Do Schools Fail to "Walk Their Talk"? Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Organizational Hypocrisy

Gökhan Kılıçoğlu, Derya Yılmaz Kılıçoğlu & Engin Karadağ

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Do Schools Fail to "Walk Their Talk"? Development and Validation of a Scale Measuring Organizational Hypocrisy

Gökhan Kılıçoğlu[a], Derya Yılmaz Kılıçoğlu[b], and Engin Karadağ[a]

[a]Department of Elementary Education, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkey; [b]Department of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskisehir, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Educational organizations in institutionalized environments may try to reflect a legitimate image of the environment in their internal structure. However, there may be loosely coupled relationship between anticipated legitimacy and the performed actions in the schools. Thus, that lack of congruence between rhetoric and the behaviors constitutes organizational hypocrisy in schools. The purpose of this article is to advance conceptual understanding of organizational hypocrisy in educational organizations and develop an empirical scale of organizational hypocrisy (OHS). Data from 503 teachers were collected from conducted interrelated studies. The studies that have been conducted to develop OHS validated the scale and demonstrated its utility in relation to organizational behaviors. Results suggested a 17 item, three-factor solution: (1) Keeping Words Into Practice, (2) Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and (3) Inconsistency in Practices. The OHS showed adequate internal consistency, was negatively related to organizational trust, and indicated predictive validity in association with organizational cynicism in schools. The article concludes with study limitations, practical implications, and future research directions.

In the 21st century, rapid developments that occur in scientific, technological, communicational, political, and sociological areas force organizations to adapt to these developments and changes. Schools are necessary as educational organizations to integrate developments and changes that exist in their environment and should not remain indifferent to these changes in order to adapt to the present era and move the society to the future. In the process of integration of changes and developments in the environment, educational organizations are constructed by the facts in their corporate environment and they tend to resemble organizations in their environment. Thus, educational organizations become compatible with the corporate environment through technical and transformational interdependencies in order to increase internal efficiency and organizational effectiveness (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

In the theory of "new institutionalism" in organizational literature, it is critical for organizations to gain legitimacy and maintain this legitimacy while interacting with the institutional environment. Establishing legitimacy offered by the institutional environment is a prerequisite for organizations in order to access the resources necessary to keep their presence (Burrell Nickell & Roberts, 2014; March & Olsen, 1989; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). In schools, for example, school administrators respond to environmental pressures by making symbolic or ceremonial changes and implementations in schools' formal organizational structure, and preserving the school's legitimacy (Spillane & Kenney, 2012). Indeed, schools may design their structures and processes through laws, regulations, and circulars promulgated by the ministry of national education in order to relate with other organizations. In addition, standardization, total quality management (TQM) practices, and corporate strategic planning as coercive forces tend to be introduced to get a rational and legitimate image of the environment, rather than as a real efficiency concern (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Educational organizations may also imitate the leading organizations when there is a high level of uncertainty and competition in the market. However, pretending to have similar structures and practices within organizational field leads to *isomorphism* among organizations, which in turn brings an organizational tendency toward decoupling (Han & Koo, 2010; Ingersoll, 1993). If the demands of the environment conflict with the internal structure, culture of the organization, and the external expectations, it is expected that organizations may "decouple," "disconnect," or "build gaps between their formal structures and actual work activities" to buffer their internal environment against the irreconcilable pressures raised by their external environment (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

Decoupling or loose coupling between formal rules and actual practices can be observed in schools (Weick, 1976). Even though it is possible to state that schools have a perfectly functioning structure and practices on paper, they cannot continue to exist as stated on paper. Bureaucratic rules, standards, and practices considered as legitimacy tools challenge schools to adhere to institutional demands from the environment. The rupture between reassuring images of rationality, formalism, and intellectual rigor being loosely related to schools' practices leads to incongruence (Boiral, 2007). Brunsson (1989) described it as "organizational hypocrisy," a loosely coupled relationship between legitimate statements, ideas, and words with the real activities. That lack of congruence between the anticipated legitimacy of the organization and its actions provide the same point of view with Weick's (1976) ideas about loose coupling between formal system of educational organizations and their complicated daily practices. Likewise, Meyer and Rowan (1977) indicate that organizations may adopt formally institutionalized rules and norms without actually practicing them. Thus, decoupling refers to the gap between formal structures shaped by irreconcilable pressures and uncertainties raised by the external environment,

and what is actually performed in organizations (Brunsson, 1989; Krasner, 1999). As a result, the gap between the formal adoption of structures such as regulations and their actual daily use often ends in hypocrisy and decoupling (Pérezts & Picard, 2015).

Even though external forces create such a situation, the inconsistency between rhetoric and reality may not necessarily be dictated by the tendency of schools to copy the corporate world, but at least in part results from the education system itself. That is, accountability or the system world of schools may dictate its own set of values which are inconsistent with those of teachers and principals. Sergiovanni (2000) draws a contrast between two competing forces in schools. The *systemworld* involves the policies, rules, and laws in order to regulate structure and the rationality of the education system. The *lifeworld* comprises school culture with the needs, values, desires, beliefs, and purposes that give meaning to education. The systemworld puts the system above the needs of people. However, the system with rigid goals and harsh sanctions may crush many goals, hopes, desires, and passions of students, teachers, and parents. Specifically, the clash between lifeworld and systemworld is the dilemma of the school principals. Thus, contradictory actions and statements—organizational hypocrisy—can be observed in educational settings due to the response to conflicting pressures in the external environment.

In terms of educational aspect, hypocrisy can be experienced in schools due to a shifting external policy environment during the implementation of policies and programs. Some of the studies explore how the World Bank's educational policies and practices in relation to the private provision of schooling are decoupled in various ways (Mundy & Menashy, 2014), and how contradictions between discourse and practice applies to teaching of civic education in Romania, and provide empirical background for organizational hypocrisy in schools (Rus, 2008). Even though hypocrisy exists when there is a conflict between organizational values and behaviors (Falk & Blaylock, 2012), it is necessary to examine under what conditions hypocrisy is more likely to happen and its consequences, since there is a lack of studies measuring hypocrisy in organizations (Phillippe & Koehler, 2005). Since there is a limited number of studies about educational organizations (Mundy & Menashy, 2014; Rus, 2008), and discussions about what organizational hypocrisy entails have been based mostly on logic—rather than empirical research—the main focus of this article is the development of an empirical scale to get an in-depth understanding of organizational hypocrisy. The developed instrument is also aimed to be tested for its psychometric properties and its utility compared to organizational trust, and to predict its relation with an organizational cynicism variable. Thus, this study includes a definition of organizational hypocrisy and its relations to organizational trust and cynicism concepts in school environments.

Organizational Hypocrisy

To comprehend the definition of organizational hypocrisy, it is necessary to understand the word *hypocrite* at first. The idea of hypocrisy has its roots in the theater. The word *hypocrites* corresponds to classical stage actors and the Greek term *hypokrisis* means playing a part by pretending to be something one is not (Runciman, 2008, p. 7). An individual hypocrite is described as a person who espouses higher standards than the real situation and pretends to use virtue, sacrifice, loyalty, commitment, idealism, and sympathetic concern for selfish ends (Fernando & Gross, 2006, p. 11). In fact, hypocrisy is failing to practice what one preaches, reflecting behavioral inconsistency, which stems from perceptions of disingenuousness (Hale & Pillow, 2015). Thus, hypocrisy can be defined in general as the inconsistency between talk (informal agreements or discussions in and between organizational groups), decisions (formal decisions or policies recorded within the organizational hierarchy and generally enacted through written documents like plans and budgets), and actions (what organizational actors do, as opposed to what they have formally agreed on or informally said they would do) (Fassin & Buelens, 2011; Femandez-Revuelta Perez & Robson, 1999).

Organizational hypocrisy is described as the voluntary behavior of an individual that does not meet proclaimed values and accepted expectations (Phillippe & Koehler, 2005); inconsistency between organization's espoused theory and theory-in-use (Argyris & Schon, 1974); espoused fundamental beliefs, values, and principles at odds with the action (Kouzes & Pozner, 1993); inconsistency in talk, decisions, and acts (Brunsson, 1989); and an organization espousing a single norm system, but living with a multi-norm system (Huzzard & Ostergren, 2002, cited in Fernando & Gross, 2006, p. 11).

Specifically, organizational hypocrisy refers to inconsistencies or disjuncture when (a) there are informal agreements as a consequence of talk; (b) decisions that result in formal discussions or policies which are usually enacted through written documents, including plans and budgets; and (c) actions where organizational actors do as opposed to what they formally agreed on or informally said that they would do (Femandez-Revuelta Perez & Robson, 1999, p. 389). Brunsson (1989) regards hypocrisy in organizations as a "fundamental type of behavior in the political organization: to talk in a way that satisfies one demand, to decide in a way that satisfies another, and to supply products in a way that satisfies a third" (p. 27). Indeed, organizations can employ inconsistencies within their talk, decisions, or products in order to win legitimacy and support from the environment. However, Brunsson (1989) postulates that inconsistencies in the outputs or products reflect inconsistencies in the environment. Hypocrisy is fundamentally about organizations, since they face competing logics of consequences and action endowed within their social agency (Meyer & Jepperson, 2000).

Organizations and managers generally are expected to "walk their talk," that is, try to practice what they preach. As Weick (1995) indicates, a "walk the talk" approach provides a sensible buffer against hypocrisy. Indeed, acting hypocritically in organizations closes the gap between their image and their daily practices by weakening their credibility (Christensen, Morsing, & Thyssen, 2010). Specifically, inconsistency between rhetoric and behavior constitutes hypocrisy in organizations that are subject to inconsistency in their external operational and normative demands (Lipson, 2006), since organizations in institutionalized environments reflect their organizational environments in their internal structure (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), where contradictory imperatives are incorporated into an organizations' inner structure. In this context, the following hypothesis that Organizational Hypocrisy has a multidimensional structure is proposed:

Hypothesis 1 Organizational Hypocrisy has a three-factor structure that is conceptually related to hypocrisy.

Hypocrisy in organizations often arises from uncoordinated responses to conflicting environmental pressures by loosely coupled or decoupled internal organizational elements (Weick, 1976), and inconsistent pressures of the organization's environment are "reflected in organizational structures, processes, and ideologies" (Brunsson, 1989). If there is a conflict between divergent groups on some interests, different types of ideologies may be generated in the organizations (Brunsson, 1989). Thus, such political organizations encourage mistrust and skepticism in their inner structure. Also, organizational hypocrisy could promote cynicism among members and observers of the organizations, and such kind of cynical attitude could result in widespread distrust toward organizations with a high degree of decoupling (Han & Koo, 2010). The gap between rhetoric and reality may also erode job security (Foote, 2001). Furthermore, if the degree of hypocrisy becomes excessive, it is believed to breed pathological consequences in organizations, such as a decline of trustworthiness and legitimacy (Han & Koo, 2010).

Organizational Hypocrisy and Trust in Organizational Life

It is necessary to highlight organizational hypocrisy in relation to organizational behaviors, especially organizational trust. In fact, trust is an important phenomenon in organizational life since it shapes relationship expectations in organizations; lays the basis of collective activity, mutual assistance, and joint accountability; and binds individuals to one another in organizations (Louis, 2007; Smylie, Mayrowetz, Murphy, & Louis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2004; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Furthermore, trust "contributes to great efficiency when people have confidence in other people's words and

deeds" (Tschannen-Moran, 2004, p. 16). Specifically, trust is described as "the expectancy that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). Likewise, Bromiley and Cummings (1995) contend that trust is "one person's belief that another (a) makes good-faith efforts to act in accordance with commitments, (b) was honest in the negotiations that preceded such commitments, and (c) will not be excessively opportunistic in taking advantage" (pp. 223–224). Thus, it is believed that people depend on others to behave in accordance with their expectations. So, people have great faith that their expectations will be met by other people (Simons, 2002). This implies that trust corresponds to commitments about future actions that will be kept. Therefore, inconsistency between words and deeds influences people and gives birth to mistrust in organizations.

When trust is taken into account in educational settings, it is noticed that "schools are fundamentally social institutions that depend daily on the quality of the interpersonal relations with which they are imbued" (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009). Thus, organizational trust is accepted as the social resource that makes up much of the school's capacity (Cosner, 2009). Without trust, admirable goals of the schools would not be experienced (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). People's ability to trust others eases coping with the pressures of the workplace (Marshall, 2000), provides emotional security, and enhances a sense of well-being (Kutsyuruba, Walker, & Noonan, 2016). Besides, trust as a lubricant enables communication in educational organizations and provides greater efficiency through confidence in people's words and deeds (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Therefore, it is obvious that consistency is an important factor for the growth of trust in schools (Handford & Leithwood, 2013).

Trust, which refers to the willingness of people to rely upon others; expectation; and confidence of the individuals about other people's statements and promises may resemble organizational hypocrisy, with regard to confidence in other people. Especially managers' word–and-deed alignment is so important for the maintenance of trust in organizations. It may be concluded that organizational trust has similarities with organizational hypocrisy, which is delineated as the discrepancy between talk, decisions, and actions. However, the two concepts are examined as different constructs, even emphasizing similar points. In fact, organizational hypocrisy is about whether there is an inconsistency between espoused fundamental beliefs, values, and principles, and the action that follows. Specifically, organizational hypocrisy is related to how the organization is honest in words and deeds. Howbeit, it is asserted that word-deed misalignment in organizations influence trust negatively (Simons, 2002). If the perception of speech is misaligned with actions, mistrust may be undermined through the norms of reciprocity in organizations (Fox, 1974). Thus, it can be concluded that there may be a relationship between trust and hypocrisy rather than being the same

construct. In short, a significant negative correlation can be accepted between Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Trust.

Hypothesis 2 Organizational Hypocrisy in schools is negatively related to Organizational Trust.

Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Cynicism

Organizational hypocrisy in relation to another organizational behavior, organizational cynicism, is stressed to comprehend the prediction possibility. Indeed, the hypothesis produced in this section identifies the possible outcome of organizational hypocrisy to test predictive validity of organizational hypocrisy.

Cynicism is an innate personality trait reflecting generally negative emotions and perceptions like frustration about human behavior, while organizational cynicism refers to negative attitudes toward the organization that is composed of *cognitive, affective*, and *behavioral* dimensions, which are (1) one's belief that the organization lacks integrity, (2) a negative affect toward the organization, and (3) tendencies toward disparaging and exhibiting critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and affects (Abraham, 2000; Andersson, 1996; Brandes, Dharwadkar, & Dean, 1999; Dean, Brandes, & Dharwadkar, 1998, p. 345). Specifically, organizational cynicism is multidimensional, corresponding to three components, beliefs, affect, and behavioral tendencies, which is characterized in attitude theory (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993) as being an aspect of people changing over time that is directed at their organization (Hart, 1997). Organizational cynicism involves the *belief* that the organization lacks integrity and betrays the lack of principles of fairness, honesty, and sincerity. Cynicism is stated as felt as well as thought, which is experienced through emotion, as well as through cognition. The *affective* dimension of organizational cynicism includes emotional reactions of people such as feeling contempt for and anger toward the organization, as well as experiencing distress, disgust, and shame about their organization, while the *behavioral* dimension of organizational cynicism involves tendencies toward negative behavior such as disparaging behavior and pessimistic predictions about the organization (Dean et al., 1998). Organizational hypocrisy consists of negative components such as inconsistency in talk, decision, and action; an organization's inefficiency to reflect the environment's norms and values, and failure to fulfill its goals and mission. Thus, both imply consistency, honesty, and sincerity in organizations. Consequently, organizational hypocrisy is the process of producing pathology (Lipson, 2006), including the beliefs that there is no sincerity, honesty, or openness in an organization, and affective and behavioral responses of individuals across discrepancies may promote organizational cynicism.

Cynicism is believed to be a form of self-defense in order to cope with unpleasant thoughts and feelings about actions taken by the organization and the management (Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997). Hence, that response may have profound implications for both the individual and the organization. Indeed, cynical attitudes of individuals could raise widespread distrust, with a high degree of hypocrisy in organizations. Beliefs against the organization based on perceptions or experiences of untruthful or unfair dealing, lack of uprightness, dishonesty, or insincerity may elevate organizational cynicism (Naus, Iterson, & Roe, 2007, p. 690). Specifically, when words diverge from actions and there is an inconsistency between word and deed, organizations may find themselves in hypocritical situations. To test the predictive validity of Organizational Hypocrisy, we hypothesized that the gap between statements and practices predicts individuals' perceptions of Organizational Cynicism.

Hypothesis 3 Organizational Hypocrisy in schools is positively related to Organizational Cynicism.

Significance of the Study

It is a common finding that organizational hypocrisy has negative results on organizations, such as leading to a decrease in workers' performance, continuance, trust, commitment, job satisfaction, and sense of justice toward the organization (Brunsson, 1989; Cha & Edmondson, 2006; Phillippe & Koehler, 2005). Therefore, organizational hypocrisy which contains unethical elements can give birth to various pathological organizational behaviors. However, limited theoretical and empirical studies examining the concept of organizational hypocrisy in educational setting makes it difficult to scrutinize which parameters organizational hypocrisy affect in terms of schools, what kind of results can be generated, and which premises are influenced. In this article, we contribute to educational administration and leadership literature by emphasizing conceptual underpinnings of organizational hypocrisy and providing a first scale which is tested to ensure validity and reliability in different school samples. The scale reveals inconsistencies in statements, decisions, and actions, and the incoherence between rhetoric and reality in educational setting that is generally experienced. Therefore, the rationale behind this study is based on the contribution of filling the gap in the conceptual measurement of organizational hypocrisy by providing a better understanding of how hypocrisy affects organizational trust and cynicism behaviors in schools. Furthermore, this study contributes to future research by playing a pioneering role in measuring this concept in schools, as well as paving the way for identifying how other organizational behavior variables that influence school governance, atmosphere, and school leadership are affected by

organizational hypocrisy. Besides, this study gives teachers and school leaders a priority to a thorough grounding about the organizational-hypocrisy concept that is related to governance and accountability. Indeed, this study helps school administrators to understand themselves and the school in a corporate aspect with providing opportunity to recognize whether the theory is handled in practice in institutional structure of schools, whether people in schools have taken consistent steps considering the promises and decisions, or whether schools are systems that only operate on paper. Specifically, teachers and school leaders may acknowledge how organizational hypocrisy takes place in schools as follows: whether decisions are being implemented in real life, whether there is an inconsistency in rhetoric and action, whether the school acts in keeping with the predetermined goals, whether teachers follow the objectives of the curriculum, to what degree the school reflects the values of the environment and how much the promises are kept in the school. In short, this study contributes to how the school fulfills its function by providing important insights to teachers and school leaders.

Methodology

Participants and Procedure

The overall data of this study was collected from 503 teachers working at public primary and secondary schools in Eskisehir, Turkey. Eskisehir is a province of Turkey and the 25th most populous city, having 615 educational institutions (MONE, 2017a). Eskisehir province depends on the ministry in educational issues and schools are not given the opportunity to make decisions. Indeed, authority for education is vested in the Ministry of National Education, the central body, not the local community. The ministry holds the power for all educational decisions. Therefore, schools in Eskisehir do not have the opportunity to prepare their own curricula and course materials, to decide on teacher and administrator employment, and to have an independent budgeting system.

During scale development, purposive sampling strategy in Stage 1, and cluster sampling strategy in Stages 2, 3, and 4, were used. Participants in Stages 2, 3, and 4 were recruited from 98 different schools in Eskisehir, which were located at different socioeconomic environments, lower, middle and upper. Randomly selected schools for data collection in each stage are presented in Table 1. After receiving permission from school districts, survey forms were distributed to teachers working at different public primary or secondary schools by our research team during the data-collection process. In addition, the data were collected at different time intervals. All participants are informed that their participation was on voluntary basis. We excluded 37 participants who failed to answer more than five items and mean substitution was used to replace the missing responses to five items.

Table 1. Overview of the Scale Development Study.

Stages	Steps of the scale development	Sample	Results
	Development of a preliminary pool of items, based on the definition and the literature review	Discussion of retrieved items with experts in the field of organizational behavior	Preliminary item pool (30 items) reduced to 17 items.
Stage 1	Item generation and content validity with experts.	Five experts in the field of organizational behavior.	Item pool consisting of 17 items. Content validity was achieved by all the experts, with 87% consent rate.
Stage 2	Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), dimensionality and reliability.	$N = 168$ teachers: working at public primary ($n = 107$) and secondary schools ($n = 61$) in Eskisehir, Turkey. 21 primary schools (low = 9, middle = 7, upper = 5).* 10 secondary schools (low = 4, middle = 4, upper = 2).* Seniority = 13.96. Average age = 37. 12, 73.8% female, 24.4% male, 1.8% missing.	Three-factor solution emerged;17 items remained. Three factors named Keeping Words Into Practice, Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and Inconsistency in Practices. Internal consistency of the extracted items was estimated by getting appropriate Cronbach's alpha values.
Stage 3	Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), convergent validity, dimensionality and reliability	$N = 163$ teachers working at public primary ($n = 90$) and secondary schools ($n = 73$) in Eskisehir, Turkey. 22 primary schools (low = 12, middle = 6, upper = 4).* 9 secondary schools (low = 3, middle = 4, upper = 2).* Seniority = 11.97. Average age = 35.01. 62% female, 27% Male, 11% missing.	Organizational Hypocrisy Scale (OHS) validated by CFA.
Stage 4	CFA, additional validity estimate, predictive validity, reliability.	$N = 172$ teachers working at public primary ($n = 114$) and secondary schools ($n = 58$) in Eskisehir, Turkey. 23 primary schools (low = 9, middle = 7, upper = 7).* 13 secondary schools (low = 5, middle = 5, upper = 3).* Seniority = 11.57. Average age = 35.06. 70.9% female, 23.3% male, 5.8% missing.	OHS further validated; the scale negatively associated with Organizational Trust concept; Organizational Hypocrisy predicts Organizational Cynicism.

Note. *Socioeconomic environment.

The present study aimed to develop a scale that covers four stages, as shown in Table 1. For item generation and content validation, five experts in the field of organizational behavior were selected in the first stage. To conduct exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and examine internal consistency in Stage 2, we analyzed the data from a sample ($n = 168$) of participants who completed the survey. To test factor structure, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was utilized with the data collected from a sample ($n = 163$) of participants in Stage 3. To verify convergent, additional, and predictive validity of the scale, data gathered from a sample ($n = 172$) of teachers was used in Stage 4. As is obvious, validity and reliability of the scale were tested in different stages with different samples. The reasons for doing this were to ensure whether the current structure of the scale is preserved in different samples and to test whether the constructed scale is valid and reliable in each time period (Bagozzi, 1994; Hinkin, 1995, 1998; Schriesheim, Powers, Scandura, Gardiner, & Lankau, 1993; Voegtlin, 2011).

Measures

The data of the study was gathered through a utilization of the following scales: the Organizational Trust Inventory, which reveals teachers' perceptions about organizational trust; the Organizational Cynicism Scale, which elicits their perceptions about cynicism in their organizations; and a demographic questionnaire that describes their characteristics such as age, sex, experiences, and schools.

Organizational Trust Inventory
Organizational Trust Perception was determined through a 12-item, short-form survey developed by Bromiley and Cummings (1996). The response format of the scale is a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) through 7 (*strongly agree*). Items assessed organizations with respect to the dimensions such as *keeps commitments* (3 items), *negotiates honestly* (6 items), and *avoids taking excessive advantage* (3 items). The first dimension implies an individual that behaves to fulfill the commitments, while the second indicates individual's statements and behavior prior to making commitments consistent with the individual's real desires and facts. The third dimension implies that the individual takes short-term advantage of unforeseen opportunities for personal gain at the expense of the others. In order to reduce response bias, five items were worded in negative and reverse scored. Two of the Organizational Trust Scale dimensions have only three items each, which may cause a high standard error of measurement. However, a lower reliability estimate will provide a higher standard error of measurement (Harvill, 1991). More specifically, standard error of measurement and test reliability are inversely related. When examining the scale for internal

consistency, the Cronbach alpha coefficients for the dimensions were as follows: *keeps commitments* (α = .86), *negotiates honestly* (α = .74), and *avoids taking excessive advantage* (α = .77), which in turn provides a smaller standard error of measurement. In addition, it is clear that the Cronbach alpha coefficient is not interpreted as a measure of the test uni-dimensionality or an index of the homogeneity of a measurement instrument (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Thus, whether items on the Organizational Trust Scale were sufficient and discriminating well was checked by item-total correlation. Specifically, in order to examine the responses of participants to test items and assess the quality of the items, item-total correlation was computed. This correlation was performed to check if any item in the set of the test is inconsistent with the averaged behavior of the others. This is the relationship that an item-total correlation provides to evaluate how well the items function in a scale. A small item-correlation provides evidence that the item is not measuring the same construct measured by the other items. In the Organizational Trust Scale, item correlations were computed between values .20 and .40. The correlation values were more than .20 or .30, which indicates that the corresponding items in the scale correlate well with the overall scale (Everitt, 2002; Field, 2013). The correlation values showed that items on the Organizational Trust Scale discriminate well, that the three items on a rating scale is sufficient, and that there is no need for items to be dropped.

Organizational Cynicism Scale

In order to determine teachers' organizational cynicism perceptions, the Organizational Cynicism Scale developed by Brandes et al. (1999) was used. The scale includes 13 items with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale assessed three dimensions of Organizational Cynicism: *affective* (5 items), *cognitive* (3 items) and *behavioral* (5 items). *Affective* dimension of Organizational Cynicism implies that teachers have negative attitudes like fear, anger, disgust, or shame toward their schools. *Cognitive* dimension implies teachers' beliefs that their schools are deprived of honesty, openness, and sincerity, which are the characteristics that generate integrity in organizations. *Behavioral* dimension indicates that teachers show their negative emotions and beliefs in their acts. Higher scores on these factors indicate teachers' negative affective, cognitive, and behavioral attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward their schools. The number of items in one dimension of the scale may be thought of as resulting in a high standard error of measurement. The reliability coefficient has an effect on the magnitude of the standard error of measurement, which means that the more reliable the test is, the smaller standard error of measurement the test has. If the reliability coefficients of the scale were computed, the Cronbach alpha values for all dimensions were as follows: *affective cynicism* (α = .94), *cognitive cynicism* (α = .62) and *behavioral cynicism* (α = .90). Reliability estimates provided a smaller standard error of measurement for the

Organizational Cynicism Scale, except the *cognitive cynicism* dimension. However, it is obvious that increasing the number of items of this dimension may increase reliability and in turn decrease the estimate of the amount of error. In order to evaluate how well the items function in the Organizational Cynicism Scale, item-total correlation was computed. By means of item-total correlation, correlation between the question score and the overall assessment score was compared. Whether or not responses to a given test should be included in the set being averaged was decided and item correlations for the Organizational Cynicism Scale were computed between values .20 and .97. Correlation values indicated that items on the Organizational Cynicism Scale discriminate well and that three items on a rating scale is sufficient (Everitt, 2002; Field, 2013).

Construct Definition

Our initial conceptualization of Organizational Hypocrisy was based on the following: (1) a comprehensive view of the organizational hypocrisy literature considering the theoretical background, (2) consultation with an expert in concept mapping in order to organize the related literature, and (3) feedback from organizational-behavior experts to operationalize the construct and refine the definition. Our efforts resulted in the following definition of organizational hypocrisy in educational organizations.

Grounded in the theoretical literature, hypocrisy is asserted as a complex, multifaceted concept studied empirically by psychologists and discussed logically by philosophers (Alicke, Gordon, & Rose, 2013; Crisp & Cowton, 1994; McKinnon, 1991; Szabados & Soifer, 1999, 2004). Even though the consistency between attitudes and behaviors is generally stated as a component of hypocrisy, there are some other aspects that need to be considered. Many of the components acknowledged to be necessary for hypocrisy are specified as intent to deceive others, weakness of will, self-deception, and degree of discrepancy (Alicke et al., 2013). Indeed, some philosophers conjecture that hypocrisy and intentionally deceiving others are inextricably linked (Szabados & Soifer, 1999). Weakness of will and intent to deceive self and others pertain to the way hypothetical behavior was defined and construed (Alicke et al., 2013). With regard to intent for deception, people may fail to practice what they preach and their behavior may be viewed as hypocritical (Crisp & Cowton, 1994). Besides, people behaving consistently with their values sometimes fail due to a lack of control or weakness of will, which in turn underlies hypocrisy (Alicke et al., 2013). People who knowingly contradict their proclamations and values, but act in a way to bring their behavior more in line with their attitudes, support self-deception, which is another essential component of hypocrisy (Alicke et al., 2013). Finally, the degree of discrepancy between expressed attitudes and contradictory behaviors also influences the frequency with which hypocrisy is ascribed (Alicke et al., 2013).

On the other hand, organizational hypocrisy could be delineated as a negative organizational behavior that coincides with (1) inconsistency in rhetoric and the action, (2) inefficiency to reflect the environment's norms and values with a failure to fulfill the organization's goals and mission, and (3) deceiving the stakeholders. This organizational behavior involves interaction among micro-level systems or proximal factors (e.g., school administrators, teachers and the other staff, students and their parents, the stakeholders, and so forth) and macro-level system or distal factors (e.g., school district administrators, education policymakers, ministry of national education, and so forth). We drew the outline of the construct as it reveals the perceptions of the participants regarding their organizations. Thus, we also defined the following three dimensions of Organizational Hypocrisy: (1) Keeping Words Into Practice, (2) Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and (3) Inconsistency in Practices. We defined Keeping words Into Practice as the coherence between talk, decisions, and actions in a school organization. Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment dimension corresponds to how schools achieve their mission and goals with reflecting values of the environment. We defined Inconsistency in Practices as the school principals' act of deceiving stakeholders (teachers and educational personnel, students and their parents). That misleading behavior can be exemplified in the failure of school principals in setting realistic goals, saying one thing and doing something else, or expressing to solve a problem in the school, but not actually performing it.

Scale Construction

In order to gain valid and reliable data, rigorous measurement development was conducted in this section. Frequently cited works in the measurement-development field (Bagozzi, 1994; Hinkin, 1995, 1998; Schriesheim et al., 1993; Voegtlin, 2011) were followed in validating Organizational Hypocrisy. The steps followed shown in Table 1 are: (1) a rigorous item generation as a result of the assessment of the items by experts in the field of organizational behavior, (2) verification of content validity in order to comprehend to what extent items reflect Organizational Hypocrisy, (3) an internal consistency assessment of the construct, (4) a test of convergent validity, (5) a test of additional validity of the scale to understand the relationship between Organizational Hypocrisy and other conceptualizations (i.e., Organizational Trust), and (6) a test of the predictive validity of Organizational Hypocrisy with examining the relationship between Organizational Cynicism concept.

Item Generation and Content Validation
Stage 1. Based on the definition of organizational hypocrisy and the literature review, an initial pool of 30 items was generated by the research team. The items were formulated in a way so that participant teachers could rate

their schools. Then, to ensure the content, clarity, and parsimony of each of the 30 items, we sought additional advice from organizational behavior-experts. Indeed, the initial item pool was presented to five experts in the field of organizational behavior to estimate the content validity of the construct.[1] They were asked to address the adequacy of the items, how well the items reflect organizational hypocrisy, and how well overall items cover the domain of that organizational behavior. After discussing the items, results were validated with the experts and items that did not fit the construct were deleted, so the initial pool of items was reduced and the items were partly reformulated to 21 items. Then, the research team discussed the items one by one based on the dimensions of hypocrisy, and the items that did not match with the dimensions were deleted. At the end of this evaluation, a pool of 17 items remained. The item pool was then operationalized as a measurement instrument, incorporating a 5-point Likert scale response format ranging from (1) *I totally disagree* to (5) *I totally agree.*

Exploratory Factor Analysis and Internal Consistency
Stage 2. In this step, initial psychometric properties of the Organizational Hypocrisy Scale (OHS), including underlying factor structure, were determined by an empirical validation of the scale conducted through exploratory approach. Additionally, internal consistency of the extracted items was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha.

In Stage 2, the 17-item scale obtained from Stage 1 was applied to the participants. Participants were 168 teachers working at 21 public primary ($n = 107$) and 13 secondary schools ($n = 61$) in Eskisehir selected via a clustered sampling strategy. Of 21 primary schools, nine were located in low-, seven in middle-, and five were in upper-socioeconomic environments. Of 13 secondary schools, four were located in low-, four were in middle-, and two were in upper-socioeconomic environments. Of the participants, 73.8% ($n = 124$) were women and 24.4% ($n = 41$) were men (1.8% of the participants did not report their sex). On average, the participant teachers were 37.12 years old (range = 24–58, $SD = 7.17$). Of the participants who completed the demographic items, the average seniority of the teachers was 13.96 years (see Table 1).

The Kaiser-Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (.91) and significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p < .001$) indicated that the sample is appropriate for EFA. Direct oblimin rotation was conducted to estimate the factors because factors were found to be correlated, and substantial theoretical basis for construct dimensions in social sciences were accepted to be correlated (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Straban, 1999). Since oblique rotation provides a much more accurate and realistic representation of how constructs are likely to be related to one another, direct oblimin rotation was chosen. To decide how many factors should be extracted, scree plot and eigenvalue cutoff point were utilized. The results showed three factors which

met the eigenvalue criteria (i.e., eigenvalue > 1.0; Kaiser, 1958). An examination of the scree plot also suggested a three-factor solution since slope of the lines changed dramatically (Field, 2013). Items were retained if they had .40 or higher factor loading on one factor, and if the cross loadings were less than .20 (Field, 2013; Stevens, 2002).

Factor 1 consisted of five items, accounting for 44.16% of the variance, and was named Keeping Words Into Practice, which is about the cohesion between promises and acts. This factor was internally consistent (α = .86). The results for the items retrieved from EFA are reported in Table 2. Factor 2 involved seven items and accounted for 8.81% of the variance. We named this factor Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, because all items reflected mission and goals of the school organizations with values of the environment. This factor was internally consistent (α = .84). The Pearson product moment correlation between Factor 1 and Factor 2 was .71 ($p < .01$). Factor 3 consisted of five items, accounting for 6.47% of the variance, and was named Inconsistency in Practices, since all items infer inconsistencies between statements and actions. This factor was found to be internally consistent (α = .79). The Pearson product moment correlation between Factor 1 and Factor 3 was .66, while the correlation between Factor 2 and Factor 3 was .58 ($< .01$). Since the factors are measuring the same concept, it is expected of them to correlate with each other, but it is clear that the factors were not highly correlated and the multicollinearity assumption was not violated, since correlations between factors were not above .80 or .90 (Field, 2013).

Convergent Validity and Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Stage 3. One of the important aspects of construct validation is to test the convergent validity (Bagozzi, 1994; Hinkin, 1995). Convergent validity corresponds to the agreement reached by multiple measurements of the same concept (Bagozzi, 1994). The research team could not measure convergent validity directly by validating Organizational Hypocrisy with other existing instruments due to the limited number of studies performed in the field. Thus, dimensionality of the construct was tested using CFA to test the factor structure and analyze convergent validity.

The questionnaire involving 17 items was distributed to 163 teachers working at 22 public primary (n = 90) and nine secondary schools (n = 73) in Eskisehir selected via clustered sampling strategy. Of 22 primary schools, 12 were located in low-, six in middle-, and four in upper-socioeconomic environments. Of nine secondary schools, three were located in low-, four in middle-, and two in upper-socioeconomic environments. The majority of the participant teachers were female (62%), 27% of the participants were male, and 11% of the participants did not report their gender. On average, the participants were 35.01 years old (range = 23–59, SD = 7.94). The mean number of years that they served as a teacher was 11.97 years.

Table 2. Items and item loadings from EFA and CFA

OHS items	Stage 2: EFA			Stage 3: CFA			Stage 4: CFA		
	n=168			n=163			n=172		
2 The school administration embodies taken decisions by himself/herself.	.85			.84			.76		
1 The school principal keeps his/her promises.	.83			.85			.86		
7 The school administration does things that are expressed before.	.78			.77			.79		
3 School members act in accordance with the school's values.	.74			.56			.51		
17 There is no difference between the ideas and practices of school principal.	.62			.73			.62		
5 Our school reflects the environment's norms.		.80			.76			.71	
12 The school fulfils its mission within its strategic plan.		.79			.73			.67	
11 Teachers in the school implement the objectives of the curriculum.		.74			.46			.57	
6 The school serves depending on school purpose.		.68			.79			.76	
8 Our school reflects values of its surrounding.		.65			.65			.67	
16 The needs of students in our school are met.		.63			.65			.60	
14 School management establishes policy/practices in the line with the determined objectives.		.62			.82			.82	
9 Although school management say that they will solve problems in the school, they don't.			.80			.78			.80
4 The school principal sets unrealistic goals.			.79			.47			.35
15 The school principal acts contrary to the norms created by himself/herself.			.77			.66			.78
13 Even if school administration states something to do; do something else.			.74			.81			.77
10 Any dispute in the school immediately is covered up.			.46			.37			.32
Dimensions*	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3
Cronbach's alpha for each dimension	.86	.84	.79	.82	.86	.72	.86	.87	.74
χ2				266.36			226.88		
df				116			116		
χ2/df				2.29			1.95		
NNFI(TLI)				.95			.96		
CFI				.95			.97		
SRMR				.071			.057		
RMSEA				.089			.075		

Note. *F1 corresponds to "keeping words into practice" dimension, F2 corresponds to "compliance between internal structure and the environment" dimension, and F3 corresponds to "inconsistency in practices" dimension.

Similar to the preliminary scale implementation, we applied the 17-item questionnaire to participant teachers using a 5-point Likert-type response format. Indeed, the scale consisted of three dimensions: Keeping Words Into Practice, Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and Inconsistency in Practices. Calculated coefficient alphas for Keeping Words Into Practice (five items), Compliance Between Internal structure and the environment (seven items), and Inconsistency in Practices (five items) dimensions were .82, .86, and .72, respectively.

The research team conducted CFA using maximum-likelihood estimation procedure to examine the fit of the three-factor model found in Stage 2. The fit indexes were evaluated in aggregate to draw conclusions about adequacy of fit. The chi-square statistic was selected in order to estimate the relative and absolute goodness of fit of the hypothesized model. However, the chi-square test result ($\Delta\chi^2 = 266.36$, $p = .000$) indicated that the predicted model is not congruent with the observed data. A poor fit based on a small sample size may result in a nonsignificant chi-square. In order to make it less dependent on sample size, normed chi-square was computed as chi-square fit index ($\Delta\chi^2 = 266.36$) divided by the degrees of freedom ($\Delta df = 116$) and found as 2.29, which is between the values of 2 and 5. Therefore, normed chi-square indicated an acceptable fit between the hypothetical model and the sample data (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001). To address the limitations of the chi-square test, goodness-of-fit indices as adjuncts to the chi-square statistic are used to assess the model (Martens, 2005). Tuckey Lewis Index (TLI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) were used, since these indices are less affected by model misspecification and less sensitive to sample size than is the chi-square statistic (Hu & Bentler, 1998, 1999). The results showed good fit statistics (see Table 2), with TLI = .95, CFI = .95; SRMR = .07, and RMSEA = .089. Values of relative-fit indices, including TLI and CFI, that are greater than or equal to .95 indicate a good fit for the data (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003). Moreover, values of SRMR less than .05 indicate a good model fit, while values less than .08 show a reasonable model fit. With regard to RMSEA, values less than .05 are considered to indicate a perfect fit, values between .05 and .10 show an acceptable fit, and values greater than .10 indicate a poor fit (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996).

Across the aforementioned indices, the established three-factor solution was found to be a good fit for the data, and the chi-square statistic divided by degrees of freedom indicated that the three-factor model was a good fit for the data. Besides, various fit indices (i.e., TLI, IFI, and CFI) also showed a good fit, as did SRMR and RMSEA. Thus, it can be concluded that the proposed hypothesis was validated that Organizational Hypocrisy has a three-factor structure (Hypothesis 1).

Additional Validity Estimate and Predictive Validity

Stage 4. The last two hypotheses were tested in the final step by means of additional validity and predictive validity estimates. The association between the two similar measures of Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Trust were compared at first.

The 17-item questionnaire was applied to 172 participant teachers working at 23 public primary ($n = 114$) and 13 secondary schools ($n =58$) in Eskisehir selected via cluster sampling. Of 23 primary schools, nine were located in low-, seven in middle-, and seven in upper-socioeconomic environments. Of 13 secondary schools, five were located in low-, five in middle-, and three in upper-socioeconomic environments. Among these teachers, 23.3% were male, the majority of them (70.9%) were female, and 5.8% of the participants did not report their gender. On average, the participants were 35.06 years old (range = 23–60, SD = 7.65). Also, the average seniority of the teachers was found to be 11.57 years.

Before performing additional validity estimates, CFA was conducted to test dimensionality of the organizational-hypocrisy construct using the maximum-likelihood estimation procedure. For thresholds in estimating the goodness of fit of the structural equation model, frequently cited and recommended standards were considered (Hu & Bentler, 1998, 1999; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001; MacCallum et al., 1996; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). The chi-square statistic was chosen to estimate the relative and absolute goodness of fit of the hypothesized model. Nonetheless, the chi-square test result ($\Delta\chi^2$ = 235.16, p = .000) showed that the predicted model is not congruent with the observed data. Therefore, normed chi-square was computed as chi-square fit index ($\Delta\chi^2$ = 235.16) divided by the degrees of freedom (Δdf = 116) and found to be 1.95, which was less than 2.5, and then the model was considered a good fit for the data (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Moreover, several relative-fit indices were computed (TLI = .96, CFI = .97; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .075) that demonstrated a good model fit for the three-factor solution of the OHS. In addition, the results of the final scale reported high internal consistency for each dimension: Keeping Words Into Practice (α = .86), Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment (α = .87), and Inconsistency in Practices (α = .74).

Following CFA and reliability analysis, additional validity estimates for the scale were tested by comparing Organizational Hypocrisy to the Organizational Trust construct using the correlation between the two concepts. Organizational Trust was measured using the 12-item survey developed by Bromiley and Cummings (1996). CFA results for the Organizational Trust Scale indicated that it provides the three-factor solution with a good fit (χ^2/df = 2.24; TLI = .89, CFI = .92, SRMR = .08, RMSEA = .08).

Pearson product moment correlations examination of the associations between the two scales showed that there were negative correlations between dimensions of

Table 3. Correlations among Organizational Hypocrisy, Organizational Trust, and Organizational Cynicism.

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 OHS- Keeping Words Into Practice	1	.659*	.383*	−.313*	−.454*	−.266*	.319*	.417*	.203*
2 OHS- Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment		1	.433*	−.483*	−.608*	−.408*	.477*	.528*	.268*
3 OHS- Inconsistency in Practices			1	−.293*	−.426*	−.631*	.524*	.700*	.412*
4 Organizational Trust–*Keeps commitments*				1	.418*	.237*	−.317*	−.299*	−.191*
5 Organizational Trust–*Negotiates honestly*					1	.456*	−.460*	−.466*	−.186*
6 Organizational Trust–*Avoids taking excessive advantage*						1	−.637*	−.746*	−.531*
7 Organizational Cynicism-*Affective*							1	.661*	.523*
8 Organizational Cynicism-*Cognitive*								1	535*
9 Organizational Cynicism-*Behavioral*									1

Note. *$p < .01$, two tailed, $n = 172$.

Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Trust (Hypothesis 2), as shown in Table 3.

There were negative and moderate correlations between the Keeping Words Into Practice aspect of hypocrisy and *keeps commitments* ($r = −.313$), *negotiates honestly* ($r = −.454$), and *avoids taking excessive advantage* ($r = −.266$) dimensions of Organizational Trust. The Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment dimension of Organizational Hypocrisy was negatively and significantly related to *keeps commitments* ($r = −.483$), *negotiates honestly* ($r = −.608$), and *avoids taking excessive advantage* ($r = −.408$) aspects of Organizational Trust. There were negative and moderate-to-high correlations between Inconsistency in Practices aspect of hypocrisy and *keeps commitments* ($r = −.293$), *negotiates honestly* ($r = −.426$), and *avoids t aking excessive advantage* ($r = −.631$) dimensions of Organizational Trust.

Finally, the predictive validity of Organizational Hypocrisy was addressed in the study. Predictive validity corresponds to how well the construct of interest can predict other concepts from which a relationship can be theoretically drawn (Bagozzi, 1994). The relationship between Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Cynicism was examined (Hypothesis 3). To measure Organizational Cynicism, the 13-item Organizational Cynicism Scale developed by Brandes et al. (1999) was used. CFA results for the scale indicated that the Organizational Cynicism Scale provides a three-factor solution with a good fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.62$, TLI = .96, CFI = .97; SRMR = .06; RMSEA = .097).

The proposed Hypothesis 3 was tested with structural equation modelling. Before structuring the model, the correlation between Organizational Hypocrisy and Organizational Cynicism was examined through Pearson product moment correlation. There were small-to-moderate correlations between the Keeping Words Into Practice aspect of hypocrisy and *affective* ($r = .319$),

cognitive (r = .417), and *behavioral cynicism* (r = 203). Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment dimension of Organizational Hypocrisy was significantly related to *affective* (r = .477), *cognitive* (r = .528), and *behavioral cynicism* (r = 268). There were moderate-to-high correlations between Inconsistency in Practices aspect of hypocrisy and *affective* (r = .524), *cognitive* (r = .700), and *behavioral cynicism* (r = 412). In addition, the results of structural equation modelling indicated acceptable statistics for the model (χ^2/df = 5.76, TLI = .85, CFI = .96; SRMR = .05; RMSEA = .08). The hypothesized relationship between the two constructs was also found to be significant (r = .81; p < .05). Even the chi-square statistic (χ^2 = 34.56) divided by the degrees of freedom (df = 6) came out rather high; but still one could argue that the model could be accepted as an approximate fit and the model has an acceptable RMSEA value (Bollen, 2014; Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin, & Summers, 1977). Due to the known sensitivity of this statistic to sample size, it is stated that the use of the χ^2 statistic index provides little guidance in determining the extent to which the model does not fit. Thus, it is believed that the other indices' values could be taken to make acceptable and appropriate decisions (Bagozzi & Yi, 1990; Byrne, 2010; Widaman, 1985). Therefore, the results showed that Organizational Hypocrisy is positively related to Organizational Cynicism in schools (Hypothesis 3).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, researchers developed a scale of Organizational Hypocrisy to capture the phenomenon empirically. The scale was validated by different studies. The results showed a Scale of Organizational Hypocrisy that has good psychometric properties, correlates with theoretically related constructs such as organizational trust, and predicts the proposed theoretical hypothesis.

More specifically, organizational hypocrisy literature was reviewed and preliminary pool of items was developed in the first step of the study. Content validity was achieved via feedback from organizational-behavior experts. In the second stage, tests of dimensionality and reliability of the scale were performed to test the consistency of the scale. EFA results indicated that OHS has a three-factor solution with high reliability values and correlations.

In the third stage, CFA and reliability results for the Hypothesis 1 showed that Organizational Hypocrisy has a multidimensional factor structure that is conceptually related to hypocrisy. Indeed, convergent validity of the scale was achieved and multiple measurements of the same concept provided the same results. Thus, three dimensions of Organizational Hypocrisy were defined: (*i*) Keeping Words Into Practice, (*ii*) Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and (*iii*) Inconsistency in Practices.

In the final step, further validity estimates were performed to understand to what extent Organizational Hypocrisy relates to other conceptualizations

(i.e., Organizational Trust). Hypothesis 2 showed that Organizational Hypocrisy is negatively related to Organizational Trust. As Organizational Hypocrisy increases in an organization, Organizational Trust between school members decreases. In fact, discrepancies between talk, decisions, and acts—not keeping the words into practice—decrease trust between school members. This is mostly due to the fact that inconsistency in actions influences the behavior of the organization members, such as their intention to believe others. Indeed, organizational trust is the conviction of people to rely upon others who act in accordance with their statements and promises, are honest in negotiations, and are not excessively opportunistic in taking advantages (Bromiley & Cummings, 1995; Smylie et al., 2007). Therefore, inconsistency and insincerity reflected in the organization decrease belief toward individuals, especially toward the words and deeds of the leader (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Hypothesis 3, which tested the predictive validity of Organizational Hypocrisy with the Organizational Cynicism concept, showed that Organizational Hypocrisy is significantly related to Organizational Cynicism in the final stage. This means that when actions diverge from words, individuals exhibit negative attitudes toward their organization. Actually, organizational cynicism stems from the belief that the organization lacks moral integrity, acting with double standards (Dean et al., 1998). Therefore, as is also drawn from the results of the hypothesis, inconsistency and disconnection between words and deeds give birth to negative attitudes toward the organization and the organization might not operate effectively (Charette, 2006; Naus et al., 2007).

When organizations try to satisfy a myriad of demands from various institutional actors, they are faced with numerous conflicting ideals and demands that extend the gap between organizational realities and idealized corporate self-descriptions. Intensified demands, conflicting ideals, and pressure from the environment in turn are believed to lead to cynicism in organizations (Christensen, Morsing, & Thyssen, 2010). Likewise, if organization members perceive that their leaders do not fulfill expectations of the members on justice, they may believe that their leaders do not walk the talk (Cha & Edmondson, 2006; Simons, 2002). Specifically, if leaders disregard the principal of fair treatment and demonstrate contradictory behaviors to what they advocate, unfavorable subordinate reactions might appear in the face of hypocrisy (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Duffy, Ganster, Shaw, Johnson, & Pagon, 2006; Greenbaum, Bardes Mawritz, & Piccolo, 2012).

Since educational organizations are loosely coupled systems (Weick, 1976), there may be loosely coupled relationship between legitimate statements, ideas, and words with real activities in schools. Due to the gap between formal structures shaped by irreconcilable pressures and the uncertainties raised by the external environment, organizational hypocrisy can be observed in schools. Thus, there may be inconsistency between talk, decisions, and

actions in educational organizations. Specifically, school administrators and teachers in schools may employ inconsistencies within their talk and decisions in order to gain legitimacy and support from the environment.

Three dimensions of Organizational Hypocrisy in schools for this scale-development study are as follows: (1) Keeping Words Into Practice, (2) Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment, and (3) Inconsistency in Practices. When these concepts are scrutinized in schools, Keeping Words Into Practice provides the coherence between talk, decision, and actions in school organizations. Besides, Compliance Between Internal Structure and the Environment corresponds to how schools achieve their mission and goals while with reflecting values of the environment. Inconsistency in Practices gives information about the school principals' act of deceiving stakeholders, teachers and school personnel, students, and their parents.

It is clear that the contradictions between organizational pressures and the internal reality of the environmental management pose problems of hypocrisy in the school context of Turkey. The reason for this situation may be due to the education system itself, as Sergiovanni (2000) stated. Desires, hopes, and passions of students, teachers, and parents may not match up with rigid goals of the education system. Specifically, Turkey's education system is more highly centralized than most other middle-income countries (Gershberg, 2005). The Republic of Turkey is made up of 81 provinces that spread out across seven regions. The education system in Turkey is based on a highly centralized system comprising these seven regions. Accordingly, all education policies are steered by the national government. The Ministry of National Education sets educational policies and oversees the administration at all stages. The head of the ministry appoints Directorates of National Education which work under the direction of provincial governors. However, schools and local actors have little autonomy and limited capacity to respond individuals' needs. Thus, schools do not set policies; they just implement the tasks that the ministry offers (Kamal, 2017; OECD, 2013). The Ministry of National Education is also responsible for drawing up curricula; preparing the content of course materials; coordinating, designing, and building schools; developing educational materials, and so on. The ministry holds the power of teacher and administrator employment. Moreover, school budgeting is set up by the ministry, considering the information given by the schools to the ministry's online information system (Kamal, 2017; MONE, 2017b; Nuffic, 2015). Local authorities and schools cannot make up their own policies and it is very difficult to have effective accountability due to the bulky structure of the education system. Any staff budget and other expenditure decisions cannot be taken by the school since there is no budgeting system peculiar to schools and the economic expenditure of the schools is met by the budget allocated to them by the ministry. Thus, the accountability challenge emerges in finding ways to perform the demands of

the system while advancing the lifeworld of the schools (Sergiovanni, 2000). As a result, a centralized education system with little autonomy may lead to inconsistencies between talk and actions in educational settings.

In parallel with Turkey, some other middle-income countries such as Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, China, Indonesia, India, and Pakistan also experience inconsistencies in educational contexts. For example, the South Caucasus region, including the countries Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, experiences discrepancies in its educational settings. In spite of many advances and governance reforms they implemented in order to improve the efficiency and quality of the education system, the reforms have not produced expected results in these countries due to inconsistencies between declared policies and implemented strategies (UNESCO, 2016). In addition, there is a gap between educational reform ideas in China at the macro level and the school realities at the micro level during the implementation process of new curriculum reform (Yan & He, 2012; Zheng, 2013). It is also asserted that there is an inconsistency and incoherence between theoretical underpinnings of educational programs and the practice in schools and classrooms because of newly reconfigured relationships between the central government and local governments (He, 2011). Likewise, the rhetoric of decentralization processes in education has not matched the reality in Indonesia. Specifically, teachers have accepted a set of values and displayed behaviors that clash with the philosophical underpinnings of decentralization in Indonesia (Bjork, 2003; Mukundan & Bray, 2004). Similarly, educational policies and plans fail to be implemented and to achieve the desired objectives in Pakistan because of experienced inconsistencies such as unclear or ambitious policy goals and discrepancies in educational statistics. In fact, teacher education programs carried out by the government were asserted not to correspond with the stated goals of educational policies (Ali, 2006). Thus, it can be concluded that when schools are expected to do what they cannot actually do given their resources, what they preach in existing documents, policies, or actions and what they actually deliver to families or students may vary in reality. Education systems may not keep the predetermined policies in practice and not reflect the environment's norms and values, so they fail to fulfill schools' goals and mission.

Limitations

Although data obtained in this study provide initial support for the OHS, several limitations exist, similar to other studies. The first potential limitation may be that the language and cultural validity of the scale were not performed in any country other than Turkey, since the study was just focused on Turkey. We were also limited in our analyses in such a way that we were unable to obtain perceptions of school staff other than the teachers. To further validate the scale, a sample of all school members working in

different schools in different countries should be examined. Additionally, the convergent validity of the OHS was not performed directly, since there was a limited number of scales developed to measure organizational hypocrisy. A further limitation of the study could be that we did not request information on the experience of the teachers in the school in which they currently work, which might be associated with their perceptions of organizational hypocrisy. We obtained information about their experience as a teacher, so we assumed that all the participating teachers knew their schools well and had an idea about their organization.

Implications and Future Research Directions

An instrument that measures teachers' perceptions regarding organizational hypocrisy, with adequate psychometric support, provides an efficient method of assessment of hypocrisy in organizations. The OHS can be used to measure perceptions of members in an organization in relation to hypocrisy. The organizational-hypocrisy concept is addressed for nonprofit organizations (Larsson, 2013), global organizations like United Nations (Lipson, 2006), enterprises stating certain standards (Boiral, 2007, 2012; Han & Koo, 2010) and also religious institutions (Fernando & Gross, 2006). However, studies addressing hypocrisy in loosely structured systems (Weick, 1976) such as educational organizations with scale developments are very limited. Thus, items developed in the OHS can be adapted to health-care organizations, civil-society organizations, or other similar enterprises to assess whether these organizations really keep their words into practice and achieve their mission and goals while reflecting values of the environment.

In the face of tremendous change in the institutional environment of schools, teachers and school leaders are expected to deal with policy discourses that create tensions within schools (Spillane, Parise, & Sherer, 2011). The demands placed on schools by the external stakeholders may be more diverse; thus, school leaders have to make sense of, notice, and respond to diverse stakeholders. They also need to work at knitting together the environmental expectations to create an "organizational self" in the school that is coherent, integrated, and self-consistent rather than being hypocritical (Kraatz, 2009; Spillane & Kenney, 2012). Addressing educational objectives, such as setting direction for the school and developing short- and long-term goals to realize them, are critical for school leaders. Therefore, school leaders need to seek to achieve results that in their view are consistent with government objectives. School leaders should also try to make efforts such as persuading teachers and compelling their cooperation with external policy; asserting their in-group identity as teachers; brokering information and framing policy that would appeal to teachers' interests, values, goals, and norms; initiating weekly staff meetings; and creating a more coherent instructional program in order to create conditions that hinder organizational

hypocrisy (Spillane & Kenney, 2012). Besides, school leaders may work to align classroom practice with the content covered in government standards, design organizational routines to standardize instructional programs, monitor teacher and student performance, and make classroom practice more transparent as regards performing accountability in schools. At the same time, school leaders and teachers should cooperate across educational-policy pressures for the appearance of self-consistency, coherence, and reliability in schools, rather than organizational hypocrisy (Spillane & Kenney, 2012). In addition, policy-makers at the Ministry of Education could give more autonomy to school administrations and leaders in decision making and provide more resources to diminish legal and financial obstacles of schools in order to lessen hypocrisy in schools. Policymakers should also set more rational and reachable goals for all schools to achieve, rather than allowing schools to say one thing and do something else.

Future research can use OHS to advance knowledge in the field of organization science. In relation to this, future research could investigate the relationship between organizational hypocrisy and other organizational behaviors. By testing the antecedents and outcomes of organizational hypocrisy, our understanding of the phenomenon of organizational hypocrisy could be also extended. Subsequently, future investigations should examine organizational hypocrisy in terms of subordinates' organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intention, organizational citizenship behaviors, and organizational justice perceptions. Along these lines, how organizational hypocrisy influences school members' perceptions about school climate and culture can be investigated to gain a deeper understanding of organizational hypocrisy in educational settings. Using qualitative methods with specific instances, such as investigating the relationship between organizational conflict and organizational values, or resistance to change, would also provide details about the patterns of word-deed misalignment.

Note

1. One of the experts consulted to determine content validity of organizational hypocrisy was Nils Brunsson, a scholar with considerable work on the topic.

References

Abraham, R. (2000). Organizational cynicism: Bases and consequences. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs*, *126*, 269–292.

Ali, S. (2006). Why does policy fail? Understanding the problems of policy implementation in Pakistan: A neuro-cognitive perspective. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *34*(1), 1–20.

Alicke, M., Gordon, E., & Rose, D. (2013). Hypocrisy: What counts? *Philosophical Psychology*, *26*(5), 673–701. doi:10.1080/09515089.2012.677397

Andersson, L. (1996). Employee cynicism: An examination using a contract violation frame-work. *Human Relations*, 49, 1395–1418. doi:10.1177/001872679604901102

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bagozzi, R. P. (1994). Measurement in marketing research: Basic principles of questionnaire design. In R. P. Bagozzi (Ed.), *Principles of marketing research* (pp. 1–49). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1990). Assessing method variance in multitrait-multimethod matrices: The case of self-reported affect and perceptions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 547–560. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.75.5.547

Bjork, C. (2003). Local responses to decentralization policy in Indonesia. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(2), 184–216. doi:10.1086/376540

Boiral, O. (2007). Corporate greening through ISO 14001: A rational myth? *Organization Science*, 18(1), 127–146. doi:10.1287/orsc.1060.0224

Boiral, O. (2012). ISO certificates as organizational degrees? Beyond the rational myths of the certification process. *Organization Studies*, 33(5–6), 633–654. doi:10.1177/0170840612443622

Bollen, K. A. (2014). *Structural equations with latent variables*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Brandes, P., Dharwadkar, R., & Dean, J. W. (1999). Does organizational cynicism matter? Employee and supervisor perspectives on work outcomes. *Eastern Academy of Management Proceedings*, 150–153.

Bromiley, P., & Cummings, L. L. (1995). Transactions costs in organizations with trust. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 5, 219–247.

Bromiley, P., & Cummings, L. L. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI). In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 302–319). London, UK: Sage.

Brunsson, N. (1989). *The organization of hypocrisy: Talk, decisions and actions in organizations*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Burrell Nickell, E., & Roberts, R. W. (2014). Organizational legitimacy, conflict and hypocrisy: An alternative view of the role of international auditing. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25, 217–221. doi:10.1016/j.cpa.2013.10.005

Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cha, S., & Edmondson, A. (2006). When values backfire: Leadership, attribution, and disenchantment in a values-driven organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 57–78. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.10.006

Charette, M. (2006). Organizational hypocrisy. *Government Executive*, 38(7), 68.

Christensen, L., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2010). The polyphony of corporate social responsibility: Deconstructing accountability and transparency in the context of identity and hypocrisy. In G. Cheney, S. May, & D. Munshi (Eds.), *The handbook of communication ethics* (pp. 457–474). Hillside, NJ: LAwrence Erlbaum

Cosner, S. (2009). Building organizational capacity through trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 248–291. doi:10.1177/0013161X08330502

Crisp, R., & Cowton, C. (1994). Hypocrisy and moral seriousness. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 31, 343–349.

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 341–352.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*, 331–351. doi:10.2307/3069350

Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *101*, 105–126. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.04.005

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Everitt, B. S. (2002). *The Cambridge dictionary of statistics*. Cambridge, **UK**: Cambridge University Press.

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Straban, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, *4*(3), 272–299. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272

Falk, C. F., & Blaylock, B. K. (2012). The H factor: A behavioral explanation of leadership failures in the 2007–2009 financial system meltdown. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *9*(2), 68–82.

Fassin, Y., & Buelens, M. (2011). The hypocrisy-sincerity continuum in corporate communication and decision making: A model of corporate social responsibility and business ethics practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *98*(3), 425–453. doi:10.1108/00251741111126503

Femandez-Revuelta Perez, L., & Robson, K. (1999). Ritual legitimation, de-coupling and the budgetary process: Managing organizational hypocrisies in a multinational company. *Management Accounting Research*, *10*, 383–407. doi:10.1006/mare.1999.0114

Fernando, M., & Gross, M. (2006). *Workplace spirituality and organizational hypocrisy: The holy water-gate case*. 20th ANZAM (Australian New Zealand Academy of Management) Conference on Management: Pragmatism, Philosophy, Priorities, Rockhampton, Central Queensland University. Retrieved from http://library resources.cqu.edu.au:8888/access/detail.php?pid=cqu:738

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). London, UK: Sage.

Foote, D. (2001). The question of ethical hypocrisy in human resource management in the U.K. and Irish charity sectors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *34*(1), 25–38. doi:10.1023/A:1011909904150

Fox, A. (1974). *Beyond contract: Work, power and trust relations*. London, UK: Farber & Farber.

Gershberg, A. I. (2005). *Towards an education decentralization strategy for Turkey: Guideposts from international experience*. Policy Note for the Turkey Education Sector Study. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. J., & Berebitsky, D. (2009). Trust as a mediator of the relationships between poverty, racial composition, and academic achievement: Evidence from Michigan's public elementary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(2), 292–311. doi:10.1177/0013161X08330503

Greenbaum, R. L., Bardes Mawritz, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2012). When leaders fail to "walk the talk": Supervisor undermining and perceptions of leader hypocrisy. *Journal of Management*, *41*(3), 929–956. doi:10.1177/0149206312442386

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Hale, W. J., & Pillow, D. R. (2015). Asymmetries in perceptions of self and others' hypocrisy: Rethinking the meaning and perception of the construct. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*, 88–98. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2064

Han, J., & Koo, J. (2010). Institutional isomorphism and decoupling among Korean firms: Adoption of performance compensation system. *Korean Journal of Sociology*, *44*(3), 27–44.

Handford, V., & Leithwood, K. (2013). Why teachers trust school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *51*(2), 194–212. doi:10.1108/09578231311304706

Hart, P. M. (1997, April). *Personality, work-related experiences and organizational cynicism: A longitudinal study*. Presented at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology annual meeting, St. Louis, MO.

Harvill, L. M. (1991). An NCME instructional module on standard error of measurement. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 10(2), 33–41. doi:10.1111/emip.1991.10.issue-2

He, A. E. (2011). Educational decentralization: A review of popular discourse on Chinese–English bilingual education. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 31(1), 91–105. doi:10.1080/02188791.2011.544245

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 967–988. doi:10.1016/0149-2063(95)90050-0

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1(1), 104–121. doi:10.1177/109442819800100106

Hu, I., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, 3(4), 424–453. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.3.4.424

Hu, I., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure modelling: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Huzzard, T., & Ostergren, K. (2002). When norms collide: Learning under organizational hypocrisy. *British Journal of Management*, 13, 47–59. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.13.s2.5

Ingersoll, R. M. (1993). Loosely coupled organizations revisited. *Research in the Sociology of Education*, 11, 81–112.

Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (2001). *LISREL 8.5 for Windows*. [Computer software]. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Kaiser, H. K. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 23(3), 187–200. doi:10.1007/BF02289233

Kamal, K. (2017). Education in Turkey. *World Education News & Reviews*. Retrieved from http://wenr.wes.org/2017/04/education-in-turkey

Kouzes, J. M., & Pozner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kraatz, M. S. (2009). Leadership as institutional work: A bridge to the other side. In T. B. Lawrence, R. Suddaby, & B. Leca (Eds.), *Institutional work: Actors and agency in institutional studies of organizations* (pp. 59–91). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kutsyuruba, B., Walker, K., & Noonan, B. (2016). The trust imperative in the school principalship: The Canadian perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 15(3), 1–30. doi:10.1080/15700763.2016.1164866

Larsson, O. S. (2013). Convergence in ideas, divergence in actions: Organizational hypocrisy in non-profit organizations. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 35(2), 271–289. doi:10.2753/ATP1084-1806350205

Lipson, M. (2006, March). *Organized hypocrisy and global governance: Implications for United Nations reform*. Presented at the annual convention of the International Studies Association, San Diego, CA. Retrieved from http://alcor.concordia.ca/~mlipson/isa06_proceeding_100739.pdf

Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and improvement in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 1–24. doi:10.1007/s10833-006-9015-5

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130–149. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.1.2.130

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1989). *Rediscovering institutions: The organizational basis of politics*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Marshall, E. M. (2000). *Building trust at the speed of change: The power of the relationship-based corporation*. Toronto, Canada: American Management Association.

Martens, M. P. (2005). Future directions of structural equation modelling in counselling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *33*, 375–382. doi:10.1177/0011000005274598

McKinnon, C. (1991). Hypocrisy, with a note on integrity. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, *28*, 324–325.

Meyer, J. W., & Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The "actors" of modern society: The cultural construction of social agency. *Sociological Theory*, *18*(1), 100–120. doi:10.1111/0735-2751.00090

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340–363. doi:10.1086/226550

MONE, Ministry of National Education. (2017a). *National education statistics: Formal education 2016–2017 (1st semester)*. Ankara, Turkey: Ministry of National Education Strategy Development Presidency. Retrieved from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_03/31152628_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2016_2017_1.pdf

MONE, Ministry of National Education. (2017b). *Okul bazlı bütçeleme kılavuzu*. Retrieved from https://banaz.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_01/25140549_doc02923120170125105912.pdf

Mukundan, M. V., & Bray, M. (2004). The decentralization of education in Kerala state, India: Rhetoric and reality. *International Review of Education*, *50*, 223–243. doi:10.1007/s11159-004-2621-7

Mundy, K., & Menashy, F. (2014). The World Bank and private provision of schooling: A look through the lens of sociological theories of organizational hypocrisy. *Comparative Education Review*, *58*(3), 401–427. doi:10.1086/676329

Naus, F., Iterson, A. V., & 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:10.1177/0018726707079198

Nuffic. (2015). *Education system Turkey: The Turkish education system described and compared with the Dutch system*. Retrieved from https://www.nuffic.nl/en/publications/find-a-publication/education-system-turkey.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2013). *Education policy outlook: Turkey*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/edu/EDUCATION%20POLICY%20OUTLOOK%20TURKEY_EN.pdf

Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pérezts, M., & Picard, S. (2015). Compliance or comfort zone? The work of embedded ethics in performing regulation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *131*, 833–852. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2154-3

Phillippe, T. W., & Koehler, J. W. (2005). A factor analytical study of perceived organizational hypocrisy. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, *70*(2), 13–20.

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

Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, *35*(4), 651–665. doi:10.1111/jopy.1967.35.issue-4

Runciman, D. (2008). *Political hypocrisy: The mask of power, from Hobbes to Orwell and beyond*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rus, C. (2008). The model of organized hypocrisy applied to Romanian civic education policies and practices. *Journal of Social Science Education*, *9*(1), 112–120. doi:10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v7-i1-1059

Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, *8*(2), 23–74.

Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Scandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C., & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management*, 19(2), 385–417. doi:10.1177/014920639301900208

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *The lifeworld of leadership: Creating culture, community, and personal meaning in our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13, 18–35. doi:10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543

Smylie, M. A., Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and the development of distributed leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(4), 469–503.

Spillane, J. P., & Kenney, A. W. (2012). School administration in a changing education sector: The US experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(5), 541–561. doi:10.1108/09578231211249817

Spillane, J. P., Parise, L. M., & Sherer, J. Z. (2011). Organizational routines as coupling mechanisms: Policy, school administration, and the technical core. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 586–620. doi:10.3102/0002831210385102

Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Szabados, B., & Soifer, E. (1999). Hypocrisy, change of mind, and weakness of will: How to do moral philosophy with examples. *Metaphilosophy*, 30, 60–78. doi:10.1111/1467-9973.00112

Szabados, B., & Soifer, E. (2004). *Hypocrisy: Ethical investigations*. New York, NY: Broadway Press.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547–593. doi:10.3102/00346543070004547

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2016). *Changing dynamics in the governance of education: A comparative analysis of emerging issues and reforms in emerging countries*. (Draft version). UNESCO. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/gov-report.pdf

Voegtlin, C. (2011). Development of a scale measuring discursive responsible leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(1), 57–73. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1020-9

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 1–19. doi:10.2307/2391875

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wheaton, B., Muthen, B., Alwin, D. F., & Summers, G. (1977). Assessing reliability and stability in panel models. *Sociological Methodology*, 8(1), 84–136. doi:10.2307/270754

Widaman, K. F. (1985). Hierarchically tested covariance structure models for multitrait-multimethod data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9(1), 1–26. doi:10.1177/014662168500900101

Yan, C., & He, C. (2012). Bridging the implementation gap: An ethnographic study of English teachers' implementation of the curriculum reform in China. *Ethnography and Education*, 7(1), 1–19. doi:10.1080/17457823.2012.661585

Zheng, H. (2013). The dynamic interactive relationship between Chinese secondary school EFL teachers' beliefs and practice. *The Language Learning Journal*, 41(2), 192–204. doi:10.1080/09571736.2013.790133