

A Scale Development Study: Reliability and Validity Study of the Organizational Anomie Scale

Mehmet Ali Yarım, Durdağı Akan, Serap Morkoç

Theoretical Framework

Anomie is a word originating from Greek., with “an” meaning absence/lack and nomos meaning rule (Zoghbi & Rodriguez, 2007). Anomie refers to the situation where the structure containing the previous rules has disappeared and the structure containing the new rules is not able to fully form due to the changes occurring in a society or a group (Mansfield, 2004). Individuals are said to face anomie when they fail to encounter sufficient moral constraints, namely when they have no clear understanding of what are appropriate and acceptable behaviors (Ritzer, 1992). The concept of anomie is a sociological concept that has appeared. This concept refers to the deterioration of social values, ethical rules, and social structure as well as the loss of social institutions’ functionality (Allport, 2016).

Anomie is the state of irregularity and normlessness in individual behaviors that occur when balance and integration are impaired (Edinsel, 2018; Swingewood, 1998). Anomie is basically considered to be a psychological state characterized with a tendency to be self-involved. In this respect, anomie evokes meanings such as reje-

@ Dr., Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, karazeybekli@hotmail.com

ID 0000-0002-8168-8526

@ Doç. Dr., Atatürk Üniversitesi, kallender35@gmail.com

ID 0000-0002-5397-8470

@ Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, serap2018@outlook.com

ID: 0000-0003-4009-7671

➔ Yarım, M. A., Akan, D. ve Morkoç S. (2021). Bir Ölçek Geliştirme Çalışması: Örgütsel Anomi Ölçeği. İş Ahlakı Dergisi, 14(2), ss. 381-422

✍ Araştırma Makalesi

© İGİAD
DOI: 10.12711/tjbe.2021.14.2.2633
İş Ahlakı Dergisi, 2021
isahlakidergisi.com

cting social norms, alienation, or feeling isolated from society. In line with this conceptualization, anomie is a state of indifference and self-concern that involves feeling life to be meaningless; it is a state where feelings of aimlessness and powerlessness are dominant (Martin, 2000; Kontry, 2005; Baumer, 2007; Bjarnason, 2009). In this context and according to theory, the ideas of interest, position, and concern are combined with a distrust in the leader and the deterioration of the social structure, pushing the individual into a phenomenon of normlessness and a lack of values.

The cultural goals found in Merton's (1994) theory of anomie consist of desire and longing. Tools also exist that individuals can legitimately use to achieve these goals. Distributing cultural norms is important for achieving cultural goals (Can, 2004).

In this context, the concept of anomie can be said to be an attitude based on normlessness and meaninglessness resulting from losing the effectiveness and meaning of the values and rules that emerge with societal changes. After this stage, distrust toward the administration gets added to the anomie process, and destructive consequences such as hopelessness, cynicism, and despair can ultimately occur in societies and individuals. The destructive process that will be seen in organizations as an important component of societies and in employees as the basic dynamics of organizations can deeply shake work life, organizational culture, and health as well as the functioning of societies. In this context, analyzing this phenomenon in depth in organizational life has extreme importance.

Objectives and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to determine the effectiveness of the criteria in order to develop a valid and reliable scale for determining teachers' perceptions toward the concept of organizational anomie among civil servants.

Methodology

Sample and Population

The data required to determine the factor structure of the Organizational Anomie Scale were obtained from administrators and teachers working in Erzurum Province's central districts of Aziziye, Palandöken, and Yakutiye during the 2020-2021 academic year. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were carried out on separate sample groups through the pilot application of the scale. In any scale development study, having a sample size of 5 to 10 times the number of items is considered sufficient for the sample selection in the factor analyses (Bryman & Cramer, 2001, as cited in Seçer,

2015). The pilot application of the study was carried out with 83 participants, the main application for the validity and reliability study was conducted with 464 participants, and the confirmatory factor analysis study was conducted with 302 participants.

Measures and Data Analysis

A literature review of the concept of anomie was conducted prior to developing the attitude scale toward anomie. A question pool of 48 items was created as a result of the literature review of the local and foreign literature based on Durkheim and Merton's views on the concept of anomie. These questions were then sent to a group of eight experts in education management, language, and the field. Based on the experts' opinions, the content validity rate (CGO) and content validity index (CVI) were calculated.

After this stage, a pilot study was conducted over a group of 82 people for the clarity and precursor analysis. The obtained data were subjected to factor and sub-item analyses, and the validity and reliability of the pilot scale were calculated. As a result of these analyses, the draft scale was found to be highly valid and reliable in terms of the KMO and reliability values. As a result of the item analysis, the items were observed to have high rates of discrimination. As a result of the factor analysis, only the factor loading value for Item 23 was seen to be both insufficient and loaded onto more than one factor; thus, this item was excluded from the scale. After the results from the pilot application, the validity, reliability, exploratory, and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for the draft scale consisting of 37 items.

Findings

In line with the opinions of the expert group, items 5, 16, 19, 20, 24, 30, 33, 38, 43 and 48 were removed from the scale. As a result of this process, 38 items remained in the revised version of the draft scale. The fact that the CGI value of the items obtained from the scale development study in line with the expert opinions is greater than the CVI value of the scale indicates that the developed scale was developed to ensure content validity (Ateş Çobanoğlu, 2013, Lawshe 1975). It can be said that the Organizational Anomie Scale developed in this context has content validity. After the scale was revised in line with expert opinions, it was applied and item analyzes were made with the data obtained. First of all, t-test analysis was performed to determine the discrimination and difficulty indexes of the items, and then the total correlation strength of the items was examined.

According to the t-test results between the upper and lower 27th percentiles, a significant difference was seen to exist among the scores for all items, with the

scores for each item being greater than the critical t-test value of 1.96. Having significant t-test results for the scale's items indicates the items on the scale to have high reliability (Büyüköztürk, 2015). In addition, the performed analyses found the total internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for all items to be .87. According to these results, the scale's items have been determined to have high measuring power and reliability.

Before determining the factor structure of the scale, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and data regarding Bartlett's test of sphericity were examined. The KMO value was found to be .92, and the result from Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 = 12,133.59$; $p = .000$) has been found to be meaningful. According to these values, the data from the sample were seen to be suitable for factor analysis.

According to the scree plot graph and its eigenvalues, it is seen that the draft scale consists of 4 factors. When the variance loads obtained from the exploratory factor analyzes and their explained variances are examined, the first dimension accounts for 21.05% of the total variance; second dimension, 18.13%; the third dimension explains 15.96% and the last dimension 9.46%. These four dimensions explain 64.59% of the total variance. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, the first dimension of the scale consists of 9 items, the second dimension consists of 5 items, the third dimension consists of 6 items and the fourth dimension consists of 8 items. The scale consists of a total of 4 dimensions and 29 items.

The results from analyzing Cronbach's alpha of internal consistency show an $\alpha = .871$ for the dimension of meaninglessness, $\alpha = .689$ for the dimension of normlessness, $\alpha = .726$ for the dimension of administrative trust, and $\alpha = .895$ for the dimension of helplessness and hopelessness.

As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, the following fit indices have been found: $\chi^2 / SD = 4.87$, $CFI = 0.91$, $NFI = .90$, $AGFI = .89$, $GFI = .90$, and $RMSEA = .079$.

Discussion and Implications

This developed scale is considered able to both fill the gap in the local literature and to create an explanation and awareness for many variables and processes that employees experience in organizational life. Based on Durkheim and Merton's views on the concept of anomie, a 48-item question pool had been created based on the results from the domestic and foreign literature review. As a result of the experts' opinions regarding the content validity of the scale, 10 items were remo-

ved from the pool and a pilot study was conducted with 83 participants to measure the intelligibility of the remaining 38 items and questions. As a result of the item analysis, the distinctiveness and intelligibility levels of the questions were seen to be appropriate, and the draft scale was applied to the main sample group.

The obtained data were first subjected to item analyses, with item-total correlations and lower-upper group t-test scores being examined. Item correlations being greater than .30 and the significance of t-test scores for the lower and upper 27th percentile groups showing the participants to have understood the questions correctly and the items to be appropriate for measuring the desired concept have supported the content validity.

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (EFA and CFA) were also performed to determine the construct validity of the measurement tool. Prior to the EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett values were checked to test whether the sample was adequate. The study determined the KMO value to be 0.96, the *p* value in the Bartlett test to be 0.00, and the anti-image *r* values to be between 0.55-0.95. These values have been accepted as proof showing the scale to be suitable for factor analysis. As a result of the 38-item EFA, Items 15 and 21 were found to have insufficient variance loads; Items 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 23, and 27 were also excluded from the scale due to overlaps. In this context, a measurement tool consisting of 29 items and 4 factors was obtained as a result of EFA. The factor loads of the items in the scale range from .48 to .72. The four factors in the measurement tool explain 65% of the total variance measured in relation to organizational anomie.

As a result of the CFA analysis of the measurement tool, the fit indices were found to be within acceptable values. These results show the model to have great fit.

Cronbach's alpha values for the factors range between .69 and .90, and the composite reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as .84. According to these results, the scale can be said to have a good level of reliability and to provide internal consistency.

As a result of this study, a valid and reliable scale has been developed for organizational anomie involving the dimensions of: 1) Normlessness, 2) Meaninglessness, 3) Administrative Trust, and 4) Hopelessness and Helplessness. The developed Organizational Anomie Scale is able to contribute and serve as a reference for researchers who want to work with different geographies, sample groups, and variables related to the concept of anomie.

Kaynakça | References

- Allport, G. W. (2016). *Önyargının doğası* (1. Basım) (N. Nirven, Çev.). Sakarya: Sakarya Üniversitesi Kültür Yayınları.
- Altunışık R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroglu, S. ve Yıldırım, E. (2007). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri-SPSS uygulamalı*. Sakarya: Sakarya Kitapevi.
- Arslan Ö. ve Yavuz, E. (2019). Örgütsel adalet, örgütsel anomi ve örgütsel güven arasındaki ilişki: Otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 14(2), 113-134. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.14792
- Aslan, Ş. ve Uyar, S. (2019). Araştırma yaklaşımlarının seçimi. Ş. Aslan (Ed.). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri nicel, nitel ve karma tasarımlar için bir rehber*. Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Ateş, A. (2013). Eğitimsel web sitesi bir de yeğleme. *Eğitim Teknolojileri Dergisi*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Ayre, C., & Scally A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio: Revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 47(1), 79-86. doi: 10.1177/0748175613513808
- Bashir, H. & Bala, R. (2019). Development and validation of a scale to measure anomie of students. *Psychological Studies*, 64(1), 131-139. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0158370
- Batmantaş, H. ve Örucü, E. (2018). Örgütsel güven ile sinizm arasındaki ilişki: Bir uygulama. *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 18 (36), 199-214. doi: 10.30976/susead.399087
- Baumer, E. P. (2007). Untangling research puzzles in Merton's multilevel anomie theory. *Theoretical Criminology*, 11(1), 63-93. doi: 10.1177/1362480607072736
- Bjarnason, T. (2009). Anomie among european adolescents: Conceptual and empirical clarification of a multilevel sociological concept. *Sociological Forum*, 24(1), 135-61. doi:10.1111/j.1573-7861.2008.01089.x
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2017). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* (23. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (15. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Can, Y. (2004). Durkheim ve Merton'un anomi kuramları bağlamında cemaatten cemiyete Türk toplumu. *Muhafazakâr Düşünce*, 1(2), 98-113.
- Cohen, D. V. (1995). Ethics and crime in business firms: Organizational culture and the impact of anomie, in F. Adler and W. S. Laufer (eds.), *The legacy of anomie theory* (Transaction, New Brunswick, NJ), pp. 183-206.
- Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis* (2. Baskı). New Jersey: Hillsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2016). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik spss ve lisrel uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Devellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development theory and applications* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Durkheim, E. (2016). *Ahlak ve toplum* (D. Çenesiz, Çev.). İstanbul: Pinhan Yayınları.

- Edinsel, K. (2020). *Anomi*. [https://dusunbil.com/2020/01/anomi-nerede-ne zaman ve nasıl/](https://dusunbil.com/2020/01/anomi-nerede-ne-zaman-ve-nasil/) adresinden 03.03.2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Elmore, T. M. (1962). *The development of a scale to measure psychological anomie*. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA).
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications Pvt Ltd.
- Formiga, N., Fleury, L.F., Fandino, A.M., & Souza, M.A. (2016). Empirical evidence of an organizational anomie the measure in Brazilian workers. *Revista De Psicologia*, 18(1), 134-149.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hil.
- George, D. ve Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (10a ed.), Boston: Pearson.
- Gerber, J. J. & Macionis, L. M. (2010). *Sociology* (7th Canadian ed.). Toronto: Pearson Canada.
- Gürbüz, S. (2019). *Amos ile yapısal eşitlik modellenmesi*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.
- Heydari, A., Davoudi, I., & Teymoori, A. (2011). Revising the assessment of feeling of anomie: Presenting a multidimensional scale. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30(1), 1086-1090. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.212
- Hwang, C., & Henry, L. (1990). Development and validation of the mathematics anxiety scale for children. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 23(3), 121-127. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01181
- Johnson, P. & Duberley, J. (2011). Anomie and culture management: Reappraising Durkheim. *Organization* 18(4) 563-584. doi:10.1177/1350508410392435
- Kalaycıoğlu, E. (2018). *Özgürlük ve anomie*. <https://Sarkac.Org/2020/01.12/> adresinden 02.12.2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Karagöz, Y. (2017) *SPSS 23 ve amos bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri ve yayın etiği*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik.
- Khine, M. S. (2013). *Application of structural equation modeling in educational research and practice*. Rotterdam, Boston, Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Kılıç, S. ve Toker, K. (2010). Örgütsel adalet ile örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Journal of Yasar University*, 15 (58), 288-303. doi: 10.19168/jyasar.499909
- Kline, R. B. (2019). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesinin ilkeleri ve uygulaması* (S. Şen, Çev. Ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Konty, M. (2005). Microanomie: The cognitive foundations of the relationship between anomie and deviance. *Criminology* 3(1)107-32. doi: 10.1111/j.0011-1348.2005.00004.x
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4) 563-575. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
- Maciejewska, R. (2016). *Employee anomie in the organization*. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie Sklodowska, Lublin*, 41(2), 159-172. 02.02.2021 tarihinde <http://Journals.Umcs.Pl/Article/Viewfile/4653/4005> adresinden erişilmiştir.
- Mansfield, P. (2004). Anomie and disaster in corporate culture: The impact of mergers and acquisitions on the ethical climate of marketing organizations. *Marketing Management Journal*, 14(2), 88-99.

- Martin, K. D., Johnson, J. & Cullen, J. B. (2009). Organizational change, normative control deinstitutionalization, and corruption. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 19(1), 105-130.
- Martin, R. (2000). Anomie, spirituality, and crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 16(1), 75-98. doi:10.1177/1043986200016001005
- Merton R. K. (1965) *Continuities in the theory of social structure and anomie*. Paris: Plon.
- Messner, S. F. (1988). Merton's "social structure and anomie": The road not taken. *Deviant Behavior*, 9(1), 33-55.
- Nowodzinski, P. (2015). Anomia strategiczna – próba konceptualizacji. *Studia i Prace Wydziału Nauk Ekonomicznych i Zarządzania*, 39(4), 223-234. https://Wneiz.Pl/Nauka_Wneiz/Sip/Sip39-2015/Sip-39-T4-223.Pdf adresinden 23.02.2021 tarihinde erişildi.
- Özdamar, K. (1997). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özdemir, E. (2015). Tarama yöntemi. Metin, M. (Ed.). *Kuramdan uygulamaya eğitim bilimlerinde bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (S. 77 – 97). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Özmen, Ü. (2017). *Anomi hastalığı*. <https://www.Birgun.Net/Haber/Ahlaksizlik-Hastaligi-Anomi-194581> adresinden 10.12.2019 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2008). *An introduction to applied multivariate analysis*. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Reicher, S., Haslam, S.A. & Hopkins N. (2005) Social identity and the dynamics of leadership: Leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16 (4), 547-568. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.06.007
- Ritzer, G. (1992), *Sociological theory*. (3rd ed.). (Ü. Tatlıcan, Çev.). McGraw-Hill. [http://www.umit-tatlican.com/uploadsF/1/Emile-Durkheim-\(Ritzer,-1992\).pdf](http://www.umit-tatlican.com/uploadsF/1/Emile-Durkheim-(Ritzer,-1992).pdf) adresinden 21.02.2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Rothstein B, & Eek D. (2009). Political corruption and social trust an experimental approach. *Rationality and Society*, 21(1), 81-112.
- Seçer, İ. (2015). *Spss ve lisrel ile pratik veri analizi*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Skiba, M. , Smith, DR ve Marshall, KP. (2009). Applying Merton's theory of anomia to career disruptions. *Management Research News* , 32 (4), 392-404.
- Souza, M. A. & Ribas J., R. C. (2013). Anomia organizacional: Discussão conceitual e desenvolvimento de escala. *Revista Psicologia Argumento*, 31(75), 677-686. doi: 10.7213/psicol.argum.31.075.AO05
- Srole, L. (1956). Social integration and certain corollaries: An exploratory study. *American Sociological Review*, 21(6), 709-716. doi: 10.2307/2088422
- Sümer, N. (2000). Yapısal eşitlik modelleri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 3(6), 49-74.
- Swingewood, A. (1998). *A short history of sociological thought*. London: Mcmillian.
- Switzer, T. G. (2013). *Measuring normlessness in the workplace: A study of organizational anomie in the academic setting*. A Ph.D. Dissertation in Leadership and Change Program. Seattle, USA: Antioch University.
- Şimşek Ö. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş, temel ilkeler ve lisrel uygulamaları*. Ankara: Ekinoks.

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2010). *Using multivariate statistics*. (4th ed.). MA: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Tavşancıl, E. (2002). *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve spss ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Teymoori, A., Jetten, J., Bastian, B., Ariyanto, A., Autin, F., Ayub, N., Badea, C., Besta, T., Butera, F., Costa-Lopes, R., Cui, L., Fantini, C., Finchilescu, G., Gaertner, L., Gollwitzer, M., Gómez, Á., González, R., Hong, Y. Y., Jensen, D. H. & Wohl, M. (2016). Revisiting the measurement of anomie *Plos One*, 11(7), 35-49. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0158370
- Tezbaşaran, A. (1997). *Likert tipi ölçek geliştirme kılavuzu* (2. Baskı). Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Tsahuridu, E. E. (2011). An exploration of factors affecting work anomia. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(2), 297-305. doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0655-2
- Wang J., & Wang X. (2012). *Structural equation modeling: Applications using mplus: Methods and applications*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wickert, C. (2019). *Anomie strain theories*. <https://soztheo.de/theories-of-crime/anomie-strain-theories/> adresinden 03.01.2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- Wolf, A. & Wallace, R. A. (2012). Çağdaş sosyoloji kuramları: *Klasik geleneğin genişletilmesi*. (3. Baskı). (L. Elburuz, M. R. Ayas, Çev.). Ankara: Doğubatı Yayınları.
- Yang, A. (2015). *Quantifying anomia: Development of a scale*. Master's thesis. College of Science and Mathematics. Fresno, USA: California State University.
- Yeşilyurt, S. Ve Çapraz, C. (2018). Ölçek geliştirme çalışmalarında kullanılan kapsam geçerliği için bir yol haritası. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20(1), 251-264. doi: 10.17556/erziefd.297741
- Yılmaz, V. (2009). *LISREL ile yapısal eşitlik modellemesi-I: Temel kavramlar, uygulamalar, programlama*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Yurdugül, H. (2005). Ölçek geliştirme çalışmalarında kapsam geçerliği için kapsam geçerlik indekslerinin kullanılması. XIV. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi. 28-30 Eylül Denizli: Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi. 16.01.2021 tarihinde <https://Yunus.Hacettepe.Edu.Tr/~Yurdugul/3/İndir/Pamukkalebildiri.Pdf> adresinden alınmıştır.
- Zahra, S. A., Priem, R. L., & Rasheed, A. (2005). The antecedents and consequences of top management fraud. *Journal of Management*, 31 (6), 803-827. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279598
- Zoghbi, P., & Gonzales, S. M. (2009). The role of anomia on the relationship between organisational justice perceptions and organisational citizenship online behaviours. *Journal of Information, Communication & Ethics in Society*, 7(1), 72-85.
- Zoghbi, P., & Rodriguez, T. E. (2007). Organizational anomie as moderator of the relationship between an unfavorable attitudinal environment and citizenship behavior (ocb): An empirical study among university administration and services personel. *Personnel Review*, 36(6), 843-866. doi: 10.1108/00483480710822391

Örgütsel Anomi Ölçeği

Bu bölümde insanların çalışma yaşantıları ile ilgili bazı tutum ve davranışları yansıtan ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Bu tutum ve davranışların her birinin <u>sizin kendi</u> çalışma yaşantınızda ne derece yer aldığını belirtmenizi istiyoruz. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi değerlendirirken sağ tarafta bulunan “Kesinlikle katılmıyorum”dan “Kesinlikle katılıyorum”a doğru uzanan cevap seçeneklerinden <u>size</u> uygun olanını işaretleyiniz.	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Çalıştığım kurumda uyulması gereken net ahlaki kuralların olmadığını düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
2. Çalıştığım kurumda kişisel hırslar ve menfaat, yazılı ve yazısız kurallardan ve normlardan daha önemlidir.	0	0	0	0	0
3. Çalıştığım kurumda yazılı ve yazısız örgütsel ve toplumsal kuralların eskisi kadar etkili olmadığını düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
4. Çalıştığım kurumda saygının, insan ilişkilerinin ve örgüt maneviyatının etkili olmadığını düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
5. Çalıştığım kurumda bireyler normlar, kurallar ve örgüt kültüründen ziyade günü kurtarmayı düşünürler.	0	0	0	0	0
6. Çalıştığım kurumda çoğu zaman kime güvenebileceğimi bilmiyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
7. Çalıştığım kurumda çalışanlar çok çabuk tutum ve davranış değiştirebilmektedir.	0	0	0	0	0
8. Çalışma hayatında eksik ve yanlış olan çok şey var.	0	0	0	0	0
9. Çalıştığım kurumda insanların konum ve menfaat sağlamak için inanmadıkları ve istemedikleri uygulamaları bile yapabileceklerini düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
10. Çalıştığım kurumda çalışanların ödül ve çıkar için inandıkları değerlerden kolaylıkla vazgeçebileceğini düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
11. Çalıştığım kurumda etik, ahlaki, evrensel ve yerel değerlerin eskisi kadar önemsenmediğini düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
12. Çalıştığım kurumda çalışanların çok rahat yalan söyleyebileceklerini düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
13. Çalıştığım kurumda çalışanlar işlerine gelen kurallara uyarlar.	0	0	0	0	0
14. Çalıştığım kurumda dürüstlüğün her zaman işe yaramadığını düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0
15. Çalıştığım kurumda yapılan işlerin doğru olup olmadığını dan ziyade işe yarayıp yaramadığına bakıldığını düşünüyorum.	0	0	0	0	0

16. Çalıştığım kurumda hedefler ve beklentiler net değildir.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Çalıştığım kurumda yönetsel adaletin ve liyakatin olmadığını düşünüyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Çalıştığım kurumda kaynaklar ve yasal güç meşru kullanılmaz.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Çalıştığım kurumda etkili bir mali ve personel yönetimi olmadığını düşünüyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Çalıştığım kurumun misyon ve vizyonu ile kurumdaki politika ve uygulamalar tutarlıdır.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Çalıştığım kurumda çalışanların hak ettiklerini ve çalıştıklarının karşılığını aldıklarını düşünüyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Çalıştığım kurumda kariyer imkanlarının adil olmadığını düşünüyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. Çalıştığım kurumda ne yapacağımı tam anlamıyla bilmiyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Çalıştığım kurumda geleceğim konusunda çok kaygılıyım.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Çalıştığım kurumda işler gün geçtikçe kötüye gidiyor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Çalıştığım kurumda kendimi yalnız ve çaresiz hissediyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Gün geçtikçe mesleğime karşı olan tutkum ve bağlılığım azalıyor.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Çalıştığım kurumda kendimi geliştirmekten vazgeçtim.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. Gelecekte nerede olduğumu ve nasıl başarılı olacağımı bilemiyorum.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Ölçek boyutları:

Normsuzluk ifadeleri: 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10

Anlamsızlık ifadeleri: 11,12,13,14,15

Yönetsel Güvensizlik ifadeleri: 16,17,18,19,20,21

Umutsuzluk ve Çaresizlik ifadeleri: 22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29

Puanlama: Ölçekteki cevap seçenekleri “Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum”dan (1) “Kesinlikle Katılıyorum”a (5) uzanan altı basamaktan oluşmaktadır. Ölçekteki toplam puanların artması iş yerinde örgütsel anominin artışını göstermektedir. Ölçekte 20 ile 21. maddeler ters kodlanmıştır.