavior within the framework of social exchange theory. According to the results of research study, distributive and procedural justice determines trust tendencies of individuals towards management; while emerging trust plays a role in shaping the organizational citizenship behavior. Consequences of psychological contract breach for the employees are increased stress, decline in organizational commitment as well as violation of trust towards the organization and eventually intention for severance (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996; Robinson and Morrison, 2000; Lambert, Edwards and Cable, 2003). Niehoff and Paul (2001, p. 5), on the other hand, stated that accurate description of the psychological contract is one of the most important effort for the sake of the creation/correction of a climate of trust in organizational sense. In some studies conducted in this context, an adverse relationship between the perception of contract breach and trust towards the organization has been suggested (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996; Cassar, 2001; Conway and Briner, 2002; Chrobot-Mason, 2003). The first hypothesis of the research in this theoretical context is as follows:

***H<sub>1</sub>, Perception of psychological contract breach has a negative impact on organizational trust.***

Besides the perceived psychological contract breach and organizational trust; organizational cynicism and psychological contract are also associated within the scope of social exchange theory (Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks and Lomeli, 2013, p. 183) and the psychological contract breach has been suggested as an important determinant in the development of employees' cynical attitude. Accordingly, the individual may be suspicious of organizational integrity and stability assessed in the context of and cynicism whenever the organization fails to fulfill its obligations to him/her (Stanley, 2007; Neves, 2012; Mete, 2013). In addition, the perception of employees pertaining to psychological contract may also be effective in the evaluation of managerial consistency of the organization (Andersson, 1996; Martin, Staines and Pate, 1998). Researchers such as Sims (1994), Morrison and Robinson (1997), Herriot, Manning and Kidd (1997), and Millward and Brewerton (1999) asserted that psychological contracts are based on employee expectations on the fulfillment of promises assumed to be given by the employers. The perceptions of psychological contract breach, on the other hand, occur whenever the employee's expectation does not comply with the perceived promises (Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Turnley et al., 2003). In this aspect, the psychological contract breach arises mainly with two personal perceptions. The first one is the employees' belief that the employers gave them promises; the second one is the mismatch between that belief and the perceived promises (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003, p. 630). Considering stimulus, success and deprivation/satiation propositions in Homans's (1974) social exchange theory; employees' perception of psychological contract breach can lead to neglect of their personal obligations. So that; the employees begin to develop a belief associated with cynicism that the organizations lack integrity and unity following the perception of breach, and the employees can exhibit negative attitudes and behaviors towards the overall functioning of the organization (Pelletier and Bligh 2008, p. 829). In summary, the results related to psychological contract breach are regarded as the primary determinants of organizational cynicism (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003, p.

631; Chiaburu et al. 2013, s.182; Bashir and Nasir, 2013, p. 62). The second hypothesis of research is formed as follows:

***H<sub>2</sub>. Perception of psychological contract breach has a positive impact on organizational cynicism.***

One of the major determinants in the emergence of organizational cynicism is the belief that the organization will take advantage of benefits in return for his/her efforts or the situation that supports this belief. In the organizational climate where such beliefs prevail, the employees may develop cynical attitudes and behaviors towards the organization which diminish commitment to it (Kanter and Mirvis, 1991, p. 57). On the other hand, such researchers as Bateman et al. (1992) and Andersson and Bateman (1997) claimed that cynical attitudes in similar cases arise as a reflection of a lack of trust towards the organization and the authority. Abraham (2000) is one of the researchers who have drawn attention to the relationships between cynicism and trust. Personal cynicism attitudes mentioned by Abraham (2000) are based on the perception of the individual that people are unreliable and selfish in general. Andersson (1996), similarly, described cynicism as adverse attitudes and behaviors due to experiences causing such thoughts and feelings as hopelessness, frustration and distrust. Similarly; Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar (1998) used the expression "pattern of beliefs pertaining to unreliable individuals or organizations lacking coherence" in describing cynicism. According to Thompson et al. (1999); cynical attitudes and behaviors of the organization's members are part of the adverse consequences of distrust in organizational sense (Ribbers, 2009, p. 5). Stanley et al. (2005, p. 453) argued that trust became an effective determinant in the development of cynicism. Again, according to these authors, although such a relationship between the two concepts exists, distrust may also occur in the absence of cynicism. Overall; such active determinants of trust such as honesty, integrity, benevolence, and ethical consistency (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 718) are also commonly used in defining the concept of cynicism. In this regard, it is expected that the organizations consisting the aforementioned elements will have strong trust of their members, and otherwise is expected to develop cynical attitudes and behaviors (Özler, Atalay and Şahin, 2010, p. 54-55). Empirical studies determined that dismissal undermines the trust towards the organization by leading to the development of the cynical attitude (Brandes et al., 2008). The third hypothesis of the research under this proposition is established as follows:

***H<sub>3</sub>. Organizational trust has a negative impact on organizational cynicism.***

Both organizational trust and organizational cynicism are suggested to be related to psychological contract breach since the premises of those two cases such as honesty, openness, integrity, experience and fulfillment are the factors of the psychological contract. According to Dean et al. (1998, p. 348), while organizational trust emerges as a result of lack of an individual's positive experiences, cynicism occurs due to negative experiences. In this sense, unmet expectations on psychological contract can affect both trust and cynical attitudes. Upon examining traditional psychological contract literature, the issue seems to be based on two key assumptions. The first one is about positive results emerging with the fulfillment of the obligations attributed to the organizations in psychological contracts. Fulfillment of their contractual obligations enables employees to have trust towards the organization with a sense of belonging (Robinson and Morrison, 1995; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; Conway and Briner, 2002; Lambert et al., 2003). The second assumption is about shortcomings on the fulfillment of the contract that will have negative outcomes in organizational sense (Lambert et al., 2003, p. 899). It is possible to observe several studies that support this view in the literature. One among those studies detected a negative impact of psychological contract breach on both job satisfaction and organizational



citizenship behavior, while psychological contract breach is positively related to negligence in workplace and intention for severance (Turnley and Feldman, 2000). According to study results of Robinson and Rousseau (1994); the psychological contract is found to be negatively related to trust and job satisfaction, although it is determined to be a positively related with the intention for severance. A similar study which is conducted by Robinson (1996) also revealed a negative impact of perceived breach on both trust and performance, while it is positively related to intention for severance. Robinson and Morrison's (2000) study also indicated similar results on the negligence of personal obligations. In the literature; unmet expectations are rendered as the basic factor in the emergence of cynicism and reduction of personal trust (Robinson, 1996; Thompson et al., 2000). Within the context of "aggression-approval" proposition as one of the key propositions in Homans's (1974) social exchange theory, perception of breach may cause strong emotional reactions that can lead to nervousness, distrust, decline in commitment to the organization and increase in the tendency to severance (Robinson and Rousseau, 1994; Robinson, 1996; Morrison and Robinson, 1997; Robinson and Morrison, 2000). Similarly, it is suggested that the organizations with breach of contract will be negatively judged by its employees, and ultimately individuals can response to this situation in various aspects (Johnson and O'Leary-Kelly, 2003, s.631). Kickul and Lester (2001) focused on the question of how contract breach may lead to behavioral outcomes for employees. The study detected that the employees may react negatively based on their perception of the breach and avoid cooperation within the organization. In another study of Kickul (2001), the perception of psychological contract breach, which relates positively with perceived organizational injustice, is claimed to account for employees' negative reactions and inconsistent behaviors. Conway and Briner's (2002) study argued that perceptions of a breach that may lead to such conditions as depression and anxiety for individuals in the organization are detected to have a negative impact on organizational trust and a positive impact on organizational cynicism mentioned in Chrobot-Mason's (2003) study. In Pugh, Sharlicki and Passell's (2003) work, the levels of trust and cynicism for laid-off employees in their new employing organization are tried to be measured. Results of the study indicate that employee's perception of psychological contract breach due to layoff is negatively related to their trust towards their new employing organization and positively related to their cynicism at their new employing organization. Bal et al. (2010) examined how trust variable modify the relationship between the perception of psychological contract breach and work performance. According to the results of the study, behaviors of employees with low levels of social exchanges are not significantly affected by contract breach, whereas the work behaviors decreased as contract breach increased among the employees with high levels of social exchanges. Dulac, Coyle-Shapiro, Henderson and Wayne (2008) also detected an adverse relationship between perception of contract breach and organizational trust, while organizational commitment of the employees is decreased and intention for severance is increased. In this context, the last hypothesis of the research is stated as follows:

***H<sub>4</sub>. Organizational trust has a mediatory role in the impact of perceived psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism.***

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The field study of this research was carried out on the employees working for five-star hotel businesses in Antalya province whose number constitutes the universe of the study. The selection of Antalya province and the type of business has two basic reasons. According to the data from The Ministry of

Culture and Tourism (2012), approximately 59% (219) of totally 398 five-star hotel businesses in Turkey have been operating in Antalya Region and approximately 57% of customers who stay at this type of hotels preferred those five-star hotel business in the region. Thus, the city is expected to shed light on the structure of employment relationships especially in hotel businesses operating in the coastal zone where the development of mass tourism is considered. The main reason to prefer five-star hotel as the type of business is the notion that objective standardization occurs in the highest level in such areas as management concept, organizational structure, and operation in terms of business status. According to Antalya Provincial Culture and Tourism Directorate (2012), the number of rooms in the five-star hotels and the number of beds in Antalya province are 84,497 and 188,181, respectively. According to the International Hotel criteria, the number of employee per room in the five-star hotels is stated as 1.1 (Çetiner, 1995, p. 16). Considering the number of rooms, the total number of five-star hotel business employees in Antalya would be calculated as 92,946 (84,497 times 1.1). This figure constitutes the universe of the study. In the study, simple random sampling method is utilized since it is not possible to reach the whole universe due to such reason as time and cost. In this sampling type, all analysis units in the universe are equal and independent to be included in the research study. In this respect, the possibility of all individuals' participation in the execution of research is the same (Büyükoztürk et al., 2012, p. 85). Since the universe of the research study consists of 92,946 analysis units, the sampling formula developed for unlimited universe unlimited universe ( $N > 10,000$ ) within the scope of the quantitative research is used (Ural and Kılıç, 2006, p. 47). Accordingly, the sample of the study consists of 384 people. Research has benefited from the questionnaire survey as a data collection tool and the scales developed on all three issues are utilized in order to determine the hotel employees' perceptions of psychological contract breach, reasons for breach, the level of organizational trust and the status of organizational cynicism. In this study, the perceived psychological contract breach scale developed by Coyle-Shapiro and Conway (2005) based on Rousseau's (1990) study is used to determine the hotel employees' perception of psychological contract breach as well as it is done by Bal et al. (2010). The related scale, while including elements of the aforementioned expectations, is a measurement tool classes which classifies these elements with factors analysis in three dimensions (Bal et al., 2010, p. 477). These dimensions are expressed as economic, social and development/career. According to the data obtained in this study, overall reliability value of the scale has been calculated at 0.963. The survey questionnaire on the perception of psychological contract breach consists of five-point Likert-type scale with response options. The employees are presented with such options as 1=Never realized and 5=Fully realized, in the context of the question "What is the realization level of the following issues within the scope of your expectations from your hotel?". However, the data are coded with reverse scoring and the analyses in the following sections of the research study are performed with the help of values reached after this process in order to determine the level of perceived breach which is adversely related with realization level. Furthermore, four questions developed by Turnley et al. (2003) to determine the employees' views on the reasons for psychological contract breach are also included to the survey. These questions are as follows: (1) The hotel could fulfill its promises, but it chose not to, (2) A situation beyond the control of the hotel debarred it from fulfilling its promises, (3) We had a misunderstanding with the hotel on promises, (4) Since I could not fulfill my responsibilities, the hotel did not keep its promises either.

In order to determine the organizational trust as the other subject, the research study has also benefited from technical survey. Upon reviewing the related literature, one can observe a variety of assessment

tools which have been developed to measure organizational trust levels of the employees (Butler, 1991; Mayer et al., 1995; McAllister, 1995; Robinson, 1996; Cummings and Bromiley, 1996). In this study, organizational trust scale developed by Cummings and Bromiley (1996) is used to determine the level of employees' organizational trust. Therefore, it does not include both elements of trust in the managers and trust in the colleagues. The five-point Likert scale consists of 12 questions and response options which are rated as 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree. According to obtained data, Cronbach's Alpha reliability of the value for the scale is 0.950. The measurement tool used in the study for organizational cynicism is organizational cynicism scale developed by Brandes's (1997) which consists of cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions. The scale used in a variety of research studies and graduate theses conducted in Turkey (Kalağan, 2009, Sur, 2010; Ayduğan, 2012; Topçu et al., 2013) is also utilized in this study, in adherence to Brandes's (1997) original study, in order to determine employees' organizational cynicism attitudes. According to data collected for this study which consist of totally 14 expression and a five-point Likert-type scale, Cronbach's Alpha value for the scale is 0.960. The field research of the study has been performed between June-September in 2013 for the hotel businesses in central Antalya, Kemer, Belek, Side and Alanya. Although the sample consisted of 384 people, a total of 1500 questionnaires have been distributed and 761 of them are considered for evaluation.

This is a predictive correlational research study within the concept of its scope and hypotheses. Psychological contract breach perception, in theoretical context; is the possible predictor variable on organizational trust and organizational cynicism. Multiple and hierarchical regression analyses are performed to determine that causality relationship. When the analyses are carried out, factors with a possible effect on the dependent variable and factors that may differentiate the effect of the independent variables must be taken under control (Karasar, 2005, p. 91). Thus, the factors that may affect the level and direction of the causal relationship among the perception of psychological contract breach, organizational trust, and organizational cynicism are included in the analysis as control variables prior to performed hierarchical regression analyses. The variables with no significant effect on the dependent variable are excluded from the model after analysis. Control variables consist of professional features of the employees such as demographics, and working periods, working period in tourism, working department and their own opinions on the reasons for the psychological contract breach. Due to categorical data collected on the aforementioned variables, a dummy variable for each of those variables is produced and included in the analysis. The fourth hypothesis of the study is based on the assumption that the organizational trust acts as mediator variable for the relationship between the perceived psychological contract breach and the organizational cynicism. Baron and Kenny (1986) suggested that certain conditions must be met in order to analyze any relationship model between independent and dependent variables with a mediator variable. According to this; the mediator variable must be a direct predictor variable on the dependent variable while the independent variable is a direct predictor variable on the mediator and the dependent variables. In addition, when the mediator variable is included to the regression model which determines the impact of independent variable on the dependent variable, the influence level of independent variable must be relatively low. While the full mediator impact is present, partial mediator effect occurs in the model where the impact disappears. The provision of full effect suggests that the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable arises indirectly via mediator variable (p. 1176). In this sense, the real basic causes behind the patterns of relationships between variables studies in social sciences are being determined in order to contribute to the explanation of social reality. Also in this study, two basic regression analyses are performed



in order to determine whether organizational trust has a mediatory role in the impact of the perceived psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism. Accordingly; first of all, the control variables are rendered constant and then multiple regression analyses are utilized in order to determine the impact of the perceived psychological contract on organizational trust. After that, the hierarchical regression analysis is conducted to determine both the impact of psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism and the potential mediatory role of organizational trust in this effect. Furthermore, Sobel test is performed to determine the significance of the mediatory effect. The estimation program prepared by Preacher (2010) is used for Sobel test.

#### 4. FINDINGS

38.6% of the employees surveyed are female and 61.4% of them are male. As for the age ranges, it is determined that approximately three-quarters of the employees are 35 years of age and under. Upon examining the results on educational level of employees, about 40% of them are found to be primary and secondary school graduates. In terms of income, three-quarters of the employees have a monthly income of 1,800 TL. and less. 65% of the employees have been employed by the hotel for 3 years or less. In terms of the duration of employment in tourism, about 60% of those surveyed are found to be employed in the tourism industry for 6 years and less. In addition, the staff consists of employees with both seasonal and permanent status, with percentages of 56.9% and 43.1%, respectively. In terms of titles, the employees are comprised of workers (77.1%), chefs (14.2%) and department managers (8.7%). In terms of the departments, there is a variety of departments in which those surveyed employees work such as the front office (17.2%), food and beverage (34.2%), floor services (18.5%), accounting (7.8%), sales and marketing (9.1%), human resources (7.6%), and technical services, landscaping, security, etc. (5.7%). According to those results, it is possible to say that the majority of those surveyed consists of male employees of seasonal staff between 24-29 years of age, secondary school graduates, with monthly income of 801-1,300 TL., have been working in the hotel for 1-3 years and working in tourism sector for 4-6 years as workers in the food and beverage departments. On the other hand, it is observed that 55.5% of the employees working in five-star hotel businesses in Antalya region are under 29 years of age and 43.5% of them have secondary school education level and under. This research study utilized scales dealing with three subjects which have been used in various studies. The perception of psychological contract breach is composed of three dimensions. The highest breach perception has been shown to occur in the economic dimension (3.634). This is followed by the improvement (3.527) and the social dimension (2.941). Overall perception of psychological contract breach is moderate (3.375). Nonetheless, about 61% of employees think that the hotel businesses fail to fulfill their commitments without any external influences. About 39% of the employees, however, think that the breach occurs due to reasons beyond the control of hotel businesses. All in all, the majority of employees expressed the opinion that the existing breach have been done deliberately by the businesses. The organizational trust consists of a single dimension. According to data obtained, the employees' trust for the organization is moderate (2.938). There are three dimensions of the organizational cynicism. Affective cynicism level is determined to be relatively low (2.539), while behavioral (3.085) and cognitive level of cynicism is moderate (2.935). The overall level of organizational cynicism is also observed to be moderate (2.876).

#### 4. 1. Testing the Research Hypotheses

Table 1 presents the results of multiple regression analyses performed to test the first hypothesis of the research study which considers the perceived psychological contract breach as independent, the organizational trust as dependent, and control variables as constant.

**Table 1.**

Model 1	Organizational Trust						
	B	Std. Dev.	$\beta$	t	P	Dual Relationship	Partial Relationship
<i>Constant</i>	<i>4.938</i>	<i>.185</i>	-	<i>26.688</i>	<i>.000</i>	-	-
<i>Psychological Contract Breach</i>	<i>-.378</i>	<i>.035</i>	<i>-.337</i>	<i>-10.792</i>	<i>.000</i>	<i>-.805</i>	<i>-.372</i>
Age 4 (36-41)	.375	.104	.122	3.592	.000	.132	.061
Age 5 (42 and over)	.490	.135	.089	3.623	.000	.133	.061
Income 3 (1301-1800 TL)	.191	.097	.063	1.973	.049	.073	.033
Income 4 (1801-2300 TL)	.269	.120	.084	2.247	.025	.083	.038
Duration of Employment in Tourism 2 (1-3)	-.371	.103	-.151	-3.591	.000	-.132	-.061
Duration of Employment in Tourism 3 (4-6)	-.310	.117	-.140	-2.660	.008	-.098	-.045
Duration of Employment in Tourism 4 (7-9)	-.440	.136	-.159	-3.236	.001	-.119	-.055
Duration of Employment in Tourism 5 (9-over)	-.440	.142	-.169	-3.098	.002	-.114	-.052
Department 1 (Front desk)	.113	.055	.041	2.071	.039	.077	.035
Department 7 (Other)	.226	.091	.050	2.493	.013	.092	.042
Breach 1 (Premeditated Breach)	-1.026	.068	-.477	-15.013	.000	-.486	-.253
Breach 3 (Misperception)	-1.275	.360	-.062	-3.545	.000	-.130	-.060
<i>R = 0.891</i>	<i>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.793</i>		<i>Durbin-Watson 1.987</i>	<i>0.000</i>		<i>F = 84.440</i>	

As a result of the analysis performed, multiple regression analysis which consists of the perceived psychological contract breach (PCB) and the control variables with significant contributions to the model is determined to explain approximately 79% of organizational trust (OT) at 0.001 significance level ( $R = 0.891 / R^2 = 0.793$ ). Also, it is determined that very high levels of dual relationship (-0.805) between psychological contract and organizational trust diminishes to -0.372 when the other variables are taken under control. According to standardized regression coefficients, the prediction of organizational psychological contract breach has the value of -0.337 and significance level of 0.001 in predicting the organizational trust. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the research study which claimed that *"the psychological contract breach has a negative impact on organizational trust"* is accepted. This result also meets the condition that "the independent variable acts as a predictor variable in explaining the mediator variable" which is stated by Baron and Kenny (1986).

Table 2.

Model 1	Organizational Cynicism						
	B	Std. Dev.	$\beta$	t	P	Dual Relation	Partial Relation
<i>Constant</i>	<b>1.406</b>	<b>.227</b>	-	<b>6.206</b>	<b>.000</b>	-	-
<i>Psychological Contract Breach</i>	<b>.226</b>	<b>.043</b>	<b>.205</b>	<b>5.274</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>.704</b>	<b>.192</b>
Gender 1 (Female)	-.100	.051	-.047	-1.955	.041	-.072	-.041
Duration 2 (1-3)	-.283	.072	-.134	-3.928	.000	-.144	-.083
Duration 3 (4-6)	-.564	.118	-.212	-4.764	.000	-.174	-.100
Duration 4 (7-9)	-.558	.143	-.181	-3.895	.000	-.143	-.082
Duration 5 (9 and over)	-.614	.183	-.118	-3.356	.001	-.124	-.071
Duration of Employment in Tourism 4 (7-9)	.461	.166	.170	2.770	.006	.102	.058
Staff 1 (Seasonal)	.319	.081	.153	3.952	.000	.145	.083
Department 3 (Floor Services)	-.173	.071	-.065	-2.441	.015	-.090	-.051
Department 5 (Sales-Marketing)	-.191	.095	-.053	-2.012	.045	-.074	-.042
Department 7 (Other)	-.220	.111	-.049	-1.978	.048	-.073	-.042
Breach 1 (Premeditated Breach)	.857	.084	.406	10.237	.000	.754	.355
Breach 3 (Misperception)	1.352	.440	.067	3.071	.002	.113	.065
<b>R = 0.823</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.678</b>	<b>Durbin-Watson 1.773</b>		<b>0.000</b>	<b>F = 46.412</b>		
Model 2	B	Std. Dev.	$\beta$	t	P	Dual Relationship	Partial Relationship
<i>Constant</i>	<b>3.715</b>	<b>.295</b>	-	<b>12.607</b>	<b>.000</b>	-	-
<i>Psychological Contract Breach</i>	<b>.049</b>	<b>.043</b>	<b>.045</b>	<b>1.155</b>	<b>.248</b>	<b>.704</b>	<b>.043</b>
<i>Organizational Trust</i>	<b>-.468</b>	<b>.042</b>	<b>-.477</b>	<b>-11.141</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>-.806</b>	<b>-.382</b>
Gender 1 (Female)	-.094	.047	-.044	-1.992	.047	-.072	-.039
Duration 2 (1-3)	-.272	.067	-.129	-4.072	.000	-.144	-.079
Duration 3 (4-6)	-.504	.110	-.190	-4.599	.000	-.174	-.089
Duration 4 (7-9)	-.501	.133	-.162	-3.773	.000	-.143	-.073
Duration 5 (9 and over)	-.557	.169	-.107	-3.287	.001	-.124	-.064
Staff 1 (Seasonal)	.350	.075	.168	4.688	.000	.145	.091
Department 5 (Sales-Marketing)	-.176	.088	-.049	-2.011	.045	-.074	-.039
Breach 1 (Premeditated Breach)	.377	.089	.178	4.253	.000	.754	.156
<b>R = 0.852</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup> = 0.725</b>	<b><math>\Delta R^2 = 0.047</math></b>		<b>0.000</b>	<b>F = 56.327</b>		
<b>Sobel Test = -4.725 p &lt; 0.001</b>							

Table 2 presents the results of hierarchical regression analysis performed to test the second, third and fourth hypotheses of the research study. Perceived psychological contract breach and the control variables are included to the first regression model of which the organizational cynicism (OC) is the dependent variable. Analysis results indicated that the model explains 68% of the organizational cynicism ( $R = 0.823 / R^2 = 0.678$ ). When values of dual relationship are examined, PCB-OC relationship appears to be positive and at a high level ( $R = 0.704$ ). When the control variables with significant contributions are kept constant, the level of correlation decreases ( $R = 0.192$ ). When other variables are controlled, the psychological contract appears to have  $\beta = 0.205$  and significance level at 0.001 in prediction of organizational cynicism. Indeed, with this result, the second hypothesis of the research study which claims that **"the psychological contract breach has a positive impact on organizational cynicism"** is accepted. This result also meet the condition claiming that **"independent variable acts as a predictor variable in explaining the dependent variable"** developed by Baron and Kenny (1986) as a prerequisite for mediatory tests. The organizational trust is included to the model at the second stage of hierarchical regression analysis presented in Table 2. This model is determined to explain 72% of the organizational cynicism ( $R = 0.852 / R^2 = 0.725$ ). The contribution of organizational trust to the model is about 4% ( $\Delta R^2 = 0.047$ ). The value of dual relationship between organizational trust and organizational cynicism was determined to be too high and negative ( $-0.806$ ). When the control variables with significant contributions are kept constant, on the other hand, the value decreases ( $-0.382$ ). When the standardized beta coefficients are examined, the organizational trust appears to have the importance value of  $-0.477$  at 0.001 significance level in prediction of organizational cynicism. With this conclusion, the third hypothesis of the research study which claims that **"the organizational trust has a negative impact on the organizational cynicism"** is supported. Furthermore, this impact also meet the condition claiming that **"mediator variable acts as a predictor variable in explaining the dependent variable"** developed by Baron and Kenny (1986) for mediatory tests.

According to the results shown in Table 2; the perceived psychological contract breach in Model 1 where the organizational trust is excluded has  $\beta = 0.205$  and the significance level of 0.001 in predicting organizational cynicism. However, in the second regression model which includes the organizational trust, no significant relationship between the psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism is determined ( $\beta = 0.045, p > 0.05$ ). With this result, the condition that **"complete disappearance of the impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable upon the inclusion of the mediator variable"** expressed by Baron and Kenny (1986) is met. In addition, the mediatory effect of organizational trust has also been found significant through Sobel test performed in order to confirm the mediatory effect ( $p < 0.001$ ). These results supported the fourth hypothesis of this research study as follows: **"Organizational trust is a mediator variable in the impact of the perceived psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism"**. Therefore, it is determined that the impact of psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism arises through organizational trust.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study, determining the overall structure of the employment relationship in hotel businesses due to either their flexible employment structure or their seasonality feature is aimed. As part of this objective, the levels of perceived psychological contract breach, organizational trust, and organizational cynicism are tried to be determined for totally 761 hotel business employees working in five-star hotels

in Antalya province. Nevertheless, it is also aimed to determine the relationship between patterns of the referred cases. According to the obtained results; participants have mid-level perceived psychological contract breach, organizational trust, and organizational cynicism. Following the determination of the perceived psychological contract breach, organizational trust and organizational cynicism levels, the regression analyses are performed in order to determine the premises and conclusion relationship between the variables and to test the hypotheses of the research. According to the results; there is a low level of inverse relationship between the perceived psychological contract breach and organizational trust when the control variables are constant. On the other hand, the perception of psychological contract breach is found to be a significant predictor variable in explaining the organizational trust. Accordingly, the rise in the psychological contract breach lowers the perception of organizational trust. These results are consistent with theoretical assumptions examined in the literature section of this study on the pattern of relationship between the two cases. Indeed; the psychological contract breach provides data in terms of cognitive trust for the employees. Moreover, objective criteria in the organization-member relations are the basic premise of mutual trust of both parties (Lewis and Weigert, 1985). Therefore, the actors in psychological contract relations developing within an organic process (Turnley and Feldman, 2000) determine the level of trust with concrete data, experience, and impressions (Morrison, 1994; Robinson, 1996), the alignment, stability and continuity of expectations and obligations are considered as the objective criteria of trust (Shapiro, Sheppard, and Cheraskin, 1992). It is possible to assert that the significant impact of the perceived psychological contract breach detected in this study on organizational trust for the organization can be explained with the aforementioned theoretical grounds. In other words, it is seen that the employees' expectations that could be evaluated in the context of the psychological contract are not fulfilled and the level of trust in the organization would be shaped by the perceived breach. One of the negative consequences of the psychological contract breach on cognitive trust development, in terms of facts and contents, is the damage to mutual good faith approach. Indeed, in addition to experience and impression, mutual goodwill is stated to be decisive of the cognitive level of trust (McAllister, 1995; Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 2000). Thus, it is possible to claim that such attitudes and behaviors as organizational citizenship, identification, and loyalty to which goodwill is embedded will also be negatively affected, while the psychological contract breach occurred in hotel businesses has a negative impact on the employees' trust in the organization. Another problem discussed within the scope of the purpose of this research study is the question of whether the psychological contract breach causes the organizational cynicism attitudes. The results of the performed analyses reveal that the positive relationship between psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism is found to be low but significant when the control variables are considered constant. The effect of the cynical attitude is also determined to be significant in the perception of the breach. Accordingly, the perceived psychological contract breach of hotel employees is a decisive reason for the emergence of cynical attitudes towards the organization. This achieved result is in line with assumptions of the social exchange theory discussed in terms of the cause, nature and process of the relationship among the cases. In Homans's social exchange theory, sustainability of any social relationship has been evaluated within the context of six propositions such as stimulus, success, value, deprivation-satiation, aggression-approval and rationality (Ritzer, 2012).

According to the theory, non-fulfillment of the employees' expectations under the psychological contract (stimulus, success and value propositions), can lead to negative employee attitudes and behaviors towards the organization (aggression-approval proposition). Due to perceived psychological

contract breach; affective, cognitive and behavioral reactions such as negligence to work, intimidation, distrust (Robinson, 1995), unethical behavior, cynical attitudes, fear, paranoia, pessimism (Pelletier and Bligh, 2008), emotional detachment, feeling of being abused for the sake of organizational interests, anger, frustration, injustice and inequality (Rousseau, 1989; Kickul, 2001; Suazo et al., 2005) may occur. These reactions, in particular, are to be considered in terms of aggression proposition of social exchange theory. Thus, this research study suggested that the perceived psychological contract breach overlapping with social exchange theory would lead to organizational cynicism attitude. Data for the effects of perceived breach on organizational cynicism are also signs of certain adversities that can occur within the organization. As Turnley and Feldman (1998) stated, the perception of psychological contract breach does have such consequences as severance, organizational silence, and negligence. In particular, there is a wide range of adverse attitudes and behaviors exhibited in the short-term by the employees who continues to work during the period which is not appropriate for severance due to current personal and sectoral conditions (Kickul, 2001). In the long term, an ultimate organizational anomie can arise due to the worn-out relationship between employees and the organizations (Regoli et al., 1990; Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Sobel, 2010; Bal, Chiabur, and Diaz, 2011). In that respect; it is possible to say that cynical attitudes based on perceived breach may be the premise of breaks in organizational structure, drawbacks and anomie situations for hotel businesses in the long-term. The design of this research is based on the main problem of "whether organizational trust acts as a moderator variable for the impact of perceived psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism, or not". As a result of the analysis performed to determine the level and nature of the possible modulatory influence of trust; organizational trust is determined to moderate the relation between the perception of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism. In other words; the impacts of the psychological contract breach on organizational cynicism are inflicted in an indirect way through organizational trust and once trust effect is controlled, those impacts would be eliminated. Indeed, trust is the main variable in terms of formation, improvement, operation and sustainability of any social relationship (Zand, 1972; Lewis and Weigert, 1985; Zucker, 1986; Hosmer, 1995; Fukuyama, 2005). The quality and continuity of the relationship are closely related to the actors' mutual trust/distrust levels. Specifically, in terms of social exchange, the realization of expectations shaped by the parties' mutual obligations or responsibilities attributed to each other will strengthen/improve the tendency to trust in the relationship; otherwise, distrust negatively affects the existence and functioning of relation. Whitenor et al. (1998) also suggested a similar opinion on organizational trust formation. Accordingly, the psychological contract breach which is closely related to issues such organizational structure, human resources policy, and organizational culture, can lead to some damage to the trust of the employees in terms of the aforementioned models. Upon examination of findings obtained in this study, the impact of psychological contract breach on organizational trust appears as its primary result, while its effect on cynicism obviously occurs due to that relationship. In that sense, the results brought forth in the research study coincide with the theoretical assumptions. The main objective of this study is to determine the relationships among psychological contract breach, organizational trust, and organizational cynicism. The theoretical framework, research field, and performed analyses are limited in accordance with this purpose. However, in terms of business and organizational sociology, it should also be noted that all three cases are to be shaped along with peripheral variables connected to the organization. According to Blau and Schoenherr (1971), how organizational conditions influence individual relations and behaviors is one of the fundamental questions in the study of organizations. Another and more



comprehensive question, on the other hand, is what factors on which organizational conditions determining relationships and behaviors depend. Organizational conditions are independent variables in the first type of research studies, while they are dependent variables in the second type (Bozkurt, 1976, p. 111). Organization theory, in this respect, acts in accordance with two different paradigms such as strategic choice and environmental determinism in explaining managerial behaviors and changes (Sayılır, 2011, p. 220). According to structural contingency and population ecology theories of environmental determinism paradigm; organizational structure, operation, development, decisions and practices are formed depending on factors outside the organization. Ontological determination of organizations stems from that harmonization with the environment (Sargut and Özen, 2010, p. 21). Within the context of this idea; organizational design of hotel management and human resources policies in the tourism sector are being shaped by the political-economic structure of the working conditions in Turkey. Therefore; it is necessary to investigate legal and economic variables on which organizational operations, strategic planning, and administrative decisions/practices depend along with the business culture in Turkey and employment dynamics. This effort will be useful in determining the underlying causes of psychological contract breach which point out human resources approaches and practices in hotel businesses. In this context, a better understanding of the causality relationship between organizational trust and cynical attitudes would be achieved, so that radical solutions are expected to be produced for persistent problems in the structure of employment in the tourism sector.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269-292.
- Andersson, L. M. & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: some causes and effects. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5), 449-69.
- Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: an examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49(11) 1395-1418.
- Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S. & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285.
- Ayduđan, N. (2012). *Mobbingin örgütsel sinizme etkisi: Beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyon Karahisar.
- Bal, P. M., Chiaburu, D. S. & Diaz, I. (2011). Does psychological contract breach decrease proactive behaviors? The moderating effect of emotion regulation. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(6), 722-758
- Bal, P. M., Chiaburu, D. S. & Jansen, P. G. W. (2010). Psychological contract breach and work performance: Is social exchange a buffer or an intensifier? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(3), 252-273
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Bashir, S. & Nasir, M. (2013). Breach of psychological contract, organizational cynicism and union commitment: A study of hospitality industry in Pakistan. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 61-65.
- Bateman, T. S., Sakano, T. & Fujita, M. (1992). Roger, me, and my attitude: Film propaganda and cynicism toward corporate leadership. *The Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 77(5), 768-771.
- Berberođlu, B. (2012). *Klasik ve çağdaş sosyal teoriye giriş: eleştirel bir perspektif*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Blancero, D. M. & Johnson, S. A. (2001). A process model of discretionary service behavior integrating psychological contracts, organizational justice and customer feedback to manage service agents. *Journal of Quality Management*. 6, 307-329.
- Bommer, W. H., Rich, G. & Rubin, R. S. (2005). Changing attitudes about change: Longitudinal effects of transformational leader behavior on employee cynicism about organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 733-753.
- Bozkurt, Ö. (1976). Toplumsal yapı içinde örgütler. *Yönetim Sosyolojisi-Yönetim Sosyolojisi Kolokyumuna Sunulan Bildiriler*- içinde, Ankara: Türkiye ve Orta Dođu Amme İdaresi Yayınları.
- Brandes, P. (1997). *Organizational cynicism: Its nature, antecedents and consequences*. Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Brandes, P., Castro, S. L., Matrecia, S. L. J., Martinez, A. D., Matherly, T. A., Ferris, G. R. & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). The interactive effects of job insecurity and organizational cynicism on work effort following a layoff. *Journal of Leadership And Organizational Studies*, 14(3), 233-247.



- Buch, R., Kuvaas, B. & Dysvik, A. (2010). Dual support in contract workers' triangular employment relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 93-103.
- Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust Inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 643-663.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cassar, V. (2001). Violating psychological contract terms amongst maltese public service employees: Occurrence and relationships. *Journal Of Managerial Psychology*, 16, 194-208.
- Chiaburu, D. S., Peng, A. C., Oh, I. S., Banks, G. C. & Lomeli, L. C. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 181-197.
- Chrobot-Mason, D. L. (2003). Keeping the promise: psychological contract violations for minority employees. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(1), 22-45.
- Cole, M. S., Bruch, H. & Vogel, B. (2006). Emotion as mediators of the relations between perceived supervisor support and psychological hardiness on employee cynicism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(4), 463-484.
- Conway, N. & Briner, R. B. (2002). Full-time versus part-time employees: Understanding the links between work status, the psychological contract, and attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 279-301.
- Conway, N., Guest, D. & Trenberth, L. (2011). Testing the differential effects of changes in psychological contract breach and fulfillment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1), 267-276.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M. & Conway, N. (2005). Exchange relationships: examining psychological contracts and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 774-781.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M. & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(7), 903-930.
- Cummings, L. L. & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI). Roderick M. Kramer ve Tom R. Tyler (Ed), In *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (s. 302-319). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Çetiner, E. (1995). *Konaklama işletmelerinde yönetim muhasebesi*. Ankara: Tutibay Yayınları.
- Davis, W. D. & Gardner, W. L. (2004). Perceptions of politics and organizational cynicism: an attributional and leader-member exchange perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 439-465.
- De Vos, A., Buyens, D. & Schalk, R. (2005). Making sense of a new employment relationship: Psychological contract-related information seeking and the role of work values and locus of control. *International Journal Of Selection And Assessment*, 13(1), 41-52.
- Dean, J. W., Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy Of Management Review*, 23(2), 341-352.
- DeConinck, J. B. (2010). The effect of organizational justice, perceived organizational support, and perceived supervisor support on marketing employees' level of trust. *Journal of Business Research*, 63, 1349-1355.
- Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 1004-1012.
- Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P. & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*. 23(3), 601-620.
- Dulac, T., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A. M., Henderson, D. J. & Wayne, S. J. (2008). Not all responses to breach are the same: The interconnection of social exchange and psychological contract processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*. 51(6), 1079-1098.
- Durdağ, F. M. & Naktiyok, A. (2011). Psikolojik taciz algısının örgütsel güven üzerindeki rolü. *Kafkas Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 1(2), 5-37.
- Emmerick, H., Euwema, M. C. & Bakker, A. B. (2007). Threats of workplace violence and the buffering effect of social support. *Group & Organization Management*, 32(2), 152-175.
- Ermongkonchai, P. (2010). Understanding reasons for employee unethical conduct in Thai organizations: A qualitative inquiry. *Contemporary Management Research*, 6(2), 125-140.
- Fukuyama, F. (2005). *Güven, sosyal erdemler ve refahın yaratılması*. (Çeviren Ahmet Buğdaycı). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Goldner, F. H., Ritti, R. R. & Ference, T. P. (1977). The production of cynical knowledge in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 42(4), 539-551.
- Guest, D. (1998). Is the psychological contract worth taking seriously? *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1), 649-664.
- Guest, D. E. & Conway, N. (2002). Communicating the psychological contract: An employer perspective. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12(2), 22-38.
- Guest, D. E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological contract. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(4), 541-555.
- Guest, D. E. (2004). The psychology of the employment relationship: An analysis based on the psychological

- contract. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(4), 541-555.
- Halis, M., Gökgez, G. S. & Yaşar, Ö. (2007). Örgütsel güvenin belirleyici faktörleri ve bankacılık sektöründe bir uygulama. *Manas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17, 187-205.
- Hall, D. T. & Moss, J. E. (1998). New Protean Career Contract: Helping Organizations Employees Adapt. *Organization Dynamics*, 26(3), 22-37.
- Helvacı, M. A. (2010). Örgütsel sinizm. H. B. Memduhoğlu, ve K. Yılmaz, (Ed.), *Yönetimde Yeni Yaklaşımlar* içinde (s.383-397), Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Herriot, P., Manning, W. E. G. & Kidd, J. M. (1997). The content of the psychological contract. *British Journal of Management*, 8(2), 151-162.
- Heuvel, S. & Schalk, R. (2009). The relationship between fulfilment of the psychological contract and resistance to change during organizational transformations. *Social Science Information*, 48(2), 283-313.
- Hiltrop, J. (1995). The Changing Psychological Contract: The Human Resource Challenge of the 1990s. *European Management Journal*, 13(3), 286-294.
- Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: the connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.
- Huff, L. & Kelley, L. (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: a seven-nation study. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 81-90.
- James, M. S. L. (2005). *Antecedents and consequences of cynicism in organizations: An examination of the potential positive and negative effects on school systems*. Dissertation of Doctor of Philosophy, The Florida State University, Florida.
- Johnson, J. L. & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2003). The effects of psychological contract breach and organizational cynicism: Not all social exchange violations are created equal. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(5), 627-647.
- Kalağan, G. (2009). *Araştırma görevlilerinin örgütsel destek algıları ile örgütsel sinizm tutumları arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Kanter, D. L. & Mirvis, P. H. (1989). *The cynical americans: Living and working in an age of discontent and disillusion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.
- Kanter, D. L. & Mirvis, P. H. (1991). Cynicism: The New American Malaise. *Business And Society Review*, Volume 91(77), 57-61.
- Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kickul, J. & Lester, S. W. (2001). Broken promises: equity sensitivity as a moderator between psychological contract breach and employee attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2), 191-217.
- Kickul, J. (2001). When organizations break their promises: Employee reactions to unfair processes and treatment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(4), 289-307.
- Kickul, J. (2001). When organizations break their promises: Employee reactions to unfair processes and treatment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(4), 289-307.
- Kickul, J. R., Neuman, G., Parker, C. & Finkl, J. (2002). Settling the score: The role of organizational justice in the relationship between psychological contract breach and anticitizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 13(2), 77-93.
- Kingshott, R. P. J. (2006). The impact of psychological contracts upon trust and commitment within supplier-buyer relationships: A social exchange view. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(6), 724-739.
- Klehe, U., Zikic, J., Van Vianen, A. E. M. & De Pater, I. E. (2011). Career adaptability, turnover and loyalty during organizational downsizing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1), 217-229.
- Koh, C., Ang, S. & Straub, D. W. (2004). IT outsourcing success: A psychological contract perspective. *Information Systems Research*, 15(4), 356-373.
- Konovsky, A. & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Barton-Bellessa, S. M. & Jiang, S. (2012). Examining the relationship between supervisor and management trust and job burnout among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(7), 938-957.
- Lambert, L. S., Edwards, J. R. & Cable, D. M. (2003). Breach and fulfillment of the psychological contract: A comparison of traditional and expanded views. *Personnel Psychology*, 56(4), 895-934.
- Lavelle, J. J., Rupp, D. E. & Brockner, J. (2007). Taking a multifoci approach to the study of justice, social exchange, and citizenship behavior: The target similarity model. *Journal of Management*, 33(6), 841-866.
- Lewis, J. D. & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63(4), 967-85.
- Martin, G., Staines, H. & Pate, J. (1998). Linking job security and career development in a new psychological contract. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 8(3), 20-40.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-34.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal co-operation in organisations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.

- Mete, Y. A. (2013). Relationship between organizational cynicism and ethical leadership behaviour: A study at higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 89, 476-483.
- Millward, L. J. & Brewerton, P. M. (1999). Contractors and their psychological contracts. *British Journal of Management*, 10(3), 253-274.
- Mishra, J. & Morrissey, M. A. (1990). Trust in employee/employer relationships: A survey of west michigan managers. *Public Personnel Management*. 19(4), 443-486
- Morrison, D. E. (1994). Psychological contracts and change. *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 353-372.
- Morrison, E. W. & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 226-256.
- Neves, P. (2012). Organizational cynicism: Spillover effects on supervisor-subordinate relationships and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 965-976.
- Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2008). Can you get a better deal elsewhere? The effects of psychological contract replicability on organizational commitment over time. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 73(2), 268-277.
- Niehoff, B. P. & Paul, R. J. (2001) Just Workplace: Developing and maintaining effective psychological contracts. *Review of Bussines*, Spring.
- Özler, E. D., Atalay, G. C. & Şahin, D. M. (2010). Örgütlerde sinizm güvensizlikle mi bulaşır? *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2), 47-57.
- Pelletier, K. L. & Bligh, M. C. (2008). The aftermath of organizational corruption: Employee attributions and emotional reactions. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 80(4), 823-844.
- Preacher, K. J. (2010). *Calculation for the sobel test. An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests*. <http://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm>, Erişim: 03.09.2014.
- Pugh, S. D., Skarlicki, D. P. & Passell, B. S. (2003). After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(2), 201-212.
- Regoli, R., Culbertson, R. G., Crank, J. P. & Powell, J. R. (1990). Career stage and cynicism among police chiefs. *Justice Quarterly*. 7(3), 593-614.
- Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P. & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 48-59.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P. & Tang, R. L. (2006). Effects of psychological contract breach on performance of employees: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79(2), 299-306.
- Ribbers, I. L. (2009). *Trust, cynicism, and organizational change: The role of management*. Master in Strategic Management Department Organisation and Strategy Faculty of Economics and Business Administration.
- Richard, O. C., McMillan-Capehart, A., Bhuian, S. N. & Taylor, E. C. (2009). Antecedents and consequences of psychological contracts: Does organizational culture really matter? *Journal of Business Research*, 62(8), 818-825.
- Ritzer, G. (2012). *Modern Sosyoloji Kuramları*. Ankara: De Ki Yayınları.
- Robinson, S. L. & Morrison, E. W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: The effects of unfulfilled obligations. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 16(3), 289-298.
- Robinson, S. L. & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 525-546.
- Robinson, S. L. & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245-259.
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 41(4), 574-599.
- Roehling, M. V. (1997). The origins and early development of the psychological contract construct. *Journal of Management History*, 3(2), 204-217.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1989). Psychological and implied contracts in organizations. *Employee Responsibilities And Rights Journal*, 2(2), 121-139.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: a study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 11(5), 389-400.
- Rousseau, D. M. (2000). Psychological Contract Inventory Technical Report. Version 3, August. [http://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/rousseau/0\\_reports/PCI3.pdf](http://www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/rousseau/0_reports/PCI3.pdf) Erişim Tarihi: 02.01.2013.
- 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.
- Sargut, A. S. ve Özen, Ş. (2010). Örgüt kuramlarına genel bakış: karşılaştırmalı bir çözümleme. A. S. Sargut ve Ş. (Ed.) *Özen. Örgüt Kuramları* içinde (s. 11-35). Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Sayılır, Y. (2008). Türkiye'deki insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamaları açısından stratejik seçim ve kurumsal



- belirlenimin olası etkileri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 63(2), 219-249.
- Sels, L., Janssens, M. & Brande, I. (2004). Assessing the nature of psychological contracts: A validation of six dimensions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(4), 461-488.
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N. & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.
- Shapiro, S. P. (1987). The social control of impersonal trust. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(3), 623-658
- Shapiro, D. L., Sheppard, D. & Cheraskin, H. (1992). Business on a handshake. *Negotiation Journal*, 8(4)365-377.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal*, 18(4), 35-48
- Sims, R. R. (1994). Human resource management's role in clarifying the new psychological contract. *Human Resource Management*, 33(3), 373-382.
- Sobel, J. J. (2010). Social ecology and police discretion: the influence of district crime, cynicism and workload on the vigor of police response. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 481-488.
- Sparrow, P. R. (1996). Transitions in the psychological contract: A some evidence from the banking sector. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 6(4), 75-92.
- Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P. & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), 429-459.
- Stanley, S. (2007). Retreat from Politics: The Cynic in Modern Times. *Polity*, 39(3), pp. 384-407.
- Suazo, M. M., Turnley, W. H. & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (2005). The role of perceived violation in determining employees' reactions to psychological contract breach. *Journal Of Leadership And Organizational Studies*, 12(1), 24-36.
- Sur, Ö. (2010). *Örgütsel sinizm: Eskişehir ili büro çalışanları üzerine bir alan araştırması*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Thompson, R. C., Joseph, K. M., Bailey, L. L., Worley, J. A. & Williams, C. A. (2000). Organizational change: An assessment of trust and cynicism. *Final Report. FAA Civil Aeromedical Institute*. pp. 1-9.
- Topçu, İ., Türkkan, N. Ü., Bacaksız, F. E., Şen, H. T., Karadal, A. & Yıldırım, A. (2013). Sağlık çalışanlarında örgütsel sinizm ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenirliği. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Elektronik Dergisi*, 6(3), 125-131.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature meaning and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547-593.
- Turnley, W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (1998). Psychological contract violations during corporate restructuring. *Human Resource Management*, 37(1), 71-83.
- Turnley, W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (1999). A discrepancy model of psychological contract violations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(3), 367-386.
- Turnley, W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2000). Re-examining the effects of psychological contract violations: Unmet expectations and job dissatisfaction as mediators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 25-42.
- Turnley, W. H., Bolino, M. C., Lester, S. W. & Bloodgood, J. M. (2003). The impact of psychological contract fulfillment on the performance of in-role and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 29(2), 187-206.
- Ural, A. ve Kılıç, İ. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve spss ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Walker, A. & Hutton, D. M. (2006). The application of the psychological contract to workplace safety. *Journal of Safety Research*, 37(5), 433-441.
- Walker, A. (2010). The development and validation of a psychological contract of safety scale. *Journal of Safety Research*, 41(4), 315-321.
- Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E. & Austin, J. T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change measurement, antecedents and correlates. *Group And Organization Management*, 25(2), 132-153.
- Wanous, P. J., Reichers, E. A. & Austin, T. J. (1994). Organizational Cynicism: An Initial Study. *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, 1, 269-273.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support And Leader-Member Exchange: A Social Exchange Perspective. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A. & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *The Academy Of Management Review*, 23(3), 513-30.
- Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), 229-39.
- Zucker, L. G. (1986). The production of trust: Institutional sources of economic structure: 1840-1920. B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds). In *Research in organizational behavior* (p. 53-111), Greenwich, JAI Press.