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Main purpose of this study is to determine the relation between humor acts of school principals and exposure level of teachers to mobbing and organizational cynicism based on the perceptions of teachers who serve at primary schools. 550 teachers who serve at primary and secondary public schools in Yenimahalle district, Ankara Province and participated in “My Leader Teacher Project” in 2012-2013 academic year constitute the population. 232 teachers who have been chosen using simple random sampling based on the principle of voluntariness constitute the research sample. Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and hierarchical regression are used to perform data analysis. In consequence of the study, it is discovered that school principals exhibit non-humorous acts more and cynical humorous acts at the least; teachers suffer from mobbing although it is not severe; they have medium-level organizational cynicism and although humor acts of principals affect teachers’ exposure levels to mobbing and organizational cynicism; despite the stong relation between mobbing and organizational cynicism, mobbing does not have an intermediary effect on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism.
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1. Introduction

Reviewing the literature on organizational psychology, it is seen that organizational cynism is prominent and this variable is important for today’s organisations which have the aim of holding human resources for a long time and benefiting them in the most effective way. Therefore, organizational cynism is an issue which affects interpersonal relations and results of organizational functioning and which must be solved by modern organisations (Neves, 2012, 975). Modern organisations are in the struggle for revealing the reasons of cynism for business to proceed in a healthier environment and taking precautions against cynism. Studies are performed for this purpose; reasons and results of cynism which affects the business life are tried to determine. Studies on the relations among business-related results of individual and organizational cynism show that cynism has a negative influence on organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Reichers, Wanous and Austin, 1997), organizational citizenship behavior (Andersson and Bateman, 1997; Kabataş, 2010; Abraham, 2000; Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly, 2003; Yetim and Ceylan, 2011), organizational identification and organizational commitment (Polat ve Meydan, 2010; Abraham, 2000), and causes job dissatisfaction, alienation (Abraham, 2000), occupational stress, emotional exhaustion (James, 2005). Furthermore, negative acts integrated in organizational cynism cause employee to separate from organization; drift apart organizational values; experience incongruity with organization and lack of faith in organization (Yetim ve Ceylan, 2011).

Examining the reasons of organizational cynism, it can be observed that they may be individual and organisational. Organizational cynism lives on socio-psychological condition and structure of individuals and it is also affected by complicated and changeable environment; external pressure powers and external dependency of managers (Kılıç, 2013). Age, gender, educational status, marital status, income, period of service, hierarchy constitute the individual factors leading to organizational cynism; and organizational justice, organizational policies, breach of psychological contract constitute organizational factors (Kalagain, 2009; Polat, 2007; Chiaburu, Peng, Oh, Banks ve Lomeli, 2013). One of the organizational factors of organizational cynism is the ability of being a manager. This is because in consequence of the attitudes and behaviors of managers against employees, they become cynical (Fortier, 2003). There are some studies (Davis and Gardner, 2004; Wu, Neubert, Yi, 2007; Bommer, Rich ve Rubin, 2005; Broner and Nichols, 2003; Güçlü, Kalkan and Dağlı, 2013) revealing the existence of a relation between the leadership style which has an influence on manager’s attitude and behaviors; and organizational cynism. Leadership style is one of the most significant variables in improving satisfaction and performance of employees (Warrick, 1981). Although attitudes of a leader influence his followers, they also have an important role in his own success and failure (Rubin, Dierdorff, Bommer and Baldwin, 2009). Thus, it can be suggested that attitude of a leader may be related to organizational cynism which is one of the results of interpersonal relationships. Attitudes and behaviors of a leader may be either preventive or initiator condition of employees’ negative attitudes against an organization.

There are some studies demonstrating that leadership behaviors of a manager lead to cynism as well as mobbing (Cemaloğlu, 2007a; Cemaloğlu and Kılıç, 2012; Ertürk, 2011, s.186; Okçu, 2011, s. 148). Mobbing affects directly the level of stress, exhaustion and job satisfaction level; and furthermore, life satisfaction level decreases due to these three variables (Karakuş and Çankaya, 2012, s. 232). Tınaz (2006) claims that atmosphere of distrust, negative organizational climate, ebbing of general respect and collapse of organizational culture are among the important results of mobbing. Examining other reasons for mobbing, it can be observed that personality traits of manager (Gökçe, 2012, s. 280), his vocational competence and disciplinary practices (Ertürk, 2011, s. 186), supportive attitudes (Dick and Wagner, 2001, s.256), humorous acts (Cemaloğlu, Şahin and Daşcı, 2013) have an effect on teachers’ suffering from mobbing. However, manager’s sense of humor has a special place in mobbing. This is because all humorous acts do not lead to mobbing. Mobbing occurs upon the usage type of humor. Various studies show that in the event of negative use of humor, positive emotions decrease (Samson ve Gross, 2012, p. 381) and organizational commitment level of employees diminishes (Romero ve Arendt, 2011, p. 657). However, it is

It appears that employees are bound to experience cynism in consequence of manager’s negative sense of humor. In other words, mobbing levels which employees experience based on managers’ leadership behaviors affect negatively their attitudes against organization. Cynicism which is characterized by despair, intimidation, detention, exhaustion and frustration is related to humiliation, disgust and distrust. In this sense, cynicism and mobbing which may be encountered in every organization are closely related problems which have individual and organizational destructive effects (Gül and Ağrıöz, 2011). In literature, it is possible to see the studies on determining the relation between mobbing and cynism. In these studies, it is established that mobbing and organizational cynism are related (Aydoğan, 2012; Gül and Ağrıöz, 2011; Apaydın, 2012; Lobnikar and Pagon, 2004; Andersson and Bateman, 1999), mobbing has an effect upon organizational cynicism and the most pathetic dimension of mobbing is “attacks on the self-expression and communication of an individual” (Aydoğan, 2012). Studies performed at educational institutions suggest that teachers are both exposed to mobbing (Dick ve Wagner, 2001, s. 254; Gündüz and Yılmaz, 2008, s.278; Oacak, 2008, s. 92; Riley, Duncan and Edwards, 2009, s.5; Sağlam, 2008, s.139) and experience organizational cynism (Güzeller ve Kalağan, 2010; Özgan, Çetin, Kulekçi, 2011; Helvacı and Çetin, 2012; Sağır and Oğuz, 2012; Topkaya, Altunkurt, Yılmaz and Dilek, 2013, Kılınç, 2013; Ertek, 2009). Furthermore, educators who are in manager position are in the center of both organizational problems (Dick and Wagner, 2001, s. 254; Gökçe, 2012, s. 281; Oacak, 2008, s. 96; Riley, Duncan and Edwards, 2009, s.5; Broner, ve Nichols, 2003). Particularly, considering that humorous act of managers may have a significant effect on negative acts experienced at educational institutions and studies on this issue are limited in Turkey, performing studies which deal with these three variables altogether may play an important role in preventing and resolving these problems. In this study, the relation among humorous acts of school principals and mobbing experiencing level of teachers and organizational cynicism is examined based on teachers’ perception.

1.2. Purpose
Main purpose of this study is to determine the relation among humorous acts of school principals serving at primary schools and mobbing experiencing level of teachers and organizational cynicism based on teachers’ perceptions who serve at primary schools.

Answers of the following questions will be searched in order to reach the mentioned purpose. According to teachers’ perceptions,

1. What are the perceptions pertaining the dimensions of humorous acts of primary school principals (humor which denies non-humorous style, approving humor, productive social humor, cynical humor), mobbing and the dimensions of organizational cynicism (cognitive, affective and behavioral)?

2. What kind of a relation is there between humorous acts of primary school principals and mobbing and organizational cynicism which teachers perceive?

3. What level and direction do humor acts of primary school principals affect the mobbing and organizational cynicism which teachers perceive?

4. Does the mobbing perceived by teachers have an intermediary effect on the relation humor acts of school principals and organizational cynicism of teachers?
2. Literature Review and Prior Researches

2.1. Humor
Starting from Plato, one of the antique age philosophers, humor has been a concept which attracts attention of such disciplines as philosophy, literature, sociology, anthropology and psychology for ages. It is claimed that main subject of it is human and humor is everywhere human exists (Eroğlu, 2003). Humor is the ability of seeing entertaining part of situations and conditions (Akkaya, 2011). Humor is considered to be an experience which is generally initiated by a comic stimulation, ends in such a behavior as a smile or laugh and usually gives contentedness (Susa, 2002: 45). Furthermore, humor may be defined as “an irony which pursues the goal of entertaining, amusing and making fun of somebody without hurting him” and thus substantially having entertainment and tolerance (Yardımcı, 2010).

Origin of “Mizah”, modern version of which is “gülmece” is Arabic. “Mizah” is defined as joke, pleasantry and entertaining in Osmanlıca-Türkçe Ansiklopedik Lügat (Encyclopedic Dictionary of Ottoman Turkish-Modern Turkish) (Develioğlu, 2007). However, humor includes such concepts as sagaciousness and wittiness (Akkaya, 2011). Humor creates and feeds critical thinking and vice versa. Critical thinking can be created and developed in tolerant and productive world of humor where different points of view can live together (Özdemir, 2010).

Humor concept and concepts related to it are used frequently to define what kind of a personality a person has. Such concepts as “comic”, “witty”, “having sense of humor” are the adjectives which can be heard about people in daily life (Çetin, 2009). Babad (1974, s.618) classifies people in five categories according to their humor acts: non-humoros, passive appreciators, producers, reproducers and producers-reproducers. A person who has non-humoros style does not laugh a lot, make jokes, produce humor; a person who has an appreciative style appreciates humorous discourse and acts, likes jokes and responds humor by laughing. As for social-producer humor, humor is produced and shared with other individuals (Martin, 2007). In rejectionist humor style, individual does not approve humorous attitude, discourse and acts and refuses them; in cynical humor style, making fool of somebody, humiliation, exclusion and offense are involved (Babad 1974, s.618).

2.2. Mobbing
In recent years, scientist who study on management and working psychology have determined a new alienation from workplace phenomenon which results from a psychological problem related to the workplace (Tınaz, 2006). Mobbing is used to define aggressive and violent behaviors which a person is or some people are systematically and repetitively exposed by a person or group for a long time (Einarsen, 2000, s.380). In mobbing, superiors, co-workers or some people become a “gang” and aim at somebody (Baykal, 2005, 8). People who are exposed to mobbing become functionless due to the magnitude and effect of the damage from which they suffer (Özdemir and Açıkgöz, 2007).

Mobbing is practiced through repetitive offenses by other employees or employers; it is a kind of psychological violence and generally aims at intimidating the employee and suspending him from workplace. Giving a nickname, looking for a scapegoat, unjust workload, sexual abuse and physical offenses are deliberate actions aiming at intimidating, embarrassing, frustrating, bullying, frightening and hurting the person who is targeted (Einarsen, 2000, s.380). Even, possibility of slight physical violence beyond verbal violence is sometimes in question (Tınaz, Bayram and Ergin, 2008). Leymann (1996) describes 45 different mobbing acts and classifies them in 5 different groups based on the characteristics of the behaviors as; offenses on self-expression and communication, social relations, reputation, life quality and occupation and direct offenses on individual’s health. These behaviors occur at certain intervals (once in a week or more statistically) and continue for a length of time (6 months or more statistically) (Leymann, 1996; Tutar et. Al., 2010; Özler, Atalay and Şahin, 2008).
The reasons for the emergence of mobbing may be analyzed under 3 different headings. These are personality traits of sufferer and the person who performs mobbing and organizational reasons (Poyraz and Aksoy,). According to Leymann (1996), those who perform mobbing apply mobbing in order to compensate their own deficiency. Horror and distrust which they feel on behalf of their position and themselves impel them to exhibit insulting behaviors. In this respect, mobbing is a personality problem. Certain administrative and organizational reasons which cause mobbing to appear can be expressed as follows (Shallcross, 2003:7; Tınaz, 2006b:4): intensive hierarchical structure, lack of problem solving ability in organization or ineffective conflict management, weak leadership, bad management, stressful workplace, unethical practices etc.

2.3. Organizational Cynicism
Organizational cynicism is a negative attitude of employees against organization (Helvacı and Çetin, 2012). Organizational cynicism also includes emotions and opinions which incline to “negative emotion” related to organization, “insulting” and “faultfinding” behaviors. Organizational cynicism is defined as implicit or explicit harsh criticism which is given related to the organization, negative opinions and negative beliefs (Kalağan, 2009).

Basic notion in organizational cynicism is about deficiency of righteousness, honesty, justice and sincerity. Leaders in organization breach the mentioned principles in order to derive personal benefit. However, they lead to behaviors which are based on latent motives and tricks in organization (Abraham, 2000, s.269).

Organizational cynicism is negative attitude of an individual against the organization at which he works; in addition, it is comprised of cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions. It is expressed in a more explicit was as follows: (1) the belief that organization lacks integrity; (2) negative feeling against organization; (3) tendency of being faultfinding and abusive against organization which is consistent with these feelings and emotions (Dean et al., 1998).

Organizational cynicism results from the fact that employees have negative future expectations, their organizational and individual future expectations do not constitute integrity, future of organization presents uncertainty and future of organization is affected negatively (Kılıç, 2013). It can be argued that those who perform a work in a cynical way believe that managers sacrifice such principles as justice, honesty and sincerity on the altar of individual interest and the management makes choices based on individual interest (Naus et al. 2007).

Knowing the reasons and results of cynicism enables managers to manage success and negative consequences of cynicism, if any, appropriately. Being aware of the factors affecting organizational cynicism will prevent managers to take steps which may result in negative consequences (Çetin and Helvacı, 2012).

According to Özgener and Kaplan (2008), certain effective strategies must be practiced in order to manage cynicism phenomena which emerge in organizations. Certain strategies related to managing organizational cynicism are as the following: enabling employees to participate in related decision making processes, rewarding managers’ behaviors which are relationship-oriented, mentoring employees, creating a constant and fair disciplinary system in organization, managing the competition in the organization, acquainting employees with changes, improving time-saving practices, adopting an emphatic approach, increasing reliability.

3. Method
In this section, information about research model, population and sample, data collection tools and data analysis are presented.

3.1. Research Model
This research has relational screening model. According to Karasar (1994), screening models are research approaches which aim at describing a current or past situation as it is or was. There are three variables in a research model including two independent and one dependent variable.
However, mobbing is considered to be both a dependent and independent variable due to the fact that it has a direct and indirect effect on organizational cynicism. Sub-dimensions of humorous act (non-humorous style, approving humor, productive social humor, cynical humor) form a part of independent variables of a research model. Mobbing is the other independent variable of the research. Dependent variable of the research is cognitive, affective and behavioral attitudes which are sub-dimensions of organizational cynicism.

In the study, teachers’ perceptions pertaining humorous acts of principals and sub-dimensions of organizational cynicism and mobbing are examined. Moreover, it is determined to what extent the level of exhibiting humorous acts of primary school principals affects the mobbing and organizational cynicism which are perceived by teachers and whether or not mobbing is an intermediary variable between humorous acts and organizational cynicism.

3.2. Population and Sample

550 teachers who serve at primary and secondary public schools in Yenimahalle district, Ankara Province and participated in “My Leader Teacher Project” in 2012-2013 academic year constitute the population. 232 teachers who have been chosen using simple random sampling based on the principle of voluntariness constitute the research sample. Demographic information on teachers who participate in the study is presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Distribution of Type of School, Gender, Service of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>99.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining the data in Table 1, it is seen that 19.6% and 80.4% of participants are female and male, respectively. 53.9% are classroom teachers, 46.1% are branch teachers. In addition, 58.7% and 40.9% serve at primary and secondary schools, respectively.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

**Humorous Acts Questionnaire:** Humorous Acts Questionnaire which has been developed by Cemaloğlu, Recepoğlu, Şahin, Daşcı and Köktürk (2012) is utilized for principals’ sense of humor in the study. This questionnaire which consists of 30 items approach humor in five different dimensions. There are 3 items measuring “Non-humorous style” (Sample item (SI): the principal does not joke with anybody), 5 items measuring “rejectionist humor” (SI: the principal does not consider the people who make jokes as reliable), 5 items measuring “approving humor” (SI: the principal smiles when a joke is made), 9 items measuring “productive-social humor” (SI: the principal likes to make people laugh) and 8 items measuring “cynical humor” (SI: the principal saddens us with his humor style) Total of factor dimensions of the questionnaire accounts for 70.10% of the questionnaire. Internal consistency coefficients which are calculated for each dimension of the questionnaire vary between .86 and .94. Reliability coefficient which is calculated for the whole questionnaire is .92. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficients which are calculated for each dimension of humor in this study are between .86 and .94. Reliability coefficient which is calculated for the whole questionnaire is .85. In consequence of exploratory factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value is .94 and Barlett’s test for sphericity is meaningful (p=.00). It is observed that the items come under five factors as in the original questionnaire. Factor load values vary between.57 and .85. The questionnaire measures 69% of the total variance.

**Negative Acts Questionnaire:** Negative Acts Questionnaire which was developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and adapted in Turkish by Cemaloğlu (2007) has been used to determine the mobbing exposure level of the teachers. Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient which is calculated
for this questionnaire which consists of 21 items (SI: Exposure to a workload which cannot be overcome) and measures negative acts in one dimension is .94. Reliability coefficient which is calculated in this study is .95. In consequence of exploratory factor analysis, KMO value is .95 and Barlett’s test for sphericity is meaningful (p=.00). The questionnaire accounts for 65% of the total variance. Item factor load values vary between .57 and .80. It is observed that questionnaire items concentrate on one dimension.

Organizational Cynicism Questionnaire: This questionnaire was developed by Brandes, Dhalwadkar and Dean (1999) and adapted by Kalağan (2009). There are 13 items which are prepared in the form of Likert-type five point assessment (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Organizational cynicism questionnaire has three sub-dimensions as cognitive, affective and behavioral. There are five, four and four items in cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions, respectively. These three factors account for 79% of total variance. Internal consistency coefficient of the questionnaire is calculated .931 for the total of the items. Internal consistency coefficients of Organizational Cynicism Questionnaire are calculated .913, .948 and .866, respectively. Structure reliability values are calculated 0.70 and over for three dimensions. Variance values are 0, 50 and over for three dimensions.

3.4. Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and hierarchical regression are used to perform data analysis.

4. Findings and Comments
In this section, research findings are presented systematically and comments on research findings are given. In Table 1, descriptive statistics related to humorous acts of school principals and teachers’ exposure level to mobbing and organizational cynicism based on teachers’ perceptions are presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaires</th>
<th>Sub Questionnaires</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humorous Acts</td>
<td>Non-humorous style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejectionist humor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approving Humor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Productive-social humor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynical Humor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing</td>
<td>Mobbing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Cynicism</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining data in Table 2, it is observed that based on teachers’ opinions, school principals exhibit “non-humorous style” at the most with $\bar{X}=2.82$ level and “cynical humorous acts” at the least with $\bar{X}=2.02$ level. Furthermore, mobbing exposure level of teachers is calculated $\bar{X}=1.60$. It is discovered that teachers exhibit attitudes which are in the dimensions of “behavioral”, at the most, and “affective”, at the least, with “$\bar{X}=2.93$ and $\bar{X}=2.55$ levels, respectively.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient has been considered to determine what level and direction humorous acts of primary school principals affect the mobbing and organizational cynicism which teachers perceive.
Table 3.
Results of Correlation Analysis Related To Humorous Acts of School Principals and Teachers’ Exposure Level to Mobbing and Organizational Cynicism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-humorous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rejectionist</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approving</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Productive-social</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>76**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cynical</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mobbing</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cognitive</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affective</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Behavioral</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  ** p<.01

Examining data in Table 3, there is a positive and strong relation between approving humor and productive-social humor (r=.76, p<.01) which are among positive humor acts. Negative humor acts also exhibit a positive directional and meaningful relation among themselves. Examining the relationship between humorous acts and mobbing, it is observed that there is a positive and meaningful relation between mobbing and non-humorous style (r=.22, p<.01), rejectionist humor (r=.42, p<.01) and cynical humor (r=.48, p<.01) acts; there is a negative directional and meaningful relation between mobbing and approving humor (r=-.44, p<.01) and productive-social humor (r=-.19, p<.01) acts. The highest relation level related to mobbing is seen in cynical humor (r=.48, p<.01) and rejectionist humor (r=.42, p<.01) dimensions.

In other words, an increase in mobbing exposure levels of teachers can be observed as cynical and rejectionist humor acts of school principals increase; a decrease in the mentioned can be observed as approving and productive-social humor acts of school principals increase.

There is a positive relationship between cognitive dimension of organizational cynicism and affective (r=.13, p<.01) and behavioral (r=.56, p<.01) dimensions. However, there is not a meaningful relationship between affective and behavioral dimensions. There is a negative relationship between cognitive and behavioral dimensions of organizational cynicism and approving humor (r=-.31, p<.01) and productive-social humor (r=-.31, p<.01) dimensions of humor acts. In addition, there is a positive relationship between cognitive and behavioral dimensions of organizational cynicism and non-humorous, rejectionist and cynical humor dimensions of humor acts. Organizational cynicism has a positive relation with both all humor acts and mobbing. Moreover, there is a positive relation between mobbing and all dimensions of organizational cynicism.

In other words, an increase in teachers’ exposure levels to organizational cynicism in cognitive and behavioral dimensions can be observed as cynical and rejectionist humor acts of school principals increase; a decrease in the mentioned can be observed as approving and productive-social humor acts of school principals increase. Furthermore, teachers’ organizational cynicism increases as mobbing perception of teachers increase.
Table 4.
Results of Regression Analysis Aiming to Determine the Intermediary Relation of Mobbing Between Humorous Acts and Organizational Cynicism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Step: Model 1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Mobbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Step: Model 2</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>123.99</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Step: Model 3</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Step: Model 4</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>61.95</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable: Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  ** p<.01

Examining the data in Table 4, in the first regression analysis, it is ascertained that humor (independent variable) affects mobbing (intermediary variable) in a positive and meaningful way (β = .263; p < .05). In consequence of the second regression analysis, it is ascertained that mobbing (intermediary variable) affects organizational cynicism (dependent variable) in a positive and meaningful way (β = .594; p < .05).

In consequence of the third regression analysis, it is ascertained that humor act (independent variable) affects organizational cynicism (dependent variable) in a positive and meaningful way (β = .184; p < .05). This relation between humor act and organizational cynicism is a weak relation. Nevertheless, existence of such a relation is stated. Humor acts of principal affect teachers’ job satisfaction and organizational cynicism in a positive way although this relation is weak.

In consequence of the last regression analysis, it is ascertained that mobbing does not have a meaningful intermediary effect (.586; p > .05) on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism. As is seen, although humor acts of principals affect teachers’ level of exposure to mobbing and organizational cynicism and despite the strong relation between mobbing and organizational cynicism, mobbing does not have an intermediary effect on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, it is discovered that school principals exhibit non-humorous acts more and cynical humorous acts at the least; as cynical, non-humorous and rejectionist humor acts of school principals increase, teachers’ exposure to mobbing and cynicism in the cognitive and affective dimensions increase; as productive-social humor and approving humor acts increase, teachers’ exposure to mobbing and cynicism in the cognitive and affective dimensions decrease.

The first sub-problem of the study has been presented as “What are the perceptions pertaining the dimensions of humor acts of primary school principals (humor which denies non-humorous style,
approving humor, productive social humor, cynical humor), mobbing and the dimensions of organizational cynicism (cognitive, affective and behavioral)?”. Examining the findings related to this sub-problem; it is observed that school principals exhibit non-humorous acts more and cynical humorous acts at the least. The findings of the studies performed by Romero and Arendt, (2011, s. 656) and Cemaloğlu, Şahin and Daçlı (2003) support the findings of this study. Headmasters bear more responsibility than other individuals and thus have influence on the school climate more than everybody. Humor is a very useful tool for headmasters (Koonce, 1997). Leaders may use humor for various reasons. Headmasters may use humor as a creative communication tool (Tuttle, 2006). Considering that school teaching is a very stressful profession (Recepoglu, 2008), it can be suggested that their ability to articulate a negative reaction by softening it and accepting it in a more humoristic way may lead them to experience negative feelings less in workplace (Çetin, 2009). Studies performed by Özdemir, Sezgin, Kaya and Recepoglu, (2011, s. 416) show that humor is a significant variable related to ways of coping with stress and manager’s sense of humor has an effect on the job satisfaction of teachers (Recepoglu, 2008; Puderbaugh, 2006). Using specific humor acts in particular situations may be useful in a workplace (Carrie, 2009).

Opinions of the teachers on mobbing fall partly within “Sometimes” interval according to the score intervals which are taken a basis for assessing data. In this case, it may be claimed that teachers encounter mobbing acts although they are not severe. Studies performed in the literature indicate that teachers are exposed to mobbing although it is in different levels. In this respect, findings of the studies performed by Özekinci (2012), Cemaloğlu and Kılıç (2012, s.146), Ertürk (2011, s.117), Ertek (2009), Ocak (2008) support the findings of this study. Level differences in teachers’ exposure to mobbing may be related to organizational conditions. Number of people which is an organizational condition may result in differences in mobbing perception. This is because in the schools where number of teachers is limited interact with each other more and work in a family atmosphere. Individuals may avoid practicing mobbing acts due to the fact that they think that mobbing acts which they will perform in such a small community are easily noticed. Social audit may be referred here (Ocak, 2008). Researchers agree on the fact that mobbing has different aspects. Mobbing acts may stem from a superior, co-worker or inferior. Direction of mobbing is related to organizational culture and hierarchical structure (Ertek, 2009). Some of the organizational factors which provoke mobbing are extreme hierarchical structure, ineffective operation of interorganizational communication channels, stressful workplace, little or no team work, bad management and weak leadership (Shallcross, 2003, 7; Tinaz, 2006, 4). Therefore, it is essential to know organizational culture and hierarchical structure in order to determine by whom mobbing is performed.

Opinions of the teachers on mobbing fall partly within “partly agree” interval according to the score intervals which are taken a basis for assessing data. According to this result, it can be suggested that organizational cynicism level of teachers is medium-level. This finding tallies with the findings of the former studies (Arabaci, 2010; Kalağan and Guzeller, 2010; Özgan, Külekci and Özkan, 2012; Kılıç, 2013; Topkaya, Altınkurt, Yılmaz and Dilek, 2013). However, Helvacı and Çetin (2012) have discovered that organizational cynicism perception of primary school teachers within the border of Uşak province is generally “low level”. In order to understand the reason for difference in organizational cynicism level of teachers, personal features, workplace characteristics, relation among the outcomes of work in terms of work motivation and commitment must be considered. This is because organizational cynicism may be related to characteristics of individual and workplace or combination of the two (Naus, Ad and Roe 2007). Considering that changing personal characteristics is difficult or impossible in some cases, cynicism may be prevented by removing organizational factors which cause organizational cynicism. Thus, a transparent, open and accountable manner of rule must be adopted in order to prevent organizational cynicism; employees must be provided with organizational support and an environment which will increase trust toward management must be secured (Kılıç, 2013).

The second sub-problem of the study has been presented as “What kind of a relation is there between humorous acts of primary school principals and mobbing and organizational cynicism
which teachers perceive?” Examining the findings related to this sub-problem; an increase in teachers’ exposure levels to organizational cynicism can be observed as cynical and rejectionist humor acts of school principals increase; a decrease in the mentioned can be observed as approving and productive-social humor acts of school principals increase. Findings in the related literature support the findings of this study (Recepoglu, Kilinc and Cepni, 2011; Cemaloglu, Sahin and Dasci, 2013). It is expectable that negative humor acts lead to negative consequences for individual and organization.

Inconvenient use of humor may invite problems in an organization. To illustrate, mockery, which is a style of aggressive humor, may alienate people from each other in organizations. Those who misuse humor may lose trust of people (Savage, 2007). Aggressive humor styles such as mockery, despisement and humiliation alienate individuals and cause harm to social and interpersonal relationships (Klein, 2009). Martin (2007) has reached the finding that aggressive humor style has positive relation with hostility and aggression; negative relation with job satisfaction. In the event of frequent exposure to negative acts, it is possible that individual suffers from mobbing.

It is observed that as cynical and rejectionist humor acts of school principals increase, teachers’ exposure to mobbing and cynicism in the cognitive and affective dimensions increase; as productive-social humor and approving humor acts increase, teachers’ exposure to mobbing and cynicism in the cognitive and affective dimensions decrease. Moreover, teachers’ organizational cynicism increases as their mobbing perception increases. This finding tallies with the findings of former studies (Aydugan, 2012; Gul and Agirوز, 2011; Lobnikar and Pagon, 2004; Andersson and Bateman, 1999). It is natural that individuals who encounter negative humor acts and are exposed to mobbing maintain a negative attitude. Mobbing, which is a professional and cooperation disease, has certain symptoms as in every physical and psychological disorder (Gul ve Agirوز, 2011). Among the symptoms of mobbing are stress, exhaustion, decrease in job and life satisfaction levels (Karakus and Cankaya, 2012, s. 232). Cynicism involves a wider scope in terms of despair and frustration; humiliation and distrust towards different people or objects (Wanous et al., 1994). Thus, cynicism is a more comprehensive problem than mobbing. Considering organizational cynicism is an attitude which stems from the experiences in organization, mobbing act to which individuals are exposed results in organizational cynicism in process of time.

The third sub-problem of the study has been presented as “What level and direction do humorous acts of primary school principals affect the mobbing and organizational cynicism which teachers perceive?” Examining the findings related to this sub-problem; it is discovered that humor acts of school principals predict mobbing and organizational cynicism form which teachers suffer. This finding shows parallelism with the findings of the studies performed by Cemaloglu, Sahin and Dasci (2013). In addition, it is discovered that mobbing predicts organizational cynicism in the study. Gul and Agirوز (2011) have come through the similar results in consequence of their studies. It is quite expectable that humor act is a meaningful precursor of cynicism or vice versa. Negative attitudes of school principals such as spreading rumors about teachers through humorous discourse and acts, teasing them and humiliating them may cause teachers to be alienated from their profession and become unwilling to serve at the school at which they are currently in charge (Cemaloglu, Sahin and Dasci, 2013).

The fourth sub-problem of the study has been presented as “Does the mobbing perceived by teachers have an intermediary effect on the relation humorous acts of school principals and organizational cynicism of teachers?” Examining the findings related to this sub-problem; it is discovered that mobbing does not have a meaningful intermediary effect on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism. As is seen, although humor acts of principals affect teachers’ level of exposure to mobbing and organizational cynicism and despite the strong relation between mobbing and organizational cynicism, mobbing does not have an intermediary effect on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism.

In conclusion, it is discovered that school principals exhibit non-humorous acts more and cynical humorous acts at the least; teachers suffer from mobbing although it is not severe; they have medium-level organizational cynicism and despite the strong relation between mobbing and
organizational cynicism, mobbing does not have an intermediary effect on the relation between humor acts and organizational cynicism. It is considered that future studies by examining such variables as age, gender, rank and demographic variables on humor which may have negative and positive effects and the other two problems: mobbing and cynicism which are closely related to each other and have destructive organizational and individual effects will significantly contribute the literature in terms of the relation of mobbing, cynicism and humor with the aforesaid variables.
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