ISGUC.ORG

TARANDIĞIMIZ INDEXLER

İÇİNDEKİLER

YIL: EKİM **2016** / CİLT: **18** SAYI: **4**

CHANGE-SPECIFIC CYNICISM AS A DETERMINANT OF EMPLOYEE RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

Ahmet Emre Demirci[1]

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *Relevant literature in the field suggests that attitudes of the employees toward organizational change have direct impact on the success or failure of the change efforts. These effects and outcomes can be seen in different forms. In some cases, positive attitudes of the employees can enhance the change efforts while in other cases negative attitudes toward change can hinder the change process and cause failures in the change initiatives. Our study aims to reveal the relations between attitudes toward organizational change and change-specific cynicism.*

Design/Methodology/Approach: *A sample of 336 surveys were collected from six leading companies supplying materials to major domestic appliances companies in Turkey.*

Findings: *According to the results of this study, there is a strong correlation between change-specific cynicism and employees' beliefs, thoughts and attitudes toward change.*

Originality/Value: *This paper sheds light on the complex relations between employee attitudes toward organizational change and change-specific cynicism from a non-western standpoint.*

Keywords: *Cynicism, Change-Specific Cynicism, Organizational Change, Resistance to Change*

JEL Classification: *M1*

Article Classification: *Research Paper*

1   Assoc.Prof.Dr. at Anadolu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Tel.:+90-22-335 05 80 / x.3348, E-Mail: aedemirci@anadolu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Research on organizational change has a long history and a rich background of concern for both business professionals and academia. Due to its complex structure and multi-faceted nature, organizational change processes have long been discussed from various perspectives by many scholars. However, we can argue that majority of the relevant research adopts a view at organization (*macro*) level. Although increasing number of researchers have called for a more individual or employee (*micro*) level focus, micro-level studies remain limited compared to macro-level studies (Quin, Kahn & Mandl, 1994; Judge et al., 1999). Such a comparison of macro and micro level studies reveals a strong need for further research on individual or employee level issues about organizational change. From this standpoint, organizational change is a topic that calls for further research, not only at organization level, but also individual level (Elias, 2009; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). In the late 1940s, Lewin's (1947) three-stage organizational change model involving unfreezing-changing-refreezing has become unfashionable due to the highly complex nature of organizational change. Because, it would not be realistic to claim that the individuals within the organizations simply experience these steps during organization change efforts. On the contrary, individuals working for today's organizations operate under uncertainty and, in many cases, cannot even reach to the refreezing phase as the change has become a constant and unceasing factor for many businesses. Under these circumstances, organizations today have to work with employees who are adaptable, proactive and equipped with skills to respond to challenges of change and high uncertainty (Mack, Nelson & Quick, 1998).

Considering the fact that many organizational change efforts fail, we can argue that there are many factors that can potentially affect the fate of change initiatives (Axelrod et al., 2006; McGuire et al., 2008; Reeves & Allison, 2009; Hallencreutz & Turner, 2011). Organizational structure, industry in which the organization operates, organizational culture, leadership style and finally, as mentioned before, attitudes of the employees are among the many factors that directly affect the success or failure of organizational change efforts. According to Linstone and Mitroff (1994), three major factors – *technologic, organizational and individual* – should be considered in the change process. Individual factors are the most challenging factors when the organization engages in change initiatives. Because employees will most likely to resist change and such possible resistance would easily increase the odds of failure. While some employees would attribute positive meanings to change, others may character-

ize it with threat, stress and other negative feelings (Rashid, Sambasivan & Rahman, 2003). Many studies have revealed that the main reason why change initiatives fail is that the leaders tend to ignore or overlook the critical role of employees in the change process. However, employees are the most crucial aspect of all change efforts within the organization (Choi, 2011).

When the arguments are centered on the resistance to change, many recent studies refer to employee cynicism. Employees are becoming more cynical due to the chaotic nature of the business environment today. Lack of trust, corporate scandals and opportunistic behaviors of individuals trigger employee cynicism. Studies suggest that employee cynicism leads to performance problems, lower job satisfaction, lower loyalty and higher possibilities to leave the job (Chiaburu et al., 2013).

Employees' Attitudes Toward Organizational Change Efforts

Secord and Beckman (1969) define attitude as certain regularities of an individual's feelings, thoughts and predispositions to act toward some aspects of his environment. According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1975), attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object. Individuals' attitudes about certain issues are very important as those attitudes shape their behaviors. From our perspective, employees' attitudes toward organizational change efforts would most likely to affect their behaviors within the organization.

Elizur and Guttman (1976) suggest three behavioral modalities – *cognitive, affective and instrumental* – for attitudes toward change. From this standpoint, employee attitudes toward organizational change efforts can be either positive or negative. Change initiatives can evoke various emotions like excitement, happiness, fear or anger. Individuals experiencing any of these emotions can either support change or be reluctant to contribute to the efforts depending on how they feel (Vakola & Nikolau, 2005).

While some studies refer to these attitudes as "readiness for change" or "belief in change" (Trumbo, 1961; Fox vd., 1988; Drzensky et al., 2012), others prefer to use more negative statements such as "resistance to change".

We can suggest that the most common statement that is used for the attitudes toward change is "readiness for change". This statement is closely associated with the attitudes of individuals. Readiness for change can be defined as the employees' attitudes, and intentions toward the level of required change and their belief that the organization can successfully complete the change process (Armenakis, Harris & Mossholder, 1993). From the negative standpoint, the most common statement used for the attitudes toward change is "resistance to change" – a concept introduced by Coch and French (1948) in their study titled as *"Overcoming Resistance to Change"*. This study has paved the way for research on organizational change and organizational development for psychologists. Relevant research have revealed that resistance to change is among the most debated and studied attitudes in the change management theory and practice (Bouckenooghe, 2010). One of the most comprehensive approaches to employees' attitudes toward change was introduced by Elizur and Guttman (1976). They have introduced three behavioral modalities that are named as "cognitive", "affective" and "instrumental". Oreg, Vakola and Armenakis (2011) refer to these modalities as "explicit reactions". Because these modalities directly reveal how employees feel (affective), what they think (cognitive) about change efforts and how they tend to respond (instrumental/behavioral) to these efforts.

Cognitive Dimension

Cognitive responses to change efforts are the opinions individuals have about the advantages, disadvantages, usefulness and necessity of change, and about the knowledge and information required to handle it (Kwahk & Ahn, 2010). Cognitive dimension of the employees' attitudes toward change reflect their beliefs and thoughts about change. These beliefs and thoughts can be positive, negative or neutral depending on the specific case. How these beliefs are shaped is a complex question and the answer lies within the individual assessment of certain situations (Piderit, 2000). Oreg (2006) suggests that job security, intrinsic rewards, trust in management, power and prestige are among the major factors that have direct impact on employees' attitudes toward change.

Organizations can lead its people to develop positive and constructive cognitive orientation through planned practices. At this point, it is very important that the beliefs and thoughts of employees about their organizations should be supported by strong goals, objectives, values and a solid vision (Lengnick-Hall, Beck & Lengnick-Hall, 2011). Providing employees with a clear direction and leading them to embrace the values of the organization are very crucial for developing a positive cognitive orientation.

Affective Dimension

Affective dimension refers to how individuals in the organization feel about the organizational change efforts. It is obvious that senses and emotions are closely linked with the behaviors. Wade and Tavris (1996) define emotions as a state of arousal involving facial and bodily changes, brain activation, subjective feelings, cognitive appraisals which can be either conscious or unconscious and rational or irrational, and with a tendency toward action. They also refer to several universal emotions. Examples of such universal emotions include fear, anger, sadness, joy, surprise, disgust and contempt (Wade and Tavris, 1996). Individuals within the organization can easily experience any of these emotions that in return affects the change efforts.

Many studies about organizational change have been heavily criticized as they have overlooked the affective dimension and concentrated primarily on cognitive and behavioral dimensions. In fact, as the change itself is an emotional process, it is very important to consider the effects and scope of affective dimension in possible change efforts (Smollan, 2006). Bovey and Hede (2001) suggest that individuals may feel different emotions when they face changes in common practices. Employees will tend to resist change when they are not attached emotionally to the idea of change.

At this point we can suggest that different dimensions of change and, the nature and strength of emotional reactions will be different. Gersick (1991) notes that there is a strong relationship between the level of radicalness of the planned or exercised change and the level of emotional reaction of the employees toward change. Gersick (1991) also suggests that the more radical changes are, the more intensive emotions will employees experience. Because higher radicalness of change will have a greater potential to create more influential results. According to Smollan (2006), there is also a correlation between the level of complexity of change and the emotional reactions of the employees. As the complexity of the anticipated changes increase, they tend to create more negative and intense emotional reactions.

Behavioral Dimension

Behaviors of the employees toward organizational change efforts are very crucial for the results. Behavioral dimension refers to the actions already taken or which will be taken in the future. These actions can either support organizational change efforts or inhibit them. Actually, we can suggest

that the behavioral dimension is an outcome of cognitive and affective dimensions. In other words, beliefs, thoughts and emotions are transformed into behaviors. Bovey and Hede's (2001) definition of resistance to change clearly depicts behavioral dimension. They define attitudes toward change as the positive or negative behaviors of employees toward organizational change initiatives.

We can argue that the intensity of behavioral reactions toward change may vary. Anything from uncooperative attitudes for change efforts to industrial sabotages can be observed within the organization. Employees can be unresponsive to change efforts or exhibit disruptive behaviors (Bouckenooghe, 2010).

Behavioral reactions can also be positive. Avey et al. (2008) note that the positive behaviors of employees for change is very crucial for an effective change process. Many studies suggest that employees with productive thoughts, beliefs and emotions will more likely to exhibit similar behaviors that in return contributes to the successful completion of change projects.

Employees' attitudes toward change was analyzed from different perspectives in different studies. According to Bouckenooghe (2010), employees' attitudes toward change refer to attitudes such as readiness for change, resistance to change, cynicism about organizational change, commitment to change, openness to change, acceptance of change, coping with change, adjustment to change. Bouckenooghe (2010) also note that these attitudes are often used interchangeably. Although these attitudes may seem to represent multiple concepts at first sight, they actually represent closely related concepts.

This study focuses on change-specific cynicism and aims to shed light on the relationship between the employees' various attitudes toward organizational change and change-specific cynicism.

Cynicism: Theoretical Background

Cynicism as a school of thought has originated in ancient Greece. The term may have come from Cynosarges which is a town near Athens where the Cynics had established their school. Antisthenes, a follower of Socrates, is considered to be the first cynic. But, he has been overshadowed by another student of Socrates – Diogenes of Sinope. Cynics have thought about issues that have recently become topics of discussion in the field of organizational studies. Cynics have believed that the individual, not the institution, was the natural unit of human life. Thus, according to their perspective, many institutions were unnecessary and unnatural (Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1998). Cynics have openly exhibited critical behaviors against institutions (Kidd, 2005). Over the centuries and, especially after the last century, concept of cynicism has evolved based on its ancient roots to some extent and transformed into the current form. Merriam-Webster[2] defines cynicism as beliefs that people are generally selfish and dishonest by nature. Thus, their behaviors and motives are not to be trusted. Cynicism suggests that selfishness or individual self-interest are the main driving motives of human behavior.

Bond et al. (2004) define cynicism as a negative view on human nature, a belief that life only brings sadness, a thought that people constantly exploit each other and distrust in social institutions. Similarly, Safdar et al. (2006) note that cynicism also refers to prejudices against people and distrust in social structures. According to their perspective, cynicism represents a view that suggests human nature can easily be corrupted by the possession of power.

Dean, Brandes and Dharwadkar (1998) refer to five major conceptualizations of cynicism. Although these major conceptualizations are independent from each other, they share some similarities.

---

2   http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/cynicism

They suggest that personality approaches, societal/institutional focus, occupational cynicism focus, employee cynicism focus and finally organizational change focus are the major conceptualizations of cynicism. Among these five dimensions, employee cynicism focus and organizational change focus are relatively more important as this study mainly concerned with these dimensions.

Employee Cynicism Focus

Employee cynicism is one of the dimensions of five major conceptualizations of cynicism. The reason why this dimension is very crucial is that the individual is already at the centre of cynicism. Andersson and Bateman (1997) suggest that employee cynicism can be about three factors. These factors are: (1) Organization itself in general, (2) Managers, and (3) Other factors related with the organization. Violation of psychological contracts by the managers or the organization can easily cause employees to develop cynicism about any of these aspects.

According to Andersson and Bateman (1997) high levels of executive compensation, poor organizational performance and harsh layoffs are considered as variables that can evoke inconsistencies in attitudes and generate employee cynicism. They also suggest that there is a strong relationship between cynicism and organizational citizenship. This relationship clearly shows that elevated level of cynicism eliminates attitudes attributed to organizational citizenship. Similarly, Mirvis and Kanter (1991) have found that employees' attitudes against managers and organization trigger cynical behaviors.

These research findings reveal that cynicism, as a new dimension of the relationship between the employees and the employer, attract attention from both business world and academia. Employee cynicism involves negative attitudes including distrust in organization, all levels of managers and other aspects of the organization, frustration about these aspects, need for vigilance, and noncompliance (Dean, Brandes & Dharwadkar, 1998; Andersson, 1996). Similarly, Bedeian (2007) defines employee cynicism as attitudes introduced by a critical view toward the motives, actions and values of the employer. From this standpoint, employee cynicism is directly associated with the experiences of the employees regarding the organization. Although it is not explicitly mentioned, neglection or violation of psychological contract between the employee and the employer should be taken into account as it has a great potential to elevate the level of cynicism.

From a more conventional perspective on the employee-employer relations, especially in relatively more developed countries, longer term job security, training, development and promotion opportunities are among the factors that secure a long term employee commitment to the organization. Such a psychological contract generally results with long lasting mutual loyalty between employees and employers. However, economic recessions in the last several decades have led employers to violate these contracts that in return caused employee-employer relations to dissolve. Management practices such as downsizing and outsourcing led organizations to work with lower number of permanent employees (Feldman, 2000). From this perspective, we can argue that since the last quarter of 20th century, changing nature of organizations and organizational functions due to severe environmental conditions has triggered employee cynicism and led to a work environment where there is lack of trust between employees and the employer. Under such conditions, employees have started to develop certain negative attitudes against their organizations. Among these negative attitudes are beliefs that the organization lacks integrity, developing negative affect toward the organization, and tendencies to exhibit disparaging and critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and affect (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006).

Organizational Change Focus

Tom Peters (1994) notes that there is a need for some preconditions in order to increase employee loyalty and performance. One of these major preconditions is the employees' search for a "meaning" about the organization and their job. They seek a satisfactory response from the organization for their search. On the other hand, due to some organizational factors such as constant need for change and the need for flexibility to achieve organizational goals, employees work under stressful conditions and often experience frustration and resentment for the manager/organization. In many cases, these feelings turn into attitudes and they are very crucial for the fate of organizational change efforts. Previous failures will most likely to elevate cynicism and put the planned change initiatives at risk in advance. It very unlikely that the changes planned by the managers to be accomplished successfully without the support of the lower level employees. Thus, cynicism alone can be an obstacle for organizational change efforts (Reichers, Wanous & Austin, 1997).

As mentioned earlier, consequences of previous change efforts and mental predispositions of employees – even before they are employed – about change are among the leading factors that trigger cynicism. Although the employees may not have negative feelings about change initially, they may start developing such feelings after they experience negative consequences within the organization. Bordia et al. (2011) suggest that the history of change management and individual change-related experiences in an organization will have significant consequences for the development of lasting change-related attitudes. Thus, poor management of change initiatives not only hurt the change being implemented, but may have destructive effects on future change efforts.

Some employees may be cynical about change even before they were employed by the organization. Prior professional experiences, especially when they are not favorable, can lead to cynical attitudes. (Reichner, Wanous & Austin, 1997). Besides, cultural profile of the employees has significant impact on their attitudes toward change. For example, in collectivist societies where conformity and coherence are highly valued, individuals may resist change because they perceive change as a threat to their values (Erez & Gati, 2004; Harzing & Hofstede, 1996). Similarly, individuals from a cultural background where risk is less tolerated tend to resist change efforts. Because they perceive change as a factor that threatens the stability and causes uncertainty. Individuals with such cultural background will most likely to have inherent resistance to change before they start working for the organization. Oreg (2003) suggests that although these individuals may have loyalty to certain aspects of the organization, they are, in many cases, naturally inclined to avoid and even resist change. Besides they tend to exhibit such behaviors on a systematic basis.

In other societies with individualistic values, change is perceived differently. We can argue that people from individualistic societies are more inclined to the idea of change (Leung et al., 2005; Levine & Norenzayan, 1999). In such societies, we can suggest that individuals are far more internalized the values and attitudes associated with change.

Research Methodology and Design

Hypotheses

This study mainly aims to understand if there is a relationship between change-specific cynicism and perceptions on organizational change from the employees' perspective. Discovering the nature of a possible relationship is also another aim this research.

As already mentioned in the literature review, there are many factors that are associated with the employees' attitudes and behaviors toward change. Among all these factors, our study mainly focuses on change-specific cynicism. Change-specific cynicism can have significant effects on the consequences of the organizational change efforts. Because in the organizations where change-specific cynicism clearly exists, distrust in managers and organizational factors, frustration about these factors, need for vigilance, and noncompliance can easily develop among the employees. Such a development will most likely to result with significant failures in change efforts.

In order to understand the relationship between change-specific cynicism and employees' perceptions on organizational change, following statements were hypothesized:

Hypothesis 1. Negative tendencies in the cognitive dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.

Hypothesis 2. Negative tendencies in the affective dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.

Hypothesis 3. Negative tendencies in the behavioral dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.

Research Sample

In addition to previously mentioned purposes of this study, we aim to reveal which dimension of the attitudes toward organizational change has the most significant impact on change-specific cynicism. Sample of respondents were drawn through convenience sampling method – one of the non-random sampling techniques. Research subjects were drawn among the shopfloor employees without any managerial responsibilities in six leading vendor companies operating in the domestic appliances industry in Eskisehir, Turkey.

The reason why we have chosen the domestic appliances industry is that there are constant organizational change efforts within the industry due to intense competitive pressures. Turkey has recently become a leading provider of domestic appliances in the world. According to the industrial reports of Turkish Ministry of Science, Technology and Industry (2012), one of the most significant factors that led Turkish domestic appliances manufacturers to be an important global player in the field is the highly qualified vendors that supply premium quality materials at international standards. Ministry's report also notes that the domestic appliances industry is the most innovative industry in the country with highest level of R&D investments. Major manufacturers of domestic appliances also require their vendors to have the same qualifications in order to maintain and develop their competitive edge at global level. We can suggest that the vendors in the industry are highly capable of coping with the challenging demands of the manufacturers. Such a competitive environment that requires constant innovation often calls for organizational change initiatives. Thus, subjects were drawn from the companies where research and development, constant innovation, and organizational change strategies are of paramount importance for survival.

Total number of 470 surveys were sent to six leading vendors of major domestic appliances manufacturers. After an initial control, we have found that some of the surveys were delivered without any response and some others were not filled out appropriately. These incomplete surveys were excluded from the analysis and we have ended up with 336 responses eligible for statistical analysis. In order to maintain homogeneity, subjects were drawn from an identical population in terms of their duties and departments.

Research Instrument

Change-specific cynicism was measured with the scale developed by Stanley, Meyer and Topolnytsky (2005). Stanley et al. (2005) has used structural definitions of change-specific cynicism by Hinkin (1998), Jackson (1979) and Schwab (1978) when developing the scale. Change-specific cynicism was measured with 6 questions.

Dimensions of the perceptions toward organizational change was measured with a scale developed by Oreg (2006). This scale aims to measure perceptions toward change through cognitive, affective and behavioral perspectives. All dimensions were measured with 15 questions (5 questions for each dimension).

Total number of 21 questions were asked to the research subjects and all instruments in the scale consisted of five-point Likert-type scale items described by 1=Strongly Agree to 5= Strongly Disagree.

Reliability of instruments in the scale was tested in further studies by many other scholars (Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky, 2005; Qian & Daniels, 2008; Rubin et al., 2009; Oreg, 2006; Van Dam et al., 2008; Van den Heuvel, & Schalk, 2009). Previous studies adopted these scale instruments have revealed that the instruments are valid, reliable and internally consistent. Based on our analysis, we have also found that the instruments were reliable, valid and internally consistent.

Initially, we have performed an exploratory factor analysis. Table 1.1 shows the factor loadings for each variable in three different dimensions reflecting the perceptions toward organizational change.

Table 1.1. Factor loadings for each dimension

Factor	Factor Loading
Factor 1: Affective	
OC_AFF_01	,504
OC_AFF_10	,777
OC_AFF_15	,708
OC_AFF_25	,771
OC_AFF_30	,741
Factor 2: Behavioral	
OC_BEH_5	*,098*
OC_ BEH _35	,765
OC_ BEH _40	,769
OC_ BEH _42	,687
OC_ BEH _50	,529
Factor 3: Cognitive	
OC_COG_2	,579
OC_COG_7	,760
OC_COG_9	,597
OC_COG_11	,674
OC_COG_19	,577

KMO = 0,865

Nunnaly (1978) suggests that the factor loading values should be minimum 0,50. It can be seen in Table 1.1 that one item (OC_BEH_5) under the behavioral dimension does not meet the criteria with

a factor loading value of 0,98. Thus, we have excluded the item and finally total number of 20 items were included in the further analysis.

Cronbach's alpha value for the change-specific cynicism instrument was 0.640 and the cronbach alpha value for the dimensions of perceptions toward organizational change instrument was 0.79. Overall Cronbach Alpha value for the whole scale was 0.88. These values prove that the scale is internally consistent.

Scale was originally designed in English. As the study aims to understand how change-specific cynicism is affected by the employees' perceptions toward organizational change efforts and as the employees' can only communicate in Turkish, translated version of the scale was used for the research. As a first step, researcher translated the instrument into Turkish. In order to increase the reliability of the translation, instrument was back-translated into English by a professional translator. Back-translated and original versions of the scale were reviewed by a colleague whose field is linguistics. Three statements were modified in order to maintain the integrity of the content. Final version of the instrument was distributed to research subjects.

Research Findings

Table 1.2 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations between variables. As shown in the table, variables used in this study are internally consistent and there are statistically significant relations between the variables. We can also suggest that research subjects have made over-average statements about change-specific cynicism and cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions of perceptions toward organizational change.

Table 1.2. **Correlations among the research variables**

Variable*	Mean	Std. Deviation	COG	AFF	BEH	CSCYN
Cognitive	3,6798	,73225	1,000			
Affective	3,7833	,81300	,666**	1,000		
Behavioral	3,2217	,86059	,350**	,496**	1,000	
Change-Specific Cynicism	3,1324	,63851	,447**	,392**	,359**	1,000

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

COG: *Cognitive* **AFF:** *Affective* **BEH:** *Behavioral* **CCCYN**: *Change-specific Cynicism*

Correlation values given in Table 1.2 reveals that there are statistically significant relations between the variables used in the study. It can be seen in the table that change-centered cynicism has significant and positive relations with the dimensions of employee perception toward organizational change (*cognitive r=,447 p<0,01*; *affective r=,392 p<0,01*; *behavioral r=,359 p<0,01*). Among these dimensions, we can suggest that cognitive dimension has relatively greater impact on change-specific cynicism.

Table 1.3 shows the linear regression results for how dimensions of employee perceptions toward organizational change affects change-specific cynicism.

Table 1.3. Effects of the dimensions of employee perception toward organizational change on change-specific cynicism

Independent Variables*	Std. Beta	t	Sig.
Cognitive Dimension	0,328	5,144	,000
Affective Dimension	0,069	0,995	,320
Behavioral Dimension	0,210	3,827	,000
R² = ,249	**F = 36,683**		**p= ,000**

Table 1.3 shows that the model used for this research is statistically significant (F=36,683; p=,000). We have also found that about 25 percent of the change-centered cynicism can be explained through these dimensions. However, other 75% of the change-centered cynicism can only be explained through other variables that were not considered in this study.

Based on these findings, we can argue that negative inclinations in cognitive dimension (β= 0,328 and p=,000) and behavioral dimension (β= 0,210 and p=,000) have positive impact on developing change-specific cynicism. However, overshadowed by these two dimensions, we could not find any statistically significant impact of affective dimension (β= 0,069 and p=,320) on change-specific cynicism. Table 1.4 shows the results of the hypotheses tests.

Table 1.4. Hypotheses Test Results

Hypothesis	Status
H1. Negative tendencies in the cognitive dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.	*Accepted*
H2. Negative tendencies in the affective dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.	*Rejected*
H3. Negative tendencies in the behavioral dimension of attitudes toward change will have positive correlation with change-specific cynicism.	*Accepted*

As seen in Table 1.4, hypotheses 1 and 3 are accepted as employees perceive that they have relatively more significant impact on developing change-specific cynicism. On the other hand, second hypothesis was rejected based on the research findings.

Results and Discussions

Cognitive Dimension

As our research findings suggest, there is a strong relationship between the cognitive dimension of employee perceptions toward organizational change and change-specific cynicism. As mentioned earlier in the study, cognitive dimension refers to employees' thoughts and beliefs about a possible change effort. Based on our findings, we can suggest that a negative inclination in thoughts and beliefs about change leads to elevated change-specific cynicism among the employees. In other words, negative cognitive inclinations will lead to negative attitudes such as distrust, noncompliance and need for vigilance against their managers and organization itself. In their study, Wanous, Reichers and Austin (2000) reveals the effects of pessimistic view about organizational change and pointed organizational

factors that are responsible for the loss of motivation and failure in change efforts. Managers of the organization and unions are among these major factors that trigger negative consequences. Our study also reveals that negative inclination in cognitive dimension against the organization and its managers leads to negative and pessimistic mental states among the employees. As we define cynicism as the negative attitudes of the employees within the organization, these negative mental states eventually turns into destructive behaviors.

Affective Dimension

Our research findings have revealed that our research subjects do not perceive affective dimension as a significant variable that elevates change-specific cynicism. The main reason for this result may be that affective dimension was overshadowed by the strong impact of cognitive and behavioral dimensions on change-specific cynicism. Especially the strong correlation between the cognitive dimension and change-specific cynicism may have caused this result. Supporting this point of view, many research assesses cognitive and affective dimensions together and they suggest that these two dimensions together shape the behavioral dimension (Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky, 2005). Parallel with these discussions, our research findings have also revealed that the strongest correlation in our analysis belongs to the relationship between cognitive and affective dimensions (r=0,666). Thus, we can admit that due to the strong correlation between cognitive dimension and change-specific cynicism, affective dimension was suppressed.

Behavioral Dimension

According to our findings, negative reactions and attitudes toward change will lead to elevated change-specific cynicism. Brandes (1997) suggests that employees' cynical behaviors also may include stinging, sarcastic humor that targets the organization or other forms of badmouthing. There is a strong correlation between these behaviors and employee cynicism.

From this standpoint, we can argue that distrust in the organizational factors and reactions against organizational change efforts are closely linked with each other. Emotions and perceptions of employees, whether they are positive or negative, will be eventually reflected as attitudes and behaviors.

When all these dimensions are assessed together, it can be said that these factors and dimensions will have significant impact on the success or the failure of organizational change efforts. Negative perceptional inclinations among employees should be taken into account as they would function as indicators of a future failure in the planned change initiatives.

Although are research was completed in a country with a relatively more collectivist cultural profile, we can suggest that the findings do not offer much difference in terms of the results. On the other hand, employee cynicism is relatively a new topic for Turkish academia and business environment. Our research also aimed to contribute to the relevant literature by providing insight from an Eastern country with relatively more collectivist values. For the future studies, demographic variables could also be involved in the research. Thus, the effects of different variables such as educational level, age, years of service, sex on change-specific cynicism and perceptions toward organizational change could be further explored.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I., and Fishbein, M. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading: Addison-Wesley

Andersson, L. M. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation framework. *Human Relations*, 49: 1395–1417

Andersson, L.M., and Bateman, T.S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(5) : 449-469

Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G., and Mossholder, K.W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6): 681-703

Avey, J.B., Wernsing, T.S., and Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behaviors. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(1): 48-70

Axelrod, R. H., Axelrod, E., Jacobs, R. W., and Beedon, J. (2006). Beat the odds and succeed in organizational change. *Consulting to Management*, 17(2): 1-4

Bedeian, A. G. (2007). Even if the tower Is "ivory," it isn't "White": Understanding the consequences of faculty cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(1): 9-32

Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Au, A., Tong, K. K., De Carrasquel, S. R., Murakami, F., ... & Sam, D. L. (2004). Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their correlates across 41 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(5), 548-570.

Bordia, P., Restubog, S.L.D., Jimmieson, N.L., and Irmer, B.E. (2011). Haunted by the past: Effects of poor change management history on employee attitudes and turnover. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2): 191-222

Bouckenooghe, D. (2010). Positioning change recipients' attitudes toward change in the organizational change literature. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 46(4): 500-531

Bovey, W.H., and Hede, A. (2001). Resistance to organizational change: the role of cognitive and affective processes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(8): 372-382

Cartwright, S., and Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2): 199-208

Chiaburu et al. (2013). Antecedents and consequences of employee organizational cynicism: A me-

ta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83: 181-197

Choi, M. (2011). Employees' attitudes toward organizational change: A literature review. *Human Resource Management*, 50(4): 479-500

Coch, L., and French, J.R.P. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 1(4): 512-532

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

Drzensky, F., Egold, N., and Van Dick, R. (2012). Ready for a Change? A Longitudinal Study of Antecedents, Consequences and Contingencies of Readiness for Change. *Journal of Change Management*, 12(1): 95-111

Elias, S.M. (2009). Employee commitment in times of change: Assessing the importance of attitudes toward organizational change. Journal of Management, 35(1): 37-55

Elizur, D., and Guttman, L. (1976). The structure of attitudes toward work and technological change within an organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(4): 611-622

Erez, M., and Gati, E. (2004). A Dynamic, Multi-Level Model of Culture: From the Micro Level of the Individual to the Macro Level of a Global Culture. *Applied Psychology*, 53(4): 583-598

Feldman, D.C. (2000). The Dilbert syndrome: How employee cynicism about ineffective management is changing the nature of careers in organizations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(8): 1286-1300

Fox, D.G., Ellison, R.L., and Keith, K.L. (1988). Human resource management: An index and its relationship to readiness for change. *Public Personnel Management,* 17(3): 297-302

Fugate, M., Prussia, G.E. and Kinicki, A.J. (2012). Managing employee withdrawal during organizational change: The role of threat appraisal. *Journal of Management*, 38(3): 890-914

Gersick, C.J. (1991). Revolutionary change theories: A multilevel exploration of the punctuated equilibrium paradigm. *Academy of Management Review*, 10-36

Hallencreutz, J., and Turner, D. M. (2011). Exploring organizational change best practice: are there any clear-cut models and definitions?. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 3(1): 60-68

Harzing, A. W., and Hofstede, G. (1996). Planned change in organizations: The influence of national culture. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 14: 297-340

Hinkin, T.R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. Organizational research methods, 1(1): 104-121

Jackson, D.N. (1979). Construct validity in psychological measurement. Proceedings of US office of personnel management colloquium on theory and application in education and employment Princeton New Jersey, 79–91

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., and Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1): 107-122

Kidd, I. (2005). Cynicism, *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy* içinde (Ed. Rée, J. & Urmson, J. O)., Routledge

Kwahk, K.Y., and Ahn, H. (2010). Moderating effects of localization differences on ERP use: A socio-technical systems perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2): 186-198

Lengnick-Hall, C.A., Beck, T.E., and Lengnick-Hall, M.L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3): 243-255

Leung, K., Bhagat, R.S., Buchan, N.R., Erez, M., and Gibson, C.B. (2005). Culture and international business: recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4): 357-378

Levine, R.V., and Norenzayan, A. (1999). The pace of life in 31 countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(2): 178-205

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics. *Human Relations*. 1(1): 5-41

Linstone, H.A. and Mitroff, I.I. (1994). *The challenge of the 21st century: Managing technology and ourselves in a shrinking world*. SUNY Press

Mack, D.A., Nelson, D.L. and Campbell-Quick, J. (1998). The stress of organizational change: a dynamic process model. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47(2): 219-232

McGuire, J.B., Rhodes, G., and Palus, C.J. (2008). Inside out: Transforming your leadership culture. *Leadership in Action*, 27(6): 3-7

Mirvis, P.H., and Kanter, D.L. (1991). Beyond demography: A psychographic profile of the workforce. *Human Resource Management*, 30(1): 45-68

Nunnally, J.C. (1978), Psychometric Theory (2nd ed.), McGraw-Hill, New York.

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4): 680-692

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1): 73-101

Oreg, S., Vakola, M., and Armenakis, A. (2011). Change Recipients' Reactions to Organizational Change A 60-Year Review of Quantitative Studies. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(4): 461-524

Peters, T. (1994). *The pursuit of WOW*. New York: Vintage Books A Division of Random House, Inc.

Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4): 783-794

Qian, Y., and Daniels, T.D. (2008). A communication model of employee cynicism toward organizational change. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 13(3): 319-332

Quinn, R.E., Kahn, J.A. and Mandl, M.J. (1994). Perspectives on organizational change: Exploring movement at the interface. Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science (Editör J.Greenberg), Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Rashid, Md Z.A., Sambasivan, M. and Rahman, A.A. (2004). The influence of organizational culture on attitudes toward organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2): 161-179

Reeves, D.B., and Allison, E. (2009). *Renewal coaching: Sustainable change for individuals and organizations*. Jossey-Bass

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

Rubin, R.S., Dierdorff, E.C., Bommer, W.H., and 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

Safdar, S., Lewis, J.R., and Daneshpour, M. (2006). Social axioms in Iran and Canada: Intercultural contact, coping and adjustment. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 9(2), 123-131.

Schwab, D.P. (1978). *Construct validity in organizational behavior*. Graduate School of Business, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Secord, P. and Backman, C. (1969), *Social Psychology*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY

Smollan, K.R. (2006). Minds, hearts and deeds: cognitive, affective and behavioural responses to change. *Journal of Change Management*, 6(2): 143-158

Stanley, D.J., Meyer, J.P., and Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4): 429-459

TC Bilim, Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı, Sanayi Genel Müdürlüğü (2012). Beyaz Eşya Sektörü Raporu, *Sektörel Raporlar ve Analizler Serisi*

Trumbo, D.A. (1961). Individual and group correlates of attitudes toward work-related changes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45(5): 338-344

Vakola, M. and Nikolaou, I. (2005). Attitudes towards organizational change: What is the role of employees' stress and commitment?. *Employee Relations*, 27(2): 160-174

Van Dam, K., Oreg, S., and Schyns, B. (2008). Daily work contexts and resistance to organisational change: The role of leader–member exchange, development climate, and change process characteristics, *Applied Psychology*, 57(2): 313-334

Van den Heuvel, S., and 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.

Wade, C. & Tavris, C. (1996). *Psychology*, 4. Baskı, HarperCollins College Publishers, New York, NY

Wanous, J.P., Reichers, A.E., & Austin, J.T. (2000). Cynicism about organizational change measurement, antecedents, and correlates. *Group & Organization Management*, 25(2): 132-153