

AFLOAT IN UNCERTAINTY AND CYNICISM: AN EXPERIENCE FROM EGYPT

Mohamed Mousa

Estonian Business School, Estonia

Corresponding Email: Mohamed.mousa@ebs.ee

Hala A. Abdelgaffar

Estonian Business School, Estonia

Email: Hala.abdelgaffar@ebs.ee

Abstract

Due to rapid, uncertain and continuous changes in our current turbulent world, the concept “uncertainty”, which was introduced by economists and psychologists, has found a place in the managerial academic arena throughout the last three decades. This concept has a significant impact on people’s choices and business orientation, the matter that puts it at the heart of many scientific disciplines. During the last two decades, organizational cynicism has found a place in academic management literature. It has a vital role in interpreting many organizational unwanted behaviors, such as absenteeism, day dreaming and the state of being careless when doing work. This study investigates the association between uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job- related) and organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) by conducting a quantitative study of physicians in Kasr El Eini public hospital in Egypt. Upon using correlation and regression analysis for the collected data, it appears that all uncertainty types have a positive impact on organizational cynicism dimensions.

Keywords - uncertainty; strategic uncertainty; structural uncertainty; job-related uncertainty; organizational cynicism; Egypt

Introduction

The earliest attempts to conceptualize uncertainty was in the work of Knight (1921), who defined it as the instability organizations face in the business environment (Samsami, Hosseini, Kordnaeij and Azar, 2015). Admittedly, this concept was first introduced by economists and psychologists. However and because of its significance, many scientific disciplines like leadership, organizational behavior, strategic management, logistics and project management have devoted a considerable attention to addressing its details (Porter, 1980; Ellis & Shpielberg, 2003 and Karlsen, 2011). This may be considered a logic consequence after the last three decades advancement in information technology and the emergence of what is known as knowledge-driven enterprise (Koh & Simpson, 2005).

Miller (1993, p.695) defines uncertainty as “the unpredictability of environmental or organizational variables that have an impact on corporate performance” and categorized it as: environmental uncertainties (macroeconomic and political and government policy instability), industry uncertainties (product market, input market, technological, and competitive uncertainties) and firm-specific uncertainties (with regards to management and employee actions, research and development, and operations). Moreover, Song (2013) asserts that uncertainty reflects an organization’s lack of information about the future. Accordingly, Thietart and Xuereb (1997) address the following four means of absorbing uncertainty:

- Organizational means: roles, procedures, culture and other in- organization components
- Cognitive means: information about all possible stakeholders.
- Strategic means: intent, potential alliance, and planned partnerships
- Managerial means: project and time management.

Obviously, many studies (Hall & Saias, 1989; Weick, 1996, and Song, 2013) affirmed that the rapid, uncertain and daily changes are the main condition for competing in our turbulent world. Accordingly, the philosophy of managing uncertainty relies mostly on both agility, which entails a very quick reaction to market changes, and responsiveness, which fosters a balanced response to predictable and unpredictable occurring changes (Koh & Simpson, 2005).

Despite the novelty of the concept “organizational cynicism”, many studies have established its importance in organization and management research (Yasin & Khalid, 2015; Khan, Trelles, et al., 2016 and Nazir, Ahmed, Nawab & Shah, 2016). The concept reflects an employee’s feelings of distrust, insecurity, anger and disturbance emanate from his/her belief that s/he works in an unequal, insecure and dishonest organizational atmosphere (Khan, 2014). That explains why cynical employees often have negative attitudes towards their colleagues, occupations and organization (Ozler & Atalay, 2011; Kocoglu, 2014 and Simha, Elloy & Huang, 2014).

Admittedly, the topic of organizational cynicism has become of a great relevance to many scientific disciplines like philosophy, sociology, political science, psychology and management in many if not all western countries (Delkan, 2005). This may interpret why many scholars have addressed the association between organizational cynicism and many other organizational phenomena such as job burnout (Simha, Elloy & Huang, 2014), job stress (Kocoglu, 2014), work- related quality of life (Yasin & Khalid, 2015) and turnover intention (Nazir, Ahmed, Nawab & Shah, 2016). Furthermore, Kaifi (2013) asserts that cynicism provides interpretation for many employees’ behaviors like organizational psychological withdrawal, employee mental departure from work duties by day dreaming or cyber-loafing, and organizational physical withdrawal or an employee’s physical departure from his workplace by absenteeism or late arrival to work.

Kasr El Eini is the oldest, largest, and most prominent governmental medical school and hospital in Egypt. (<http://www.medicine.cu.edu.eg>). It was established in 1827 in a region called El Manial Island, Cairo. According to its website, Kasr El Ein includes 2773 medical professors and physicians, 3732 post-graduate students, and 9423 students. This medical school and hospital has the mission of graduating quality physicians capable of implementing various levels of health care practices. The school and hospital management are concerned about the development of a competitive human capital that would serve the community and share in solving national health problems.

Kasr El Eini is currently the focus of the media, politics, and public discourse because of the many difficulties faced by both physicians and patients there. The majority of its physicians are experiencing a state of low involvement and low participation. A famous Egyptian newspaper and website called al3asma has published an investigation to explore the aspects of this dilemma (<http://www.al3asma.com/40137>). Many Kasr El Eini physicians claim that besides their low salaries, the hospital is full of managerial corruption, bias, inequality and nepotism (<http://www.albawabhnews.com/2419159>). Furthermore, they feel worried about their workplace, occupation, and even their responsibilities.

Owing to the fact that Kasr El Eini is the main destination for Egyptian low and middle income families (<http://www.elwatannews.com/news/details/1255899>) and that the increase of physicians’ anger is an undisputed fact that may hinder their performance, engagement and loyalty, this research seeks to fill in a gap in management literature by examining the relationship between uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job- related) and organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral) in the context of Kasr El Eini school and hospital.

Literature review

Uncertainty

Due to its effect on both organizational members and organizational choices, the concept of uncertainty has gained a remarkable recognition in academic management life (Song, 2013). Samsami et al. (2015) affirm that the concept has come to be considered a prevailing term in various management disciplines such as strategic management, supply chain management, operations management, financial management and so on. The earliest attempt to conceptualize uncertainty was in the work of Knight (1921), who defines it as the instability organizations face in the business environment. Garner (1962) considers it as the characteristic of all possible future implications affecting organizational decision making, and later Milliken (1987) states that uncertainty is “an individual's perceived inability to predict something accurately because of a lack of information or an inability to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant data” (p. 136). Miller (1993) defines uncertainty as “the unpredictability of environmental or organizational variables that have an impact on corporate performance” (p. 695), whereas DiFonzo and Bordia (1998) define uncertainty as the sense of doubt about the future, particularly with regards to cause and effect relationships in the environment.

Weick (1987) elaborates that the main struggles any organization faces are lack of information, time constraints and the inability to understand the business environment. Sinding et al. (1998) indicate that uncertainty emanates from both external environment (the nature, rules and measures) and internal environment (financial capability, information processing and in- organization values). However, it is worthy to be mentioned that there are some later studies that have affirmed that the external environment alone can cause uncertainty (Tymon et al., 1998, and Harrison & Kelly, 2010). Ellis and Shpielberg (2003) divide uncertainty into three stages. In the first stage, managers lack the full understanding of the occurring changes around them. In the second stage managers have limited ability to predict the future of their organizations, and in the third, managers are unable to predict the future of their organizations.

To differentiate between uncertainty and risk, Mack (1971) mentions that “the risk exists when two or more states are possible and the probability of each of them can be determined with certainty. Uncertainty is used in cases where information is insufficient and observations are irregular. Deep uncertainty exists when the inferential (logical reasons) and experimental (observations) foundations of knowledge are weak”. Accordingly, he believes that risk is not as widely prevalent as uncertainty. It is also worth mentioning that managing uncertainty is a vital part of organizational culture, and subsequently it can be identified and dealt with by knowledge sharing (Alas & Mousa, 2016). Hillson (1997) mentioned in Mousa & Alas (2016) develops a formal maturity model to assess the current uncertainty capabilities of an organization. This maturity model consists of the following four levels:

- Naïve: at this level, the organization doesn't fully understand the significance and the need for uncertainty management.
- Novice: at this level, the organization has started to adopt uncertainty management. However, an organized formalized approach for managing this uncertainty is still missing.
- Normalized: at this level, the organization has designed and adopted a formal integrated approach to manage uncertainty.
- Natural: at this level, the organization has considered uncertainty management as a main part of its organizational culture. Moreover, it has become fully aware of the importance of adopting a continuous integrated approach to manage such uncertainty.

In their study, Bordia et al. (2004) illustrate three types of uncertainty:

- Strategic uncertainty: a sense of doubt regarding organization level aspects such as sustainability, future direction, and nature of business environment that an organization faces.
- Structural uncertainty: doubt derived from internal changes within the organization. This may include changes in reporting structure, policies, and functions of work units.
- Job-related uncertainty: doubt regarding job responsibilities, job roles, promotion opportunities, and so on.

Apparently, Bordia et al. (2004) considers that uncertainty has its existence in the organizational context. Pollard (2001) affirms a positive correlation between uncertainty and work stress. Conversely, a negative correlation has been

proved between uncertainty and job satisfaction as indicated by the study of Ashford et al. (1989). The same negative association has been assured between trust and uncertainty as seen in the study of (Schweiger & Denisi, 1991). Song (2015) considers that the uncertainty is born and maintained in public sector organizations because of three aspects: negative image resulting from the illegal acts of their members, organization-specific change that derives from leadership turnover, and finally an uncontrollable environment arising from changes in legislative support.

From what has preceded, it is clear that uncertainty has a significant impact on an organizations' future choices. That is why effectively managing it assists organizations in not only making good decisions but also expecting good outcomes from these decisions.

Organizational cynicism

Despite the surprisingly unusual association Dean et al. (1998) make between the term "Cynicism" and the ancient Greek word "kyon" which mean "dog", a more recent study made by Nazir, Ahmad, Nawab and Shah (2016) indicates that cynicism probably originates from "cynosarges" which was an institute of cynics outside Athens, the capital of Greece. The term cynicism was often used by ancient Greeks to describe the beliefs of skepticism, disbelief, pessimism, disappointment and scorn (Andersson, 1996). The same is confirmed by Delken (2005) when stating that the earliest Greek cynics were used to criticizing their institutions and state. That is why the study of Guastello and Rieke (1992) pointed out that cynicism worked as a philosophy for some ancient Greeks.

In defining cynicism, both Andersson & Bateman (1997) and Leung et al. (2010) differentiated between social cynicism which represents a disbelief or negative feeling toward a person, group, ideology or even a state, and organizational cynicism - our current researchable aspect - which is defined by Dean et al. (1998, P. 345) as "a negative attitude toward one's organization". It is also "a pessimistic approach shaped by an individual to his or her company" (Yasin & Khalid, 2015, P. 569). Accordingly, cynical employees believe that their co-workers are selfish and the organizations they work for lack values of honesty, justice, morality and integrity (Ince & Turan, 2011). Consequently, cynics often have feelings of mistrust, anger, insecurity, disappointment and hopelessness when dealing with their colleagues and subsequently organization (Abraham, 2000).

One of the most important definitions of organizational cynicism is what was written by Delken (2005) when considering it as "an attitude of rejection of the employing organization, or part of it, as a viable psychological contract partner" (p.10). This definition confirms both the psychological contract theory, in which employees rely on their previous experience with their organization to create their prospective expectations, and the affective events theory, in which work events can create employees' positive or negative attitude toward their work, and thus provides a comprehensive basis for the interpretation of organizational cynicism (Kocoglu, 2014 and Khan, Naseem & Masood, 2016).

Reichers, Wanous & Austin (1997) articulate that the main factors influencing organizational cynicism are a lack of recognition, rising organizational complexity, low work autonomy, poor strategic uncertainty, big gaps in salaries, conflict roles, feelings of nepotism, existence of bias, feelings of ostracism, disagreement with organizational values, unachievable organizational goals, too much work load, absence of adequate leadership skills, and finally inadequate social support.

Delken (2005) identifies the following five main forms of organizational cynicism:

- Cynicism about organizational change: refers to the reaction perceived due to change in policies, procedures and /or executive personnel.
- Employee cynicism: describes the attitudes caused by psychological contract violation.
- Occupational cynicism: describes the attitudes mainly generated from role conflict and/or role ambiguity.
- Personality cynicism: describes negative feelings toward all human behavior.
- Societal cynicism: describes citizens' distrust of their government and subsequently institutions.

Needless to say that organizational cynicism has been given a rising attention nowadays. The rationale behind this is the significant negative outcomes caused by the existence of cynicism. Barefoot et al. (1989) mentions that cynical employees are the obtrusive barriers that prevent an organization from achieving its goals. Moreover, many studies assure

the relationship between cynicism and some critical key organizational diseases such as job burnout, turnover intentions, absenteeism, low cynicism level, less citizenship behavior and so on (Aydin & Akdag, 2016).

Clearly, the studies of Stanley, Meyer & Topolnytsky (2005) and Kaifi (2013) point that the concept “organizational cynicism” includes three dimensions:

- The cognitive dimension: reflects employees’ belief that their organization lacks integrity, justice, honesty and transparency. Accordingly, employees feel that their personal values are not consistent with those of the organization.
- The affective dimension: reflects employees’ negative affective reaction (anger and disgust) towards their organization.
- The behavioral dimension: reflects employees’ negative behavioral tendencies (such as powerful negative criticism) toward their organization.

Research Methodology

Conceptual framework

This conceptual framework is designed based on a review of previous studies that have been conducted to demonstrate the relationship between cultural diversity and organizational cynicism. In this study, the three proposed independent variables are strategic uncertainty, structural uncertainty, and training. Organizational cynicism approaches (affective, continuance and normative) function as dependent variables.

Hypotheses

Based on the previous literature review, the researcher will test the following hypotheses:

- H1: all uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job-related) have a positive relationship with cognitive cynicism.
- H2: all uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job-related) have a positive relationship with affective cynicism.
- H3: all uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job-related) have a positive relationship with behavioral cynicism.

Survey Instruments

This quantitative research uses a questionnaire to collect primary data. Most questions included in the questionnaire are based on established, existing models, with some modifications made to the original questions with regards to the cultural aspect of this study sample. The questionnaire prepared for this study contains three main sections: Demographic variables, organizational cynicism and cultural diversity. A five-point Likert scale is used for all items under organizational cynicism and cultural diversity.

Section A: Demographic Variables: Involve questions about the personal information of the targeted respondents such as gender, age, marital status, level of income and organizational tenure.

Section B: Uncertainty: Based on Bordia et al. (2004) designed survey of uncertainty, this section is designed to cover three types of uncertainty: strategic uncertainty, structural uncertainty, and job-related uncertainty. This section includes three subscales. The first subscale involves four questions about strategic uncertainty, the second has four questions about structural uncertainty, and the third contains four questions about job-related uncertainty.

Section C: Organizational Cynicism: Based on Dean et al. (1998) three dimensional model of organizational cynicism, this study will examine the cognitive, affective and behavioral factors with three subscales to cover each of these researchable points.

Scope of the study

Physicians who are working in Kasr El Eini hospital in Egypt are the main population of this study. They are chosen as a sample because they represent the category of Egyptian physicians who are working in public hospitals and who are likely to complain about their hospital's integrity, nepotism, inequality and lack of training. Also, it deserves to be mentioned that the researchers were able to contact many physicians in this hospital.

By dividing the population into homogenous subgroups and then taking a simple random sample from each subgroup, the researchers rely on stratified random sampling in order to reduce any possible bias and at the same time ensure that the chosen simple random sample represents the general population. The use of stratified random sampling guarantees that each subgroup is represented in the chosen sample. Since it is difficult to determine the size of population in this case, the researcher has chosen to distribute 120 sets of questionnaires to the targeted respondents. Needless to say, the sets of questionnaire delivered in both Arabic and English were designed to match the abilities of all targeted respondents and to motivate them to respond.

Data Analysis

For data analysis, the SPSS was used to show the normal descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation. The SPSS Pearson correlation will be adopted to get the results of hypotheses testing.

Research Findings

As previously stated, the researchers distributed 120 sets of questionnaires and received responses from 100 physicians. With the help of stratified random sampling, the researchers formed the following profiles for respondents (see Table 1)

Table 1: Demographics

Demographic Variables	Items	Count
Gender	Male	90
	Female	10
Age	below 25 years	13
	26-30 years	18
	31-35 years	18
	36-40 years	16
	41-45 years	17
	46-50 years	10
	More than 50 years	8
Marital States	Single	10
	Married	82
	Other	8
Level of Education	Bachelor	98
	Bachelor + Diploma	0
	Master	2
Level of Income	EGP 1200	9
	EGP 1300-2500	10
	EGP 2500-4000	35
	EGP 4000-5500	44
	Above 5500	2
Organizational tenure	Less than 1 year	2
	1-3 years	5
	4-6 years	11
	7-9 years	67
	10-12 years	13
	Above 15 years	2
Religion	Muslim	95
	Christian	5
Work Bases	Full time	100
	Part time	0

Reliability Analysis

The Cronbach Alpha is used to assess the internal consistency of each of the variables used in the study. As depicted in Table 1, all variables have adequate levels of internal consistency, and they meet the acceptable standard of 0.60 (Sekaran, 2003). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is 0.966 (see Table 2).

Table 2: Reliability Analysis

Scale name	Number of items	Coefficient alpha values
Uncertainty	12	0.945
Strategic uncertainty	4	0.920
Structural uncertainty	4	0.949
Job related uncertainty	4	0.882
Cynicism	12	0.918
Cognitive cynicism	4	0.702
Affective cynicism	4	0.913
Behavioral cynicism	4	0.944
Total	24	0.966

Hypothesis 1

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.588, and this value is highly significant ($P= 0.0$). This moderate correlation coefficient proves that strategic uncertainty moderately affects physicians' cognitive cynicism. The result ($R^2= 0.345$, $P= 0.0$) suggests that when strategic uncertainty is perceived, there is a 34.5 % increase in physicians' cognitive cynicism (see Table 3).

Table 3: Correlation and Regression between Strategic uncertainty and Cognitive Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	r	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE of the estimate
1	.588	.345	.338	.41518

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.904	1	8.904	51.654	.000
	Residual	16.893	98	.172		
	Total	25.797	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.182	.139		15.667	.000
	Cognitive cynicism	.317	.044	.588	7.187	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.602, and the value is highly significant ($P= 0.0$). This positive correlation coefficient proves that structural uncertainty positively affects physicians' cognitive cynicism. The result ($R^2= 0.363$, $P= 0.0$) suggests that if physicians face structural uncertainty, the result is a 36.3 % increase in their cognitive cynicism (see Table 4).

Linear Regression

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.602	.363	.356	.99845

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	55.563	1	55.563	55.735	.000
	Residual	97.697	98	.997		
	Total	153.260	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.043	.335		3.115	.002
	Cognitive cynicism	.793	.106	.602	7.466	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.833, and the value is highly significant ($P = 0.00$). This highly significant positive correlation coefficient proves that job-related uncertainty positively affects physicians' affective cynicism. The result ($R^2 = 0.694$, $P = 0.0$) suggests that when job-related uncertainty is existed, there is a 69.4 % increase in physicians' affective cynicism (see Table 5).

Table 5: Correlation and Regression, between Job-related Uncertainty and Cognitive Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.833	.694	.691	.69968

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	108.885	1	108.885	222.416	.000
	Residual	47.977	98	.490		
	Total	156.862	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.869	.235		-3.701	.000
	Cognitive cynicism	1.110	.074	.833	14.914	.000

Findings 1: Since both strategic, structural and job-related uncertainty positively affect cognitive cynicism, the first hypothesis is fully supported. The results show that job-related uncertainty (.694) has far more impact than strategic uncertainty (0.345) and structural uncertainty (.363) on the level of cognitive cynicism.

Hypothesis 2

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.542 and the value are highly significant ($P = 0.0$). This result indicates that strategic uncertainty positively affects affective cynicism. The result ($R^2 = 0.294$, $P = 0.0$) suggests that when strategic uncertainty is asserted, there is a 29.4 % increase in physicians' affective cynicism (see table 6).

Table 6: Correlation and Regression, between Strategic uncertainty and Affective Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	r	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.542	.294	.287	1.09804

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.146	1	49.146	40.762	.000
	Residual	118.157	98	1.206		
	Total	167.303	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-1.466	.687		-2.133	.035
Affective cynicism	1.380	.216	.542	6.384	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.749, and the value is highly significant ($P = 0.0$). This result proves that structural uncertainty positively affects affective cynicism. The result ($R^2 = 0.561$, $P = 0.0$) suggests that when physicians find a kind of structural uncertainty, the result is a 56.1% increase in the level of physicians' affective cynicism (See table 7).

Table 7: Correlation and Regression between Structural Uncertainty and Affective Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.749	.561	.556	.86575

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	93.848	1	93.848	125.209	.000
	Residual	73.454	98	.750		
	Total	167.303	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.181	.255		.710	.480
Affective cynicism	.783	.070	.749	11.190	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.858, and the value is significant ($P=0.00$), showing a significantly positive effect for job-related uncertainty on the level of affective cynicism. The result ($R^2= 0.737$, $P= 0.000$) shows that if physicians feel a doubt concerning their jobs' skills, their level of affective cynicism increases by 73.7 % (See table 8).

Table 8: Correlation and Regression, between Job-related Uncertainty and Affective Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	r	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.858	.737	.734	.67016

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	123.289	1	123.289	274.518	.000
	Residual	44.013	98	.449		
	Total	167.303	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.673	.148		4.538	.000
Affective cynicism	.887	.054	.858	16.569	.000

Findings 2: Both strategic, structural and job-related uncertainty have a positive effect on affective cynicism; hence, hypothesis two is fully accepted. The results also show that job-related uncertainty (0.737) has a more significant effect than strategic uncertainty (0.294) and structural uncertainty (0.561) on the level of affective cynicism.

Hypothesis 3

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.664, and the value is highly significant ($P= 0.0$). This positive correlation coefficient implies that strategic uncertainty can positively affect physicians' behavioral cynicism. Specifically, the result ($R^2= 0.441$, $P= 0.0$) suggests when strategic uncertainty is affirmed. There is a 44.1% increase in physicians' feeling that they aren't in the right organization (See table 9).

Table 9: Correlation and Regression between Strategic Uncertainty and Behavioral Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	r	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.664	.441	.435	.38357

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	11.379	1	11.379	77.340	.000
	Residual	14.418	98	.147		
	Total	25.797	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.122	.122		17.441	.000
	Behavioral Cynicism	.362	.041	.664	8.794	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.811, and the value is highly significant ($P=0.0$). This positive value of correlation coefficient implies that structural uncertainty positively affects the physicians' behavioral cynicism. The result ($R^2= 0.658$, $P= 0.0$) suggests that if physicians experience a kind of structural uncertainty, their feeling of criticism towards their hospitals increases by 65.8% (See table 10).

Table 10: Correlation and Regression between Structural Uncertainty and Behavioral Cynicism

Linear Regression

Model	r	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE of the estimate
1	.811	.658	.655	.73132

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	100.847	1	100.847	188.562	.000
	Residual	52.413	98	.535		
	Total	153.260	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.407	.232		1.754	.083
	Behavioral Cynicism	1.078	.078	.811	13.732	.000

The analysis results in a Pearson coefficient of 0.661, and the value is highly significant ($P= 0.0$). This result shows a positive correlation between job-related uncertainty and physicians' behavioral cynicism. The result ($R^2= 0.436$, $P= 0.00$) shows that if job-related uncertainty occurs, there is an observed increase physicians' level of behavioral cynicism by 43.6% (See table 11).

Table 11: Correlation and Regression between Job-related Uncertainty and Behavioral Cynicism
Linear Regression

Model	r	R ²	Adjusted R ²	SE of the estimate
1	.661	.436	.431	.94984

ANOVA(b)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	68.446	1	68.446	75.866	.000
	Residual	88.416	98	.902		
	Total	156.862	99			

Coefficients(a)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	-.018	.301		-.060	.952
Behavioral Cynicism	.888	.102	.661	8.710	.000

Findings 3: Both strategic, structural and job related uncertainty positively affect physicians' behavioral cynicism. Thus, hypothesis 3 is accepted. The results show that structural uncertainty (.658) has a more significant effect than strategic uncertainty (0.441) and job-related uncertainty (0.436) on the level of behavioral cynicism.

Discussion and conclusion

This study has attempted to examine the relationship between uncertainty types (strategic, structural and job-related) and organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral). The results of the current study show a positive association between the three types of uncertainty and the dimensions of organizational cynicism dimensions (cognitive, affective and behavioral). Job-related uncertainty has emerged to be the most dominant variable in predicting physicians' cognitive and affective cynicism, whereas structural uncertainty is considered the most dominant one in the case of behavioral cynicism.

Globalization, continuous change in the labor market and daily change in public employment and personnel rules and regulations especially in developing nations like Egypt have not only diminished employees' ability to understand their business environment but also fostered their sense of doubt concerning their in-and-out organizational sustainability, future direction, reporting structures, policies, job responsibilities, promotion opportunities and so on (Bordia et al., 2004; Samsami et al., 2015 and Alas & Mousa, 2016). Accordingly, having a well- designed and formally adopted integrated approach to manage uncertainty is no longer sufficient (Hillson, 1997).

Moreover, considering uncertainty management as a main part of organizational culture is an imperative need nowadays (Mousa & Alas, 2016). To a significant extent, it ensures a full utilization of knowledge sharing between senior and junior employees, supports a full dependence on organizational learning as a mechanism to enhance personnel's emotional and psychological intelligence, and finally deepens employees' feeling of involvement, which is considered essential for attaining staff intellectual balance (Ashford et al., 1989 and Mousa & Alas, 2016).

Currently a state of division threatens the Egyptian society, and the fact that Kas El Eini hospital is a main destination for patients from low and middle income families urges this hospital administration to realize its intended institutional role with regards to the area of certainty. This role should be managerially, socially, and educationally driven by the need to accelerate physicians' feeling of communality and soundness concerning their hospital, department and job roles. As

indicated in the literature, cynicism, regardless of its dimension, has a significant effect on employees' overall satisfaction. That is why promoting prompt open communication together with organizing regular meetings between physicians and their managers and designing monthly workshops on equality, integrity and employee-employer relationship should be considered to limit the views of nepotism, ostracism, irresponsibility, and misuse of authority felt by physicians.

In conclusion, the present study has tried to fill a gap in management literature by examining the relationship between three types of uncertainty and three dimensions of cynicism. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, this study appears to be one of the first to discuss uncertainty and organizational cynicism in Egypt and the whole Arab region. This research may be subject to criticism because of the inability to provide enough variability as the researchers focused mainly on a single public hospital, despite the fact that it is the biggest and oldest in their country, Egypt. Moreover, the researchers overlooked some moderating variables such as physicians' role, ambiguity, job autonomy, and others which may be examined in later research.

For future studies, the researcher suggests the same hypotheses be tested with nurses, consultants, and other employees working at Kasr El Eini hospital, the matter that may yield different results. Furthermore, they also suggest the same research questions be tested in other settings such as private hospitals, universities, and/or businesses to determine whether or not this would lead to similar results.

References

- Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: bases and consequences. *Genetic, social and general psychology monographs* 126 (3).
- Alas, R. & Mousa, M. (2016). Cultural diversity and business schools' curricula: a case from Egypt. *Problems and perspectives in management* 14 (2): 40-47.
- Alas, R. & Mousa, M. (2016). Organizational culture and workplace spirituality. *International journal of emerging research in management and technology* 5 (3).
- Andersson, L. M., & Bateman, T. S. (1997). Cynicism in the workplace: Some causes and effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 449-469.
- Ashford, S. J.; Lee, C. & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, causes and consequences of job insecurity: a theory- based measure and substantive test. *Academy of management journal* 32.
- Aydin, M. & Akdag, G. (2016). The relationship between organizational cynicism and organizational cynicism among hotel employees in southeastern Anatolia region of Turkey. *Eurasian journal of business and management* 4 (4).
- Barefoot, J. C., Dodge, K. A., Peterson, B. L., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Williams Jr, R. B. (1989). The Cook-Medley hostility scale: item content and ability to predict survival. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 51(1), 46-57.
- Bordia, P, Hobman, E., Jones, E., Gallois, C. & Callon, V. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: types, consequences, and management strategies. *Journal of business and psychology* 18(4).
- Dean, J. W.; Brandes, P. & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review* 3 (2).
- Delken, M. (2005). Organizational cynicism: a study among call centers. Master thesis. University of Maastricht. The Netherlands.
- DiFonzo, N., & Bordia, P. (1998). A tale of two corporations: Managing uncertainty during organizational change. *Human Resource Management (1986-1998)*, 37(3-4), 295.

- Ellis, S. & Shpielberg, N. (2003) Organizational learning mechanisms and managers' perceived uncertainty. *Human relations* 56 (10).
- Garner, W. R. (1962). Uncertainty and structure as psychological concepts.
- Harrison, J. & Kelly, S. (2009). Perceived environmental uncertainty's effect on commitment in business-to-business channels. *Marketing intelligence and planning* 28 (6).
- Hillson, D. (1997). Towards a risk maturity model. *International journal of project and business risk management* 1
- Information about Kasr El Eini hospital retrieved from: http://www.medicine.cu.edu.eg/beta/index.php/en/information_about_the_physicians_in_Kasr_El_Eini retrieved from: <http://www.albawabhnews.com/2419159>, <http://www.al3asma.com/40137>
- Kaifi, B. A. (2013). *Organizational behavior: managing and leading organizations*. Tamarac, FL: Lulumina Press. ISBN: 978-1-62550-006-9.
- Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. New York: Hart, Schaffner and Marx.
- Kocoglu, M. (2014). Cynicism as a mediator of relations between job stress and work alienation: a study from a developing country- Turkey. *Global business and management research: an international journal* 6 (1).
- Leung, K., Ip, O. K., & Leung, K. K. (2010). Social cynicism and job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Applied Psychology*, 59(2), 318-338.
- Mack, R. (1971). *Planning on uncertainty: decision making in business and government administration*. New York: Wiley inter science.
- Miller, K. D. (1993). Industry and country effects on managers' perceptions of environmental uncertainties. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24(4), 693-714.
- Milliken, F. J. (1987). Three Types of Perceived Uncertainty About the Environment: State, Effect, and Response Uncertainty. *The Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 133-143.
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Organizational Commitment: A Case Study of Egyptian Teachers Post Revolution. *International Journal of Business Administration* 7 (4).
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Uncertainty and Physicians' organizational commitment in Egyptian Public schools. *European journal of business and management* 8 (20).
- Mousa, M. & Alas, R. (2016). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: A study on the public school teachers in Menoufia (Egypt). *African Journal of Business Management* 10 (10).
- Mousa, M., & Alas, R. (2016). Cultural diversity and organizational commitment: A study on teachers of primary public school teachers in Menoufia (Egypt). *International Business Research* 9 (7).
- Nazir, T.; Ahmad, U. N. B.; Nawab, S.& Shah, S. (2016). Mediating role of organizational cynicism in relationship between role stressors and turnover intention: evidence from healthcare sector of Pakistan. *International review of management and marketing* 6 (2).
- Pollard, T. M. (2001). Changes in mental well-being, blood pressure and total cholesterol during workplace reorganization: the impact of uncertainty. *Work & Stress* 15 (1).

- Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 11(1), 48-59.
- Samsami, F., Hosseini, S. H., Kordnaeij, A., Azar, A. (2015). Managing environmental uncertainty: from conceptual review to strategic management point of view. *International journal of business and management* 10 (7).
- Sekaran, U. (2003). Research methods for business. A skill building approach (4th Ed.). United States of America: John Wiley and Sons.
- Sinding, K., Anex, R., & Sharfman, M. (1998). Environmental uncertainty, corporate strategy and public policy. *The graduate management review* 1.
- Song, Y. (2013). Leadership effectiveness and work appropriateness and meaningfulness under conditions of public organizational uncertainty: comparative organizational study between U.S. and Korea. *International review of public administration* 18 (2).
- Stanley, D. J., Meyer, J. P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), 429-459.
- Trelles, M., Stewart, B. T., Hemat, H., Naseem, M., Zaheer, S., Zakir, M., ... & Kushner, A. L. (2016). Averted health burden over 4 years at Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) Trauma Centre in Kunduz, Afghanistan, prior to its closure in 2015. *Surgery*, 160(5), 1414-1421.
- Tymon, W. G., Stout, D. E. & Shaw, K. N. (1998). Critical analysis and recommendations regarding the role perceived environmental uncertainty in behavioral accounting research. *Behavioural research in accounting* 10.
- Weick, K. E. (1996). Sensemaking in organizations. London: Sage.
- Yasin, T., & Khalid, S. (2015). Organizational Cynicism, Work Related Quality of Life and Organizational Commitment in Employees. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 9(2), 568-582.