Jurnal Teknologi

Psychometric Analysis of Predictors and Outcome of Organizational Cynicism: A Mathematical Approach

Yasin Munir*, Amran Rasli

Faculty of Management, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 81310 UTM Johor Bahru, Johor, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: yasinmunir@hotmail.com

Article history

Received : 15 August 2014 Received in revised form : 15 October 2014 Accepted :15 November 2014

Graphical abstract



Abstract

Present study is an attempt to investigate the psychometric analysis of perception of ethical climate, horizontal violence, perceived authentic leadership style and perceived organizational support as predictors and turnover intention as an outcome of organizational cynicism. Psychometric analysis is conducted through measurement model by using AMOS 21. A mathematical approach is utilized to compute the reliability and validity of the constructs. Questionnaires were distributed among 870 nurses out of which 711 questionnaires were returned at the actual response rate of 81.7% and 668 questionnaires were scrutinized at the affective response rate of 76.78%.Current study validates the questionnaire and offers a reliable instrument to investigate organizational cynicism in Asian countries.

Keywords: Perception of ethical climate; horizontal violence; perceived authentic leadership style; perceived organizational support; organizational cynicism and turnover intention

© 2015 Penerbit UTM Press. All rights reserved.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Organizations flourish because of favorable work attitudes of their employees. However, in many organizations unfavorable attitudes among employees are being explored deliberately. According to attitude theory, attitude is a disposition to respond favorably or unfavorably to an object, person, institution, or event [1]. A recent survey conducted by [2] in the health care sector of Pakistan. They found that the health care sector of Pakistan faces critical issues regarding the attitude of health care staff. An emerging topic in this context is organizational cynicism, which has been defined as:

"A negative attitude toward one's employing organization, comprising three dimensions: (1) a belief that the organization lacks integrity; (2) negative affect toward the organization; and (3) tendencies to disparaging and critical behavior toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and affect" [3; 345].

Cynicism is determined by frustration, disillusionment, hopelessness and it is an attitude which is related to distrust, contempt and disgust [4]. Moreover, [5], defined cynical people have skeptical, disappointed and pessimistic thoughts, especially about the hidden agendas, when cynical people clarify the attitude based on specific events and a tendency to deal with the workers for improving and defending their own interest. Similarly, cynics show sympathy to people and think about their own interest and claim others as selfish [6]. Furthermore, cynicism has similar meanings to suspicion, skepticism, distrust, pessimism, disbelief, negativity, picky, censorious and critic person. Cynicism is the source of enhancing strong negative emotions such as anger, scorn, nervous, distress and embarrassment. In current study, researcher wants to examine the psychometric analysis of predictors and outcome of organizational cynicism by adopting mathematical approach.

2.0 PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSIS

Instrument Validity is referred to the measures what it is used to measure [7] and validity is also measured to investigate the accuracy of the instrument. Validity is categorized in to two main components, internal validity and external validity. Internal reliability depicts the level of confidence of the researcher on the relationship of variables. External validity deals with the generalization of results that how close the findings from theory and reality. External validity may cause the sever issues of the generalizability of the results in different work settings [7]. Internal and external validity depends on the nature of experiment. A field experiment relatively contains more external validity than lab experiment. Present study deals with field experiment and data will be collected through survey methodology. The purpose to evaluate confirmatory factor analysis is not exclusively to fit the model it also provide the validity of the instrument. Measurement validity consists of goodness of model fit and construct's validity. A core assumption to proceed for structural equation modelling is that instrument should be validated. Latent constructs or measurement model reflect the accuracy of the construct validity. There are four components of construct validity which will be examined in present study 1) face validity, 2) convergent validity, 3) discriminant validity and 4) nomological validity.

2.1 Face Validity

In current study, instrument is adopted to investigate the relationship of predictors and outcome of organizational cynicism in health care. The instrument has already been investigated in different sectors of Pakistan. So there is no issue of face validity of the questionnaire because in Pakistan the official language is English. Therefore every participant easily understood the wording of the questionnaire.

2.2 Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is the construct indicators that reflect large amount of mutual proportion of variance among factors. It determines the amount of correlation among the measures of same concept [8]. Table 2.1 shows average variance extraction while Table 2.2 shows the construct reliability of each construct. Average variance extraction is the sum of square of a standardized factor loading to represent how much variation in each item is explained by latent. The average variance extracted is the average percentage of variation explained by the measurement items in a construct. The standard value of AVE is .50 or greater.

| Construct Refins Construct Sum or Kenabulues Average variance Between Deleted Perception of ethical IEC 732 Perception iEC 732 iconstruct iconstruct </th <th>Construct</th> <th>Itoms</th> <th>Crophach's</th> <th>Sum of Doliabilition</th> <th>Avorago Varianco</th> | Construct | Itoms | Crophach's | Sum of Doliabilition | Avorago Varianco |
|--|--|-------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Appla in term Extracted Deleted Deleted Perception of ethical IEC6 .735 climate IEC4 .738 IEC3 .733 | Construct | Items | Alasha if Itaaa | Sum of Kenabilities | Average variance |
| Perception of ethical IEC6 .755 climate IEC4 .738 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .734 IEC2 .732 IC3 .732 IC4 .737 IC2 .732 IC1 .732 8.072 0.73381818 Perceived authentic SA3 .738 SA1 .738 BP5 .739 BP5 .739 BP5 .739 BP5 .739 BP2 .740 BP1 .740 5.17 0.73857142 PP3 .733 PP2 .740 BP1 .740 5.17 0.73857142 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP2 .734 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP2 . | | | Alpha II Item | | Extracted |
| Perceived organizational Cynicism $O(2) = 100000000000000000000000000000000000$ | Democratical of othics1 | TECC | Deleted | | |
| climate $ ECS 732 FCC4 738 FCC3 738 FCC3 733 FCC3 732 FCC 733 FCC $ | Perception of ethical | IEC6 | .735 | | |
| HEC4 .738 HEC3 .733 HEC1 .733 HEC1 .732 HEC3 .733 HEC1 .732 HEC3 .733 HEC4 .737 HEC4 .737 HEC4 .738 HEC4 .737 HEC3 .738 HOR SA3 .738 BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP3 .738 BP4 .737 BP4 .737 BP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP2 .734 PP1 .733 OD3 .733 OD3 .733 OD3 .735 OD4 .733 OD5 .749 OC2 .752 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 <td>climate</td> <td>IEC5</td> <td>.732</td> <td></td> <td></td> | climate | IEC5 | .732 | | |
| | | IEC4 | ./38 | | |
| HEC2 .734 HEC1 .732 IC5 .733 IC4 .737 IC2 .732 IC3 .734 IC2 .732 IC1 .732 IC2 .732 IC1 .732 IC2 .732 IC3 .738 BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP2 .740 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD2 .732 OD3 .733 OD4 .733 OC5 .749 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 </td <td></td> <td>IEC3</td> <td>./33</td> <td></td> <td></td> | | IEC3 | ./33 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IEC2 | .734 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IECI | .732 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IC5 | .733 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IC4 | .737 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IC3 | .734 | | |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | IC2 | .732 | | |
| Perceived authentic SA3 738 leadership style SA2 738 SA1 738 BP5 739 BP4 737 BP2 740 BP1 740 5.17 0.73857142 Horizontal Violence PP4 735 PP3 733 PP2 734 PP1 734 OD3 733 OD2 732 OD1 733 5.134 0.73342857 OC2 752 OC3 755 OC4 749 OC5 749 OC5 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC5 749 OC5 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC5 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC5 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC7 755 OC4 749 OC5 749 OC7 755 OC3 756 OC11 748 OC12 752 OC13 756 OC13 756 OC14 749 OC5 OC13 756 OC14 749 OC15 OC13 756 OC14 749 OC15 OC13 756 OC14 749 OC15 OC15 OC14 749 OC15 OC15 OC15 OC15 OC15 OC16 OC16 OC16 OC16 OC17 OC1 | | IC1 | .732 | 8.072 | 0.73381818 |
| leadership style SA2 .738 SA1 .739 BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP2 .740 BP1 .740 BP1 .740 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC3 .756 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 POS6 .737 | Perceived authentic | SA3 | .738 | | |
| SA1 .738 BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP2 .740 BP1 .740 BP1 .740 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC14 .748 OC15 .751 OC10 .752 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC14 .740 POS6 .737 POS6 .737 POS6 .736 POS4 .740 | leadership style | SA2 | .738 | | |
| BP5 .739 BP4 .737 BP2 .740 BP1 .740 BP1 .740 BP1 .740 PP4 .735 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .733 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OD2 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC3 .756 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OS5 .737 POS6 .737 | | SA1 | .738 | | |
| BP4 .737 BP2 .740 BP1 .740 5.17 0.73857142 Horizontal Violence PP4 .735 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD4 .733 OD5 .732 OD1 .733 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC68 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 Perceived organizational support POS6 .737 POS4 .740 < | | BP5 | .739 | | |
| BP2 .740 BP1 .740 5.17 0.73857142 Horizontal Violence PP4 .735 0.73857142 PP3 .733 .734 0D3 .733 PP1 .734 0D2 .732 | | BP4 | .737 | | |
| BP1 .740 5.17 0.73857142 Horizontal Violence PP4 .735 .733 PP3 .733 .734 PP1 .734 .735 OD2 .732 .733 OD2 .732 .733 OD1 .733 5.134 0.73342857 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 .749 OC3 .755 .749 .740 OC4 .749 .755 .749 OC7 .755 .749 .755 OC8 .750 .741 .748 OC11 .748 .752 .75177777 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 .757 Perceived organizational POS5 .736 .740 | | BP2 | .740 | | |
| Horizontal Violence PP4 .735 PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .733 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC3 .756 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .757 OC13 .757 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC14 .749 OC15 .737 POS5 .736 | | BP1 | .740 | 5.17 | 0.73857142 |
| PP3 .733 PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC3 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .757 OC13 .756 OC13 .757 OC13 .757 OC13 .757 OC13 .757 OC13 .757 OC14 .749 OC15 .737 POS5 . | Horizontal Violence | PP4 | .735 | | |
| PP2 .734 PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 5.134 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .757 OC14 .737 POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | | PP3 | .733 | | |
| PP1 .734 OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 5.134 0.73342857 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 0C3 .755 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 0C7 .755 OC8 .750 0C11 .748 OC12 .752 0C13 .756 OC13 .756 6.766 0.7517777 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS5 .736 .740 | | PP2 | .734 | | |
| OD3 .733 OD2 .732 OD1 .733 5.134 0.73342857 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 0C3 .755 OC4 .749 0C5 .749 OC7 .755 0C8 .750 OC11 .748 0C12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 0.7517777 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 support POS6 .736 POS5 .736 POS4 | | PP1 | .734 | | |
| OD2 .732 OD1 .733 5.134 0.73342857 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 0C3 .755 OC4 .749 0C5 .749 OC7 .755 0C8 .750 OC11 .748 0C12 .752 OC12 .752 0C11 .748 OC12 .752 0C11 .748 OC12 .756 6.766 0.75177777 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS5 .736 .740 | | OD3 | .733 | | |
| OD1 .733 5.134 0.73342857 Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 0C3 .755 OC4 .749 0C5 .749 OC7 .755 0C8 .750 OC11 .748 0C12 .752 OC12 .752 0C13 .756 OC12 .752 0C13 .756 OC13 .756 6.766 0.75177777 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS5 .736 .740 | | OD2 | .732 | | |
| Organizational Cynicism OC2 .752 OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 Support POS6 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | | OD1 | .733 | 5.134 | 0.73342857 |
| OC3 .755 OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 Support POS6 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | Organizational Cynicism | OC2 | .752 | | |
| OC4 .749 OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OC13 .756 OS7 .737 POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | 0 | OC3 | .755 | | |
| OC5 .749 OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS5 .736 .749 POS4 .740 .749 | | OC4 | .749 | | |
| OC7 .755 OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS6 .736 POS4 .740 | | OC5 | .749 | | |
| OC8 .750 OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 Perceived organizational POS7 .737 POS6 .737 .736 POS5 .736 .740 | | OC7 | .755 | | |
| OC11 .748 OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 0.7517777 Perceived organizational support POS7 .737 737 POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 .748 | | OC8 | .750 | | |
| OC12 .752 OC13 .756 6.766 0.7517777 Perceived organizational support POS7 .737 737 POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 .740 .751 | | OC11 | .748 | | |
| OC13 .756 6.766 0.7517777 Perceived organizational support POS7 .737 | | OC12 | .752 | | |
| Perceived organizational POS7 .737 support POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | | OC13 | .756 | 6.766 | 0.75177777 |
| support POS6 .737 POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | Perceived organizational | POS7 | .737 | | |
| POS5 .736 POS4 .740 | support | POS6 | .737 | | |
| POS4 .740 | ouppoint and a second s | POS5 | .736 | | |
| | | POS4 | .740 | | |
| POS3 736 | | POS3 | 736 | | |
| POS2 737 | | POS2 | .737 | | |
| POS1 736 5159 0737 | | POSI | 736 | 5 159 | 0737 |
| Turnover Intention TII 736 | Turnover Intention | TII | 736 | 0.107 | 5.151 |
| TI2 738 | rumover intention | TI2 | 738 | | |
| TI3 735 | | TI3 | 735 | | |
| TIA 737 | | TI4 | 737 | | |
| TI5 736 | | TIS | 736 | | |

TI6

.739

4.421

0.73683333

| Constructs | Items | FL | Error | Calculation of Construct Reliability | Construct Reliability |
|------------------------|-------|------|-------|--|--------------------------|
| Perception of Ethical | IEC6 | 542 | 265 | (54 + 70 + 56 + 68 + 81 + 82 + 68 + | 9/18 |
| Climate | IEC5 | 789 | 268 | $(.54 + .79)^{2}$ /[(54 + 79 + 56 + 68 + 81 + | .)+0 |
| Childre | IEC4 | .563 | .262 | 82 + 68 + 71 + | |
| | IEC3 | .681 | .262 | $79)^2/(265+268+262+267+264+268+26)$ | |
| | IEC2 | .807 | .264 | 7+263+266+268+268) = | |
| | IEC1 | .823 | .268 | /1.2031.2001.2001.2007] = | |
| | IC5 | .673 | .267 | | |
| | IC4 | .612 | .263 | | |
| | IC3 | .679 | .266 | | |
| | IC2 | .714 | .268 | | |
| | IC1 | .788 | .268 | | |
| Perceived Authentic | SA3 | .465 | .262 | (.47 + .47 + .47 + .51 + .85 + .59 + | .881 |
| Leadership | SA2 | .467 | .262 | $(.58)^2/[(.47 + .47 + .47 + .51 + .85 + .59 +$ | |
| Style | SA1 | .466 | .262 | $(58)^2 +$ | |
| 2 | BP5 | .510 | .261 | (.262+.262+.262+.261+.263+.260+.260)] = | |
| | BP4 | .853 | .263 | × /* | |
| | BP2 | .595 | .260 | | |
| | BP1 | .578 | .260 | | |
| Horizontal Violence | HV21 | .682 | .265 | (.68 + .65 + .63 + .70 + .85 + .85 + | .925 |
| | HV20 | .647 | .267 | $.79)^{2}/[(.68 + .65 + .63 + .70 + .85 +$ | |
| | HV19 | .625 | .266 | $(.79)^{2} + (.265 + .267 + .266 + .267 + .268 + .267)] =$ | |
| | HV18 | .700 | .266 | | |
| | HV17 | .850 | .267 | | |
| | HV16 | .850 | .268 | | |
| | HV15 | .790 | .267 | | |
| Organizational | OC2 | .566 | .248 | (.57 + .69 + .69 + .71 + .64 + .73 + .74 + | .942 |
| Cynicism | OC3 | .685 | .245 | $.83 + .77)^{2/}[(.57 + .69 + .69 + .71 + .64 +$ | |
| | OC4 | .692 | .251 | $.73 + .74 + .83 + .77)^2 +$ | |
| | OC5 | .707 | .251 | (.248+.245+.251+.251+.245+.250+.252+.248 | |
| | OC7 | .640 | .245 | +.244)] = | |
| | OC8 | .734 | .250 | | |
| | OC11 | .742 | .252 | | |
| | OC12 | .829 | .248 | | |
| | OC13 | .765 | .244 | | |
| Perceived | POS7 | .654 | .263 | (.65 + .68 + .75 + .71 + .68 + .74 +) | .919 |
| Organizational Support | POS6 | .676 | .263 | $.70)^{2}/[(.65 + .68 + .75 + .71 + .68 + .74 + .70)^{2}]$ | |
| | POS5 | .747 | .264 | $(.70)^2 + (.263 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .260 + .263 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .263 + .264 + .260 + .263 + .264 + .26$ | |
| | POS4 | .706 | .260 | .264 + .263 + .264)] = | |
| | POS3 | .682 | .264 | | |
| | POS2 | .739 | .263 | | |
| | POST | .703 | .264 | (| |
| Turnover Intention | 111 | .873 | .264 | (.87 + .81 + .91 + .85 + .72 + | .925 |
| | 112 | .805 | .262 | $.61)^{-7}[(.87 + .81 + .91 + .85 + .72 +)^{-7}]$ | |
| | 113 | .907 | .265 | $.61)^{2} + (.264 + .262 + .265 + .263 + .263)^{2}$ | |
| | 114 | .853 | .263 | .264 + .261)] = | |
| | 115 | .722 | .264 | | |
| | 116 | .609 | .261 | | |

Table 2.2 Factor loadings and construct reliability

2.4 Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity is referred to the extent to which an instrument contains a construct that was truly distinct from all others. Discriminant validity is the degree to which similar constructs have distinct values. In this type of validity the responses are measured without cross loading in terms of latent constructs [7]. Discriminant validity is violated when the correlation among exogenous constructs is increased than 0.85. Factor loadings and composite reliability is presented in Table 2.3 and 2.4.

| Inter-co | onstruct | relationship | Inter Construct Correlations | Squared Inter- construct Correlations |
|----------|----------|--------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Cynicism | <> | POS | 399 | .159201 |
| Cynicism | <> | ALS | 402 | .161604 |
| ALS | <> | Violence | 381 | .145161 |
| Violence | <> | PEC | 103 | .010609 |
| POS | <> | ALS | .628 | .394384 |
| POS | <> | Violence | 162 | .026244 |
| POS | <> | PEC | .403 | .162409 |
| Cynicism | <> | Violence | .060 | 0.0036 |
| ALS | <> | PEC | .509 | .259081 |
| Cynicism | <> | PEC | 501 | .251001 |
| POS | <> | Turnover | .011 | .000121 |
| Cynicism | <> | Turnover | .560 | .3136 |
| ALS | <> | Turnover | 377 | .142129 |
| Violence | <> | Turnover | .561 | .314721 |
| PEC | <> | Turnover | 337 | .113569 |

Table 2.3 Simple and squared inter-construct correlations

Table 2.4 Squared inter-construct correlations and average variance extracted

| Constructs | Squared Inter-construct Correlation | Average Variance Extracted |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Perception of Ethical Climate | .010609, .162409, .259081, .251001, .113569 | 0.73381818 |
| Horizontal Violence | .145161, .010609, .026244, 0.0036, .314721 | 0.73342857 |
| Perceived Authentic Leadership | .161604, .145161, .394384, .259081, .142129 | 0.73857142 |
| Organizational Cynicism | .159201, .161604, 0.0036, . 251001, .3136 | 0.75177777 |
| Perceived Organizational Support | .159201, .394384, .026244, .162409, .000121 | 0.737 |
| Turnover Intention | .000121, .3136, .142129, .314721, .113569 | 0.73683333 |

2.5 Nomological Validity

Nomological validity is referred whether the nature of correlation among constructs make sense or reality based. It determines the degree that summative score of scale predict the constructs theoretically. The nomological validity is mainly measured through correlations, covariance, squared factor loading and error variance [7]. Table 2.5 shows the covariance of relationship of perception of ethical climate, horizontal violence, perceived authentic leadership style, perceived organizational support, organizational cynicism and turnover intention. Result shows significant covariance relationship except violence with cynicism and perceived organizational support with turnover intention.

| | Inter-construct re | lationship | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | Р | Label |
|----------|--------------------|------------|----------|------|---------|------|---------------|
| Cynicism | <> | POS | 042 | .004 | -9.575 | *** | Significant |
| Cynicism | <> | ALS | 051 | .005 | -9.624 | *** | Significant |
| ALS | <> | Violence | 035 | .004 | -9.195 | *** | Significant |
| Violence | <> | PEC | 007 | .003 | -2.657 | .008 | Significant |
| POS | <> | ALS | .125 | .009 | 13.738 | *** | Significant |
| POS | <> | Violence | 012 | .003 | -4.139 | *** | Significant |
| POS | <> | PEC | .057 | .006 | 9.656 | *** | Significant |
| Cynicism | <> | Violence | .003 | .002 | 1.538 | .124 | Insignificant |
| ALS | <> | PEC | .087 | .007 | 11.710 | *** | Significant |
| Cynicism | <> | PEC | 045 | .004 | -11.577 | *** | Significant |
| POS | <> | Turnover | .000 | .002 | .284 | .776 | Insignificant |
| Cynicism | <> | Turnover | .015 | .001 | 12.625 | *** | Significant |
| ALS | <> | Turnover | 019 | .002 | -9.113 | *** | Significant |
| Violence | <> | Turnover | .011 | .001 | 12.631 | *** | Significant |
| PEC | <> | Turnover | 012 | .001 | -8.238 | *** | Significant |

Table 2.5 Covariance of relationship of variables

Table 2.6 shows the correlation among variables which replicates with the previous studies. Therefore, current study does not violate the nomological validity.

| Table 2.6 Cor | relation of | variables |
|---------------|-------------|-----------|
|---------------|-------------|-----------|

| Inter-construct relationship | | | Estimate |
|------------------------------|----|----------|----------|
| Cynicism | <> | POS | 399 |
| Cynicism | <> | ALS | 402 |
| ALS | <> | Violence | 381 |
| Violence | <> | PEC | 103 |
| POS | <> | ALS | .628 |
| POS | <> | Violence | 162 |
| POS | <> | PEC | .403 |
| Cynicism | <> | Violence | .060 |
| ALS | <> | PEC | .509 |
| Cynicism | <> | PEC | 501 |
| POS | <> | Turnover | .011 |
| Cynicism | <> | Turnover | .560 |
| ALS | <> | Turnover | 377 |
| Violence | <> | Turnover | .561 |
| PEC | <> | Turnover | 337 |

3.0 CONCLUSION

In current study, psychometric analysis of perception of ethical climate, horizontal violence, perceived authentic leadership style and perceived organizational support as predictors and turnover intention as an outcome of organizational cynicism. Psychometric analysis is conducted through measurement model by using AMOS 21. A mathematical approach is utilized to compute the reliability and validity of the constructs. Present study validates the questionnaire and offers a reliable instrument to investigate organizational cynicism in Asian countries.

Acknowledgement

Author¹ is grateful for UTM funding to participate in the conference.

References

- Ajzen, I. 1994. Attitudes. In R. J. Corsini (Ed.). Encyclopedia of Psychology. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley. 114–116.
- [2] Abraham, R. 2000. Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs. 126(3): 269– 292.
- [3] Andersson, L. M. 1996. Employee Cynicism: An Examination Using a Contract Violation Framework. *Human Relations*. 49(11): 1395–1418. doi: 10.1177/001872679604901102.
- [4] Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Walker, H. J. 2007. Justice, Cynicism, and Commitment. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 43(3): 303–326. doi: 10.1177/0021886306296602.

- [5] Dean, J. W., Jr., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. 1998. Organizational Cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*. 23(2): 341–352. 1993. *Catalysis Today*. 18: 163.
- [6] Shahzad, A., & Malik, R. K. 2014. Workplace Violence: An Extensive Issue for Nurses in Pakistan: A Qualitative Investigation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 29(11): 2021–2034. doi: 10.1177/0886260513516005.
- [7] H. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. 2010. Multivariate Data Analysis. 7th ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice
- [8] Naus, F., van Iterson, A., & Roe, R. 2007. Organizational Cynicism: Extending the Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect Model of Employees' Responses to Adverse Conditions in the Workplace. *Human Relations*. 60(5): 683–718. doi: 10.1177/0018726707079198E.
- [9] Astorino, J. B. Peri, R. J. Willey, G. Busca. 1996. J. Catal. 157: 482.