# The Effect of Organizational Climate on Organizational Alienation and Destructive Deviance Behaviors

*Örgüt İkliminin Örgütsel Yabancılaşma ve Yıkıcı Sapma Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkisi*

**Eyüp Bayram ŞEKERLİ**
Associate Prof., Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Department of Accounting and Finance Management, Muğla, Türkiye
Doçent, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, SUBYO, Muhasebe ve Finans Yönetimi, Muğla, Türkiye
Orcid: 0000-0003-1562-4716 eyupbs@mu.edu.tr

## Öz

Çalışma, örgütsel iklimin sapkın davranışlar ve yabancılaşma üzerindeki etkisini araştırmaktadır. Çalışanların iş ortamlarına ilişkin algılarının hem kişisel hem de örgütsel sapkınlık ve yabancılaşma duygularını nasıl etkilediğini incelemektedir. Araştırma, örgüt iklimi ile örgütsel yabancılaşma, örgüt iklimi ile sapkın davranışlar ve yabancılaşma ile sapkın davranışlar arasında doğrudan ilişkiler olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Ayrıca, örgütsel yabancılaşmanın örgüt iklimi ve sapkın davranışlar arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık ettiğini öne sürmektedir. Araştırmanın verileri Muğla ilinde çeşitli hizmet sektörlerinde çalışan 274 kişiden toplanmıştır. Stringer (2002) tarafından oluşturulan örgüt ikliminin sadece bağlılık ve tanınma boyutları doğrulanmıştır. Bulgular, bağlılık ve tanınma boyutlarının örgütsel yabancılaşma ile önemli ölçüde ilişkili olduğunu göstermektedir. Özellikle, bağlılık ve örgütsel yabancılaşma arasındaki pozitif ilişki önemli bir sonuç olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca, çalışma örgütsel yabancılaşmanın örgütsel iklim boyutları ile hem kişisel hem de örgütsel sapma arasındaki ilişkiye tam olarak aracılık ettiği sonucuna varmaktadır.

### Anahtar Kelimeler

Örgütsel İklim, Yabancılaşma, Olumsuz Sapkın Davranışlar.

## Abstract

The study investigates the impact of organizational climate on deviant behaviors and alienation. It examines how employees' perceptions of their work environment influence both personal and organizational deviance and feelings of alienation. The research posits direct relationships between organizational climate and organizational alienation, organizational climate and deviant behaviors, and alienation and deviant behaviors. Additionally, it suggests that organizational alienation mediates the relationship between organizational climate and deviant behaviors. Data were gathered from 274 employees in various service sectors in Muğla Province, Turkey. Only commitment and recognition dimensions of the organizational climate constructed by Stringer (2002) were validated. The findings indicate that the commitment and recognition dimensions are significantly related to organizational alienation. Notably, a positive relationship between the commitment and organizational alienation emerged as a key result. Furthermore, the study concludes that organizational alienation fully mediates the relationship between organizational climate dimensions and both personal and organizational deviance.

### Keywords

Organizational Climate, Alienation, Negative Deviant Behaviors.

## Introduction

Organizational deviant factors is defined as voluntary actions that violate important organizational norms prescribed by formal and informal policies, rules, and procedures and in doing so threaten the well-being or reputation of the organization and/or its members (Robinson and Bennett 1995; Bennett and Robinson, 2000). Examples of organizational deviance include lying, stealing, absenteeism, sabotage, fraud, corruption and even violence in the workplace. Bolin and Heatherly (2001) list the following behaviors as deviant behaviors: stealing organizational materials, not making sufficient effort in the execution of tasks, drug/alcohol use at work, making false accident claims, abusing medical leave rights, and taking long breaks from work when necessary. Robinson and Bennet (1995) classify deviant behaviors into four different types of deviance. These are production deviance, property deviance, political deviance, and personal aggression. Production deviance is defined as behaviors that violate norms that determine the minimum quality and quantity of work to be accomplished. Being late for work, leaving early, taking excessive breaks, withholding effort, wasting resources, using drugs and alcohol at work, and calling in sick (absenteeism) are forms of production deviance. Political deviance involves creating social interactions that put other individuals at a personal or political disadvantage. Deviance is forms of political deviance such as nepotism, favoritism, gossiping about coworkers, and competing for personal gain (Robinson and Bennet 1995). Property deviance is defined as the unauthorized acquisition or damage of material elements/tools or assets of the organization by employees. Sabotaging equipment, accepting kickbacks, lying about hours worked, disclosing confidential information, deliberate mistakes, misusing expense accounts, and stealing from the company are forms of property deviance. Personal deviance involves deviant behaviors that are serious and interpersonally harmful. Sexual harassment, rape, verbal abuse, physical assault, sabotaging coworkers' work, stealing from coworkers, damaging coworkers' property, and endangering coworkers are forms of personal aggression (Robinson and Bennet 1995).

The above-mentioned behaviors are more of negative deviance behaviors. Deviant behaviors could also be positive and aim to support the wellness of an organization. Galperin (2002) defines constructive deviant behaviors as "the conscious violation of the norms and rules of the organization in order to positively contribute to and improve the organization or its members or both". Even if these behaviors called constructive deviant behaviors violate organizational norms, they are desired by organizations because they are beneficial in achieving organizational goals. Although constructive deviant behaviors violate organizational norms, behaviors that create some advantages for the organization can be defined as deviance behaviors. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2004) define constructive deviant behaviors as behaviors that deviate from the norms of the reference group benefit the reference group and conform to hypernorms.

In the literature, some antecedents of organizational deviance behavior are mentioned. In this study, organizational climate is examined as one of the antecedents of organizational deviance behavior. Organizational climate is related to individuals' perceptions of the organizational conditions and environment. Organizational climate describes the way the conditions of the organization are perceived by employees and the quality of the organizational lifestyle (Çetinkaya and Güleç, 2022). The more positively employees evaluate the organizational climate, the less likely they are to deviate from accepted behaviors (Kamp & Brooks, 1991; Chernyak-Haive Tziner, 2014; Lipińska-Grobelny, 2021).

Organizations where organizational-individual interactions are generally negative, in other words, where individuals generally have negative perceptions and attitudes about organizational elements, are defined as toxic organizations (Tanyolaç, 2020). Problems related to the structure and design of the organization, deficiencies in defining roles, injustice, communication problems, inadequate organizational support, and inadequate/negative leadership support (Kalemci et al., 2019) can be listed as factors based on basic organizational-individual interactions. Zahid and Nauman (2024) state that positive organizational atmosphere in the workplace weakens workplace incivility and reduces deviance behaviors. In other words, positive organizational atmosphere appears to have an effect that reduces interpersonal deviance behaviors. Similarly, Grobelny (2021) found that negative deviance behaviors such as abuse, sabotage, theft and withdrawal are rare with a positive perceived organizational atmosphere regardless of the employee gender.

The research also aims to examine the relationship between alienation and organizational deviance behaviors. It is tried to understand whether alienation supports a passive state of indifference or deviant behaviors. There are results in the literature that there is a significant and positive relationship between deviance and alienation (Kanten & Ülker, 2014; Yıldız & Alpkan, 2015; Erdem, 2021; Ağalday, 2022). In other words, as the level of alienation increases, negative deviant behaviors increase and at the same time, a decrease in performance levels can be observed (GarcíaContreras et al., 2022).

As stated above, when the literature is examined, it is understood that organizational climate and alienation affect deviant behaviors separately. In addition, there are studies (Bajaj, 1982; Demirez & Tosunoğlu, 2017; Çelik, 2023) stating that organizational climate and alienation are interrelated variables. When the literature is examined, it is seen that these variables

are discussed separately and together, but very few studies have examined all of these relationships. The main purpose of this study is to fill this gap. At this point, in the following stages of the study, the information in the literature on the relationship between the variables discussed in the study was conveyed and hypotheses were formed accordingly. In the next stage, data collection tools, sampling and the findings obtained in the research were given and in the last stage, the findings were discussed.

## 2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

Forehand and Gilmer (1964) draw attention to the interaction of the individual and environment in understanding behaviors. Zhang and Liu (2010) define organizational climate as individuals' perceptions of their work environment. Organizational climate refers to the basic characteristics of the organization formed as a result of how the organization relates to employees and other environmental elements (Campbell et al., 1970). Cooke and Rousseau (1988) propose that organizational climate is related to employees' perceptions of organizational structures and how they feel about being a member of the organization. Ehrhart et al. (2014) define organizational climate as "the shared meaning organizational members attach to the events, policies, practices, and procedures they experience and the behaviors they see being rewarded, supported, and expected". Organizational climate is related to many elements of organizational life. Organizational elements such as interpersonal relationships, motivation, leadership, autonomy, support, physical conditions, conformity to work, commitment, and innovation can be expressed as components of organizational climate (Bohórquez et. al. 2023). Downey et al. (1974) define organizational climate as "a set of characteristics that define an organisation and (a) distinguish it from other organizations, (b) are relatively permanent over time, and (c) affect the behavior of people in the organization. According to Zhang and Liu (2010), there are two basic levels related to organizational climate. These levels are the macro level, which refers to the organizational climate perceived by individuals in the whole working environment, and the micro level, which refers to the perceptions of a specific dimension or a specific environment of the organization. Bowen and Ostroff (2004) define organizational climate as "perceptions about how the organization is defined in terms of shared practices, policies, procedures, routines, and rewards, what is important to the organization, and what behaviors are expected of individuals. Schneider et al. (2013) briefly define organizational climate as the meanings that people attribute to their interrelated experiences at work.

Jianwei and Liu (2010) state that organizational climate has significant main effects on turnover intention, job satisfaction, and job competence, as well as organizational effectiveness such as employee commitment to the organization and collective identity. A positive organizational climate has significant effects on employees' job satisfaction (Gaunya, 2016; Ahmad, et al. 2018; Maqbool et al., 2020), innovation (Shanker et al., 2017; Kang, et al., 2016), and well-being (Viitala et al, 2015). Steinke (2015) investigated components, that human resources departments should create for an effective organizational climate, which were listed as employee engagement, support, training and development, effective leadership, and fairness.

In the literature review mentioned above, it is understood that organizational climate can determine an individual's attitudes toward his/her organiztion and job. As another term related to organizational climate alienation is defined as employees finding their jobs, workplaces, and roles in the workplace meaningless. Hirschfeld and Feild (2000) work alienation is defined as a person's lack of interest and other negative attitudes towards his/her work. Seaman (1959) states that alienation is related to the concepts of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-alienation. On the other hand, organizational alienation not only weakens the individual's interest in the organization and organizational issues but also causes the efforts to change direction. In this respect, according to Agarwal (1993), organizational alienation refers to the fact that the employee puts less effort than necessary for his/her job, his/her level of caring for his/her job decreases and he/she primarily strives for rewards outside the organization (Agarwal, 1993). The effect of organizational climate on the formation of attitudes about work and organization suggests that organizational climate may also be effective in the formation of alienation. There are many studies in the literature on the relationship between the elements of organizational climate and alienation. Alienation can develop due to the structural features of the organization such as centralization, bureaucracy (Aiken and Hage 1966; Miller, 1967; Haim and Weiss, 1990; Nair and Vohra, 2010), and the technological structure of the organization (Blauner, 1964). Leadership has been shown to be an effective variable on alienation in many studies (Sarros et al., 2002; Banai et al., 2004). Results show that transformational leadership was associated with lower work alienation, whereas transactional leadership was associated with higher work alienation (Sarros vd., 2002). In addition, it is also included in the literature that the job itself and its characteristics also cause alienation. Work-related factors such as job stress (Chiaburu et. al. 2014; Sunman, 2021) and job conflict (Chiaburu et. al. 2014) also have an impact on alienation. In studies on organizational climate and alienation (Kakabadse, 1986; Demirez and Tosunoğlu, 2017; Gençer Çelik, 2023; Akşit Aşık, 2018), a significant relationship between the two variables was reported. In this study, the dimensions (structures, standards, responsibility, reward/recognition, support, commitment) developed by Stringer (2002) and widely used in understanding organizational climate were adopted to measure organizational climate. Therefore, the following hypothesis are proposed.

$H_1$: Organizational climate has a significant influence on alienation

Within the scope of H1, the relationship between commitment, recognition, structure, support, standardization, response variables, which are the components of organizational climate, and alienation will be tested.

Accordingly, it is aimed to test the following hypotheses.

$H_{1a}$: Response has a significant influence on alienation

$H_{1b}$: Commitment has a significant influence on alienation

$H_{1c}$: Recognition has a significant influence on alienation

$H_{1d}$: Support has a significant influence on alienation

$H_{1e}$: Standardization has a significant influence on alienation

$H_{1f}$: Structure has a significant influence on alienation

In this study, it is assumed that organizational climate is one of very important antecedent of destructive/negative deviance behavior. Fridslan et al. (2023) and Alias et al. (2018) found that organizational climate has a negative impact on deviance behaviors. Similarly, Erturk and Zıblım (2020) reported that teachers were a strong predictor of deviant behaviors. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

$H_2$: Organizational climate has a significant influence on deviant behaviours.

Within the scope of H2, the relationships between organizational climate components and the dimensions of negative deviance behaviors will be tested.

$H_{2a}$: Response has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2b}$: Commitment has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2c}$: Recognition has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2d}$: Support has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2e}$: Standardization has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2f}$: Structure has a significant influence on organizational deviance behaviors

$H_{2g}$: Response has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

$H_{2h}$: Commitment has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

$H_{2i}$: Recognition has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

$H_{2i}$: Support has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

$H_{2j}$: Standardization has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

$H_{2k}$: Structure has a significant influence on interpersonal deviance behaviors

One of the variables that the research focuses on is organizational deviance behaviors, especially destructive deviance behaviors. Organizational deviance is defined as voluntary actions that violate important organizational norms prescribed by formal and informal policies, rules and procedures and in doing so threaten the well-being or reputation of the organization and/or its members (Robinson and Bennett 1995; Bennett and Robinson, 2000). Destructive deviance behaviors can negatively affect the performance and productivity of organizations and even threaten the existence of organizations (Tian & Guo, 2023). Destructive deviance behaviors includes behaviors that harm individuals' work, workplace, other employees and organizations. There are results in the literature that there is a significant and positive relationship between alienation and destructive deviance behaviors (Kanten & Ülker, 2014; Li & Chen, 2018; Yıldız & Alpkan, 2015; Erdem, 2021; Ağalday, 2022). In other words, as the level of alienation increases, destructive deviance behaviors increase, and at the same time, a decrease in performance levels can be observed (García-Contreras et al., 2022; Kartal, 2018). In the study conducted by Duran and Bayar (2022), it was found that the concept of alienation was equated with the concepts of alienation, reluctance, dislike, coldness, powerlessness, alienation, depression, meaninglessness and aimlessness. Argon and Ekinci (2016) identified that the low level organizational deviant behaviors negatively affect teachers` level of adaptation to the school. Duran and Bayar (2022) listed the results of alienation from work as discontent-unhappiness, inefficiency, failure, asocial relations, insecurity, increase in supervision,

operational problems and resignation. Researches directly addressing alienation and deviance behaviors (Abd-Elrhaman et al., 2020; Contreras et al. 2022; Adibifar and Monson, 2020) indicate a significant and negative relationship between the two variables.

$H_3$: There is a significant relationship between alienation and organizational deviance factors.

$H_{3a}$: There is a significant relationship between alienation and organizational deviance factors.

$H_{3b}$: There is a significant relationship between alienation and interpersonal deviance factors.

Another hypothesis aims to understand the mediating effect of alienation between organizational climate components and negative deviance behaviors at individual and organizational levels. There are not many studies examining the mediating role of alienation in the relationship between organizational climate and deviance behaviors. On the other hand, the mediating effect of alienation in the relationship between some organizational climate components and deviance has been extensively researched. For example, Erdem (2021) reports that alienation has a mediating effect between democratic leadership type and deviance behavior. Li and Chen (2018) state that alienation has a mediating effect between psychological contract violation and deviance behaviors. Farahbakhsh et al. (2020) state that alienation mediates the effect of organizational climate on deviance behaviors.

Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed;

$H_4$: Alienation mediates the relationship between organizational climate and deviance behaviors.

## 3. Research Design and Data Collection

### 3.1. Scales

Although there are many separate studies examining the relationship between organizational climate and alienation, alienation and deviance behaviors, there is no study in the literature that investigates the effect of organizational climate on destructive behaviors through alienation. In order to fill this gap, the relationship between organizational climate and deviance behaviors has been examined within the framework of the phenomenon of alienation. Organizational climate, alienation and destructive deviance behaviors were measured with a seven-point Likert scale. In order to measure these three constructs, 53 questions were asked to the respondents. The organizational climate scale was developed by Stringer (2002) with 6 dimensions and 24 statements. Organizational climate dimensions; organizational structure, responsibility, recognition, support, standards and commitment. The organizational climate scale was translated into Turkish by Hocaniyazov (2008) and this translation was validated in studies conducted by Ergülen (2011) and Mumcu and Özyer (2020).

The scale developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000) was used to measure destructive deviant behaviors. The destructive deviant behavior scale has two dimensions, organizational and interpersonal, and 19 statements in total. The scale was adapted into Turkish by Tüzün et al. (2017). Tüzün et al. (2017) reported the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the organizational dimension deviance behaviors subscale as 0.84 and the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the interpersonal dimension deviance behaviors subscale as 0.82.

The alienation scale was developed by Hirschfeld and Field (2000); it is a one-dimensional scale with 10 items. The scale was translated into Turkish by Özbek (2011). In the related study, the Cronbach Alpha value of the scale was reported as 0.71.

Ethical approval of the study was obtained from Muğla University Ethics Committee on 21.12.2023 with Protocol No/Decision No: 230118/140.

### 3.2. Sample

The present study is a cross-sectional study conducted in Muğla Province in Turkey. Data were collected by random sampling technic from service sector; health, banking, education, transportation, tourism enterprises. Örneklem büyüklüğünün ne olması gerektiğine Gpower analizi yapılarak karar verilmiştir. GPower is designed for use in determining sample sizes in social and behavioral sciences (Faul et al., 2007). In the Gpower software, adjustments were made as $f^2=0.15$ (moderate), $\alpha=0.05$ and the power set at 80% (Gefen et al. 2011). Accordingly, the minimum sample size was determined as n=103.

After it was decided that enough pilot studies were conducted, the normal data collection process started and a total of 368 data were collected. After eliminating invalid questionnaires and discarding extreme outlier data, a valid dataset consisting of 274 questionnaires was created. To collect data, a structured questionnaire including demographic dimensions was distributed to the participants (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Demographics Characteristics

| Demographic Variables | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Age | | |
| Between (18 and 29) years | 118 | 43 |
| Between (30 and 39) years | 76 | 28 |
| Between (40 and 60) years | 80 | 29 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 126 | 46 |
| Female | 148 | 54 |
| Educational background | | |
| Secondary education | 2 | 1 |
| Higher secondary education | 27 | 9,5 |
| Associate degress | 59 | 21,5 |
| Bachelor degree | 134 | 49 |
| PG degree | 52 | 19 |
| Type of Industry | | |
| Private | 150 | 55 |
| Public | 124 | 45 |

**Source:** Authors' representation.

### 3.3. Research Tool

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to determine the relationships between organizational climate, alienation and destructive deviance behaviors. SEM is widely used in conducting validity analysis of scales and hypothesis testing (Loehlin, 2004; Sörbom, 1982). For this reason, SEM was used in the study to conduct confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and hypothesis testing. The dimensions for which confirmatory factor analysis was conducted within the scope of the scales used are listed in Table (2).

**Table 2.** Scales and item numbers

| Factors | Number of Items |
|---|---|
| **Organizational Climate (OC)** | |
| Response | 3items |
| Support | 5items |
| Structure | 4items |
| Recognition | 4items |
| Standarts | 4items |
| Commitment | 4items |
| **Alienation (AL)** | 10items |
| **Destructive Deviant Behaviors (DDB)** | |
| Organizational Level (OL_DDB) | 11items |
| Personal Level (PL_DDB) | 7items |

**Source:** Authors' representation.

### 4. Results

This section presents the results of the measurement model and the structural model. SmartPLS 4.0 software was used to test the CFA and structural model.

### 4.1. Measurement model

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) ensures accurate measurement before examining relationships between latent variables (Jöreskog, 1969). SEM models consist of two key parts; measurement model and structural model (Coulacoglou & Saklofske, 2017). Measurement model specifies the number of underlying factors, how individual indicators relate to these factors, and the connections between indicator errors (essentially a CFA model). Structural model defines how the various factors influence each other (e.g., through direct or indirect effects, or no relationship at all).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is a measurement model built on structural equation modeling. At first, factor loadings were checked within the scope of indicator reliability. In this context, factor loadings must meet the $\geq 0.708$ condition (Hair et al., 2010; Hair et al., 2022). After CFA, the measurement model consisted of 25 items. Seven items were validated for organizational climate, 10 items for alienation and 8 items for destructive deviance behavior (5 items for organizational level deviant behaviors, 3 for personal level deviant behaviors). Items with factor loadings less than 0.5 were removed (Hair et al., 2009). The factor loadings of the items vary between 0.618 and 0.941. Four statements (alien5, alien7, alien8, alien9) within the in alienation scale do not meet the above-mentioned condition ($0.678 < 0.708$) with a very small difference. However, Hair et al. (2022) state that items with factor loadings less than 0.70 should not be eliminated immediately unless the factor loadings are below 0.40. Therefore, the relevant itemse were not eliminated because of AVE value is above default value

Internal consistency was analyzed within the scope of the measurement model. In this context, composite reliability-CR (Jöreskog, 1971) and cronbach alpha values were evaluated. CR values should be between 0.60-0.70 (Jöreskog 1971; Bagozzi & Yi, 1991; Hair et. al. 2014). and cronbach alpha value should be greater than 0.70 (Nunnally,1978; Cortina, 1993). In this scope, it is seen that each construct meets these values. As a result, it was decided that the measurement model had sufficient internal consistency.

**Table 3.** Factor Loadings

| Construct | Latent Variables | Observed Variables | Factor Loadings | Cronbach Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE | Rho_A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Climate | Commitment | commitment1 | 0.917 | | | | |
| | | commitment2 | 0.814 | 0.936 | 0.936 | 0.786 | 0.938 |
| | | commitment3 | 0.895 | | | | |
| | | commitment4 | 0.911 | | | | |
| | Recognition | recog1 | 0.886 | | | | |
| | | recog2 | 0.862 | 0.875 | 0.878 | 0.706 | 0.882 |
| | | recog4 | 0.768 | | | | |
| Negative Deviant Organizational Behaviors | Organizational Level Negative Deviant Behavior | orgdev2 | 0.728 | | | | |
| | | orgdev3 | 0.799 | | | | |
| | | orgdev6 | 0.941 | 0.902 | 0.904 | 0.654 | 0.912 |
| | | orgdev8 | 0.842 | | | | |
| | | orgdev11 | 0.713 | | | | |
| | Personal Level Negative Deviant Behavior | persdev2 | 0.933 | | | | |
| | | persdev4 | 0.910 | 0.909 | 0.912 | 0.776 | 0.917 |
| | | persdev6 | 0.793 | | | | |
| Alienation | | alien1 | 0.882 | | | | |
| | | alien2 | **0.599** | | | | |
| | | alien3 | 0.768 | | | | |
| | | alien4 | 0.808 | | | | |
| | | alien5 | **0.681** | | | | |
| | | alien6 | 0.807 | 0.920 | 0.919 | 0.536 | 0.926 |
| | | alien7 | **0.618** | | | | |
| | | alien8 | **0.627** | | | | |
| | | alien9 | **0.682** | | | | |
| | | alien10 | 0.791 | | | | |

Covergent validity was evaluated by examining AVE values. AVE values are above the threshold value of 0.50 (Hair et. al., 2022; Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Table 3. shows that AVE values vary between 0.536 and 0.786. Anderson & Gerbing (1988) and Dunn et al. (1994), have proposed evaluating convergent validity by analyzing the statistical significance of standardized factor loadings. All factor loadings were found to be significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, the convergent validity was judged to be satisfactory.

In the discriminant validity assessment, cross loadings values were first used to determine whether there were overlapping factors. Once it is understood that there is no overlapping substance than Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion and the HTMT (Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio) criteria as proposed by Henseler et al. (2015) were used to assess discriminant validity.

According to the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion, the square root of the average variance explained (AVE) values of the constructs in the study should be higher than the correlations between the constructs in the study. Table 4 shows the analysis results based on the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion.

**Table 4.** Fornell and Larcker Criterion

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alienation | 0.732 |  |  |  |  |
| Commitment | -0.013 | 0.887 |  |  |  |
| Orgdev | 0.656 | -0.150 | 0.809 |  |  |
| Persondev | 0.560 | -0.074 | 0.781 | 0.881 |  |
| Recognition | -0.300 | 0.807 | -0.366 | -0.314 | 0.840 |

In the discriminant validity assessment, HTMT was evaluated and it was seen that the values indicating that each construct was discriminated were below the accepted threshold values. As can be seen from Table 5, all HTMT values are below the threshold value of 0.90 (Henseler et. al., 2015).

**Table 5.** Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alienation | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Commitment | 0.137 |  |  |  |  |
| Orgdev | 0.656 | 0.174 |  |  |  |
| Persondev | 0.557 | 0.108 | 0.782 |  |  |
| Recognition | 0.301 | 0.808 | 0.371 | 0.314 | 1 |

The model fit values given within the scope of PLS-SEM are the SRMR value, which should be higher than the threshold value of 0.080, and the NFI values, which should be higher than the threshold value of 0.90. In our study, SRMR value was 0.072 and NFI value was 0.81. Portela (2012) states that when the NFI is above 0.80, the structure has sufficient fit. Therefore, it was reconfirmed that the confirmatory factor analysis result had an adequate fit.

Finally, as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, only the commitment and recognition dimensions of the organizational climate dimensions were significantly validated. Although the original scale included 6 dimensions, only commitment and recognition dimensions met the reliability and validity thresholds in CFA and were retained. Response and standardization dimensions were validated with one observed value each. The other dimensions were excluded from the model as they did not meet the reliability/validity and discrimination criteria. For this reason, many hypotheses established with the organizational climate components mentioned above could not be tested within the scope of the study.

### 4.2. Structural model assessment

In the structural model, we analyzed the $R^2$ (coefficient of determination), $Q^2$ (predictive relevance), and estimated the path coefficients (Hair et al., 2022).

**Table 6.** Results in PLS-SEM

| Hypothesis | Path | Std beta | Std error | t-value | 95% BCa CI | P Values | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1b | commitment -> alienation | 0.689 | 0.148 | 4.647 | [0.416;1.002] | 0.000 | Supported |
| H1c | recognition -> alienation | -0.856 | 0.138 | 6.204 | [-1.157;-0,614] | 0.000 | Supported |
| H2b | commitment -> orgdev | 0.003 | 0.150 | 0.017 | [-0.293;0.296] | 0.987 | Rejected |
| H2c | recognition -> orgdev | -0.188 | 0.172 | 1.089 | [-0.528; 0.148] | 0.276 | Rejected |
| H2h | commitment -> perdev | 0.198 | 0.167 | 1.182 | [-0.111;0.547] | 0.237 | Rejected |
| H2ı | recognition -> perdev | -0.335 | 0.197 | 1.702 | [-0.738;0.031] | 0.089 | Rejected |
| H3a | alienation -> orgdev | 0.600 | 0.081 | 7.370 | [0.426;0.746] | 0.000 | Supported |
| H3b | alienation -> perdev | 0.459 | 0.093 | 4.825 | [0.265;0.631] | 0.000 | Supported |

| Alienation→$R^2$ = 0.256, $Q^2\_predict$ = 0.062 |
| Orgdev→$R^2$ = 0.462, $Q^2\_predict$ = 0.274 |
| Perdev→$R^2$ = 0.348, $Q^2\_predict$ = 0.238 |

First, we hypothesized that there is a positive and significant association between organizational climate and deviant behaviors. As shown in Table 6, the two elements of organizational climate commitment and recognition influences alienation. Both commitment and recognition component of organizational climate has significant influence on alienation and H1 (H1$_b$: There is a significant relationship between commitment and alienation; H1$_c$: There is a significant relationship between recognition and alienation) has been admitted. It is seen that commitment (β = 0.689, t = 4.826, p < .001) recognition (β = -0.856, t = 6.370, p < .001) dimensions of organizational climate are effective in explaining alienation. In addition, alienation was found to be effective on negative deviance behaviors at the organizational (β = 0.600, t = 7.370, p < .001) and personal level (β = 0.459, t = 4.825, p < .001). In other words, the hypotheses "H3$_a$: There is a significant relationship between alieanation and negative organizational deviance factors" and "H3$_b$: There is a significant relationship between alienation and negative personal deviance factors" are accepted.

### 4.3. Results on the mediating role of alienation

The mediation model is explained using the mediation typology developed by Zhao et al. (2010). Zhao et al. (2010) state that the first condition specified by Baron and Kenny (1986), which is a significant relationship between the dependent and independent variable, is not necessary in the analysis of the mediation effect.

First, it is examined whether the indirect effect is significant. The results show that commitment→alienation→organizational negative deviance (β = 0.413, t = 4.030, p < .001), commitment→alienation→personal negative deviance (β = 0.316, t = 3.402, p < .001), recognition→alienation→organizational negative deviance (β = -0.513, t = 5.000, p < .001), recognition→alienation→personal negative deviance (β = -0.393, t = 4.030, p < .001) indirect effect is significant.

After this stage, it was examined whether the direct effect was significant or not. Accordingly, the relationship between commitment, recognition dimensions and negative deviance dimensions was found to be insignificant. The nonsignificance of these relationships indicates full mediation.

### 5. Result

The obtained results reveal that organizational climate factors such as commitment and recognition are effective on alienation. On the other hand, it is a surprising result that commitment affects alienation from the organization. Contrary to the general expectation, according to the results obtained, paradoxically, while commitment increases, alienation increases at the same time. The questions in the commitment scale do not have any details about the type of commitment the respondents are in. A calculative or normative commitment suggests that commitment to the organization may be conditioned by certain interests or as a moral obligation. It is thought that the fact that commitment is an obligation should also be considered in the simultaneous increase of commitment and alienation.

Meyer and Allen (1991), based on Marsh and Mannari's (1977) definition of commitment as "individuals feel that it is morally right to stay with the company regardless of how much status increase or satisfaction the organization has provided them over the years", state that commitment can emerge as a moral obligation. In the same study by Meyer and Allen (1991), referring to Wiener's (1982) definition ("the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way in which meets organizational goals and interests"), they underline that individuals may have a moral obligation to be committed. Meyer and Allen (1991) as well as Etzioni (1961) described alienating involvement with the metaphor of a prison where a coercive system of obedience is prevalent. As stated by Penley and Gould (1988), the absence of alternative jobs makes it necessary for individuals to be loyal to the organization and increases alienation. The rate of the subjects in the study working in the private and public sectors is almost the same.

When the correlation analyses were analyzed, it was observed that the relationship between commitment and alienation was negative in public sector employees, while this relationship was positive in private sector employees. This situation indicates that even if individuals are alienated from their workplace, they are obliged to maintain their commitment status or their emotional states related to commitment. In addition, this situation suggests that committed individuals may react more towards alienation in some negative situations. Bucher et al. (2024) also found that alienation attitudes of individuals were positively correlated with engagement levels in a study conducted on employees of digital micro work platforms. Bucher et al. (2024) state that due to their long history of activity on the platform, individuals are strongly invested in the system and may feel trapped and restricted, which may increase alienation. This situation has been previously discussed in the organizational commitment literature with the concept of alienative commitment (Penley and Gold, 1988). Penley and Gold

(1988) state that this type of commitment develops when job alternatives are perceived to be limited. In such a situation, individuals tend to continue their existence in the organization compulsorily. It should be taken into account that a significant part of the sample consists of public employees.Especially in countries like Turkey, where job alternatives are scarce, a significant portion of public employees may show alienative commitment tendencies (Usman et al., 2021). As a matter of fact, although the public sector in Turkey expresses many problems regarding undesired working conditions and low salaries, they continue to work in the public sector at a significant rate.

On the other hand, a significant inverse relationship was found between recognition and alienation, which is the organizational climate component related to recognition; in other words, as recognition increases, alienation decreases. When recognition is lacking or the reward system is perceived as unfair, employees may feel worthless and alienated (Ghaleb, 2024). One of the results obtained within the scope of the study related to recognition is that alienation has an indirect effect between recognition and organizational and personal deviance behaviors. Similarly, Bajaj (1982) stated that if individuals are not appreciated, they may prefer normlessness, which is a dimension of alienation, in other words, not conforming to the norms of the community.

In addition to the relationship between organizational climate and alienation, alienation has a positive effect on negative deviance behaviors. While commitment and recognition do not have a direct effect on alienation, it has been determined that negative organizational deviance behaviors increase as alienation increases (Li & Chen, 2018; Uysal, 2018). Individuals' alienation from the organization increases their likelihood of exhibiting negative deviance behaviors towards the organization and the individuals they work with. In addition, the mediating role of alienation between the identified organizational climate dimensions and negative deviance behaviors was also determined. When the literature was reviewed, this result was considered to be a unique result. Accordingly, it is concluded that the alienating effect of organizational climate increases employees' negative deviance behaviors.

The results obtained at the end of the study show that especially commitment and recognition are effective on alienation, and alienation is effective on organizational and personal deviance behaviors. It was also found that alienation has an indirect effect between the mentioned organizational climate factors and deviance behaviors. The relationships between these variables have not been sufficiently investigated in the literature. Therefore, the results obtained are considered to be original. Especially the alienative commitment of the public sector and the alienation tendencies that develop accordingly have been remarkable among the results of the study. This situation comes to mind as an issue worthy of further research on the relationship of personnel in different contexts with their work and how alienation and deviance behaviors emerge accordingly. Indeed, some research (Jernigan & Beggs, 2015) suggests that such relationships can occur across the public-private divide, or even across different lines of business within the public sector. Therefore, it is thought that researching the issue in different contexts such as public and private will contribute to the literature.

# References

Abd-Elrhaman, E. A., Helal, W. H., & ArabyEbraheem, S. M. (2020). Organizational justice, work alienation and deviant behaviors among staff nurses. *International Journal of Nursing Didactics, 10*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.15520/ijnd.v10i01.2790

Adibifar, K., & Monson, M. (2020). Workplace subjective alienation and ındividuals' well-being. *Journal of Economic Development Environment, 9*(3), 22-37. https://doi.org/10.26458/jedep.v9i3.669

Agarwal, S. (1993). Influence of formalization on role stress, organizational commitment, and work alienation of salespersons: A cross-national comparative study. *Journal of International Business Studies, 24*, 715–739. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490252

Ahmad, K., Jasimuddin, S., & Kee, W. (2018). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: do employees' personalities matter? *Management Decision, 56*(2), 421-440. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-10-2016-0713

Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1966). Organizational alienation: A comparative analysis. *American Sociological Review, 31*(4), 497-507. https://doi.org/10.2307/2090773

Akşit Aşık, N. (2018). Örgüt iklimi ve işe yabancılaşma ilişkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(1), 29-41.

Alias, M., Wai, C. K., Ahmad, Z., & Azim, A. M. (2018). Workplace deviant behavior among malaysia hotel employees. Does organizational factors matter. *An International Journal Of Engineering & Technology, 7*(4), 960–964. https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.38.27617

Amzulescu, G., & Butucescu, A. (2021). The role of work alienation in the relationship between perceived organizational ınjustice and counterproductive work behaviors. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane, 19*(1), 56-66. https://doi.org/10.24837/pru.v19i1.487

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411–423.

Argon, T., & Ekinci, S. (2016). İlk ve ortaokul öğretmenlerinin örgütsel özdeşleşme ve örgütsel sinizm düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri. *AAbant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411

Ağalday, B. (2022). Examining the effect of principals' ınclusive leadership practices on organizational hypocrisy through the mediating role of trust in principal. *Participatory Educational Research, 9*(5), 204-221. https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.111.9.5

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1991). Multitrait-multimethod matrices in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 17*(4), 426–439. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1057-7408(08)80022-8

Bajaj, P. (1982). Alienation as related to perception of organizational climate. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 17*(4), 563-572.

Banai, M., Reisel, W. D., & Probst, T. M. (2004). A managerial and personal control model: predictions of work alienation and organizational commitment in Hungary. *Journal of International Management, 10*(3), 375-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2004.05.002

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 349-360. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and freedom: The factory worker and his industry.* Chicago: Chicago U. Press.

Bohórquez, E., Pérez, M., Benavides, A., & Pérez, E. (2023). Organizational climate and its ımportance for organizational success: A literature review. A. Mesquita, A. Abreu, J. Carvalho, & C. de Mello içinde, *Perspectives and Trends in Education and Technology . Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies* (s. 441-450). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-6585-2_39

Bolin, A., & Heatherly, L. (2001). Predictors of employee deviance: The relationship between bad attitudes and bad behavior. *Journal of Business and Psychology*(15), 405–418. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007818616389

Bowen, D. E., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM-firm performance linkages: The role of the "strength" of the HRM system. *The Academy of Management Review, 29*(2), 203–221. https://doi.org/10.2307/20159029

Bucher, E., Fieseler, C., Lutz, C., & Buhmann, A. (2024). Professionals, purpose-seekers, and passers-through: How microworkers reconcile alienation and platform commitment through identity work. *New Media & Society, 26*(1), 190-215. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211056863

Campbell, J., Dunnette, M., Lawler, E., & Weick, K. (1970). *Managerial Behavior, Performance and Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Chernyak-Hai, L., & Tziner, A. (2014). Relationships between counterproductive work behavior, perceived justice and climate, occupational status, and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2014a1

Chiaburu, D. S., Thundiyil, T., & Jiexin Wang. (2014). Alienation and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *European Management Journal, 32*(1), 24-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2013.06.003

Contreras, R. G., Munoz-Chavez, J. P., Muñoz-Chávez, R. L., Lezama-ón, E., & Barrios-Quiroz, H. (2022). Work alienation, deviant workplace behavior and performance in public sector. *Sustainability, 14*(17), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710490

Cooke, R. A., & Rousseau, D. M. (1988). Behavioral norms and expectations: A quantitative approach to the assessment of organizational culture. *Group & Organization Management, 13*(3), 245-273. https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118801300302

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of applied psychology, 78*(1), 98-104. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.78.1.98

Coulacoglou, C., & Saklofske, D. H. (2017). Advances in theoretical, developmental, and cross-cultural perspectives of psychopathology. C. Coulacoglou, & D. H. Saklofske içinde, *Psychometrics and Psychological Assessment.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-802219-1.00011-0

Çelik, G. G. (2023). Örgüt ikliminin işe yabancılaşmaya etkisi: Beyaz yakalı çalışanlar açısından bir inceleme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 24*, 158-172. https://doi.org/10.53443/anadoluibfd.1217967

Çetinkaya, A. Ş., & Güleç, G. (2022). İşletmelerde örgüt iklimi: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması. *Marmara Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 44*(22), 357-381. https://doi.org/10.14780/muiibd.1225240

Dajani, M., & Mohamad, M. S. (2017). Perceived organisational ınjustice and counterproductive behaviour: The mediating role of work alienation evidence from the egyptian public sector. *International Journal of Business and Management, 12*(5), 192-201. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n5p192

Demirez, F., & Tosunoğlu, N. (2017). Örgüt ikliminin işe yabancılaşma üzerine etkisi: Gazi Üniversitesi rektörlüğünde bir araştırma. *Journal of Business Research Turk, 9*(2), 69-88. https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2017.262

Downey, H., Hellriegel, D., Phelps, M., & Slocum, J. W. (1974). Organizational climate and job satisfaction: a comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Research, 2*(3), 233-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(74)90001-0

Dunn, S. C., Seaker, R. F., & Waller, M. A. (1994). Latent variables in business logistics research: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Logistics, 15*(2), 145-172.

Duran, E., & Bayar, A. (2022). Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin İşe Yabancılaşma Kavramına İlişkin Algıları. *Avrasya Sosyal ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi (ASEAD), 9*(2), 310-328.

Ehrhart, M. G., Schneider, B., & Macey, W. H. (2014). *Organizational climate and culture: An introduction to theory, research, and practice.* New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315857664

Erdem, A. T. (2021). The mediating role of work alienation in the effect of democratic and autocratic leadership styles on counterproductive behaviors: a study in Ankara OSTİM industrial zone. *OPUS, 17*(34), 873-902. https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.839136

Ergülen, G. K. (2017). *Influence of Leader-Member Exchange Quality on Organizational Attachment Around the Organizational Climate Perspective in Family-Owned Business.* İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü [Unpublished master's thesis].

Erturk, A., & Zıblım, L. (2020). Is the perception of organizational deviation affected by the organizational climate? Research in schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 20*(85), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.85.1

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations: On Power, Involvement, and Their Correlates.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe. https://doi.org/10.2307/2148419

Farahbakhsh, A., Salajeghe, S., & Ziaaddini, M. (2020). Educational method to investigate the relationship between organizational climate and deviant behaviors with the mediation of job alienation variable (case study: national Iranian copper industries company). *Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação, 13*(32), 1-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v13i32.13179

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A., & A., B. (2007). G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146

Forehand, G. A., & Von Haller, G. (1964). Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 6*, 261_382. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0045960

Fornell, C., & Larcker D., F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18* (1), 39-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

Fridslan, U., Anindita, R., & Mustikawati, I. S. (2023). Perceived organizational support in mediating organizational climate and workplace conflict against workplace deviant behavior in type-d hospitals in Konawe Kepulauan. *Devotion Journal of Community Service, 4*(10), 1959-1967. https://doi.org/10.59188/devotion.v4i10.576

García-Contreras, R., Muñoz-Chávez, J. P., Muñoz-Chávez, R. L., Lezama-León, E., & Barrios-Quiroz, H. (2022). Work alienation, deviant workplace behavior and performance in public sector. *Sustainability, 14*(17), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710490

Gaunya, C. R. (2016). Organizational climate as a determinant of job satisfaction among public sector employees in Kisii county, Kenya. *Journal of Resources Development and Management, 23*, 47-53.

Gaziel, H. H., & Weiss, I. (1990). School bureaucratic structure, locus of control and alienation among primary schoolteachers. *Research in Education, 44*(1), 55-66. https://doi.org/10.1177/003452379004400105

Gefen, D., Rigdon, E. E., & Straub, D. (2011). An update and extension to sem guidelines for administrative. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 35*, 359-372. https://doi.org/10.2307/23044042

Gençer Çelik, G. (2023). Örgüt ikliminin işe yabancılaşmaya etkisi: Beyaz yakalı çalışanlar açısından bir inceleme. *Anadolu Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 24* (3), 158-172. https://doi.org/10.53443/anadoluibfd.1217967

Ghaleb, B. D. (2024). The concept of alienation and alienation in organizations. *Pancasila International Journal of Applied Social Science, 2*(2), 206-223. https://doi.org/10.59653/pancasila.v2i02.714

Jernigan, E., & Beggs, J.M. (2015). An Examination of Work Attitudes of Public Sector Employees. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 19*, 103-117. https://www.proquest.com/openview/685a87d3d1cea93e9183253e3d31a560/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=38870

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd edition).* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publishing.

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review, 6*(2), 106-121. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis (7th Edition).* New York: Pearson.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115-135. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

Hirschfeld, R. R., & Feild, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(7), 789–800. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7%3C789::AID-JOB59%3E3.0.CO;2-W

Hocaniyazov, A. (2008). *Ağırlama işletmelerinde örgütsel iklim ve liderlik* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Jianwei, Z., & Liu, Y. (2010). Organizational climate and its effects on organizational variables: An empirical study. *International Journal of Psychological Studies, 2*(2), 189-201. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v2n2p189

Joreskog, K. G. (1969). A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 32*(2), 183–202. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02289343

Joreskog, K. G. (1971). Simultaneous factor analysis in several populations. *Psychometrika, 36*(4), 409–426. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02291366

Joy, M. M., & VG, B. (2016). The impact of perceived organizational support on counterproductive work behaviors – an empirical study in Indian information technology sector. *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management, 5*(4), 58-63.

Kakabadse, A. (1986). Organizational alienation and job climate: A comparative study of structural conditions and psychological adjustment. *Small Group Behavior, 17*(4), 458-471. https://doi.org/10.1177/104649648601700406

Kalemci, R., Kalemci-Tuzun, I., & Ozkan-Canbolat, E. (2019). Employee deviant behavior: role of culture and organizational relevant support. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics, 28*(2), 126-141. https://doi.org/10.1108/ejmbe-11-2018-0125

Kamp, J., & Brooks, P. (1991). Perceived organizational climate and employee counterproductivity. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 5*(4), 447-458. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01014494

Kang, J. H., Matusik, J. G., Kim, T.-Y., & Phillips, J. M. (2016). Interactive effects of multiple organizational climates on employee innovative behavior in entrepreneurial firms: A cross-level investigation,. *Journal of Business Venturing, 31*(6), 628-642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2016.08.002

Kanten, P., & Ülker, F. (2014). Yönetim tarzının üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarına etkisinde işe yabancılaşmanın aracılık rolü. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*(32), 16-40.

Kartal, N. (2018). Evaluating the relationship between work engagement, work alienation and work performance of healthcare professionals. *International Journal of Healthcare Management, 11*(3), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.7176/jhmn/80-06

Li, S., & Chen, Y. (2018). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effect of organizational cynicism and work alienation. *Frontiers Psychology, 9*(1273), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01273

Lipińska-Grobelny, A. (2021). Organizational climate and counterproductive work behaviors - the moderating role of gender. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health, 34*(4), 513-525. https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.01623

Loehlin, J. C. (2004). *Latent variable models: An introduction to factor, path, and structural analysis (3rd ed).* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609823

Maqbool, S., Mohamed Ismail, S. A., & Maqbool, S. (2020). Organizational climate and job satisfaction in 21st century higher educational institutes. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 8*(4), 577–586. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8457

Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A prediction study. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391746

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v6-i12/2464

Miller, G. A. (1967). Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. *Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers, 32*(5), 755–768. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092023

Mumcu, A., & Özyer, K. (2021). Örgüt ikliminin örgütsel sinizm üzerindeki etkisinde lider - üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 19*(39), 63-94. https://doi.org/10.35408/comuybd.683576

Nair, N., & Vohra, N. (2010). An exploration of factors predicting work alienation of knowledge workers. *Management Decision, 48*(4), 600–615. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741011041373

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Özbek, M. F. (2011). Örgüt içerisindeki güven ve işe yabancılaşma ilişkisinde örgüte uyum sağlamanın aracı rolü. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 16*(1), 231-248.

Penley, L. E., & Gould, S. (1989). Etzioni's model of organizational ınvolvement: A perspective for understanding commitment to organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9*(1), 43-59. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030090105

Portela, D. M. P. (2012). Contributo das técnicas de análise fatorial para o estudo do programa *Ocupação Científica de Jovens nas Férias,* Universidade Aberta

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journa, 38*(2), 555–572. https://doi.org/10.5465/256693

Sörbom, D. (1982). Structural equation models with structured means. K. Jöreskog, & H. Wold içinde, *Systems under indirect observation.* Amsterdam. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811265990_0010

Sarros, J. C., Tanewski, G. A., Winter, R. P., Santora, J. C., & Densten, I. L. (2002). Work alienation and organizational leadership. *British Journal of Management, 13*(2), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00247

Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. G., & Macey, W. H. (2013). Organizational climate and culture. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 361–388. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.013.3

Seeman, M. (1959). On The Meaning of Alienation. *American Sociological Review, 24*(6), 783–791. https://doi.org/10.2307/2088565

Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Heijden, B. I., & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 100*, 67-77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.004

Steinke, C., Dastmalchian, A., & Baniasadi, Y. (2015). Exploring aspects of workplace climates in Canada: implications for the human resources of health-care. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 53*, 415–431. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12082

Stringer, R. A. (2002). *Leadership and organizational climate : The cloud chamber effect.* Upper Saddle River, N.J: Prentice Hall.

Sunman, G. (2021). Intermediation role of job alienation in the relationship between job stress and cyberloafing behaviour. *Socrates Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Studies, 7*(13), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.51293/socrates.123

Tanyolaç, C. (2020). Antecedents and consequences of workplace deviance: An Assessment and suggestions for future studies. *Anadolu İktisat Ve İşletme Dergisi, 4*(1), 35-48.

Tian, X., & Guo, Y. (2023). The effect of deviant workplace behavior on job performance: The mediating role of organizational shame and moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Behavioral Sciences, 13-7*, 548-561. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13070561

Tuzun, I. K., Çetin, F., & Basım, H. N. (2017). Deviant employee behavior in the eyes of colleagues: the role of organizational support and self-efficacy. *Eurasian Economic Review, 7*(7), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40821-016-0061-5

Usman M., Ali M., Mughal F., & Agyemang-Mintah, P. (2021). Policy Alienation and Street-level Bureaucrats' Psychological Wellbeing: The Mediating Role of Alienative Commitment, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(2), 278–294, https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa043

Uysal, H. (2018). The relationship between psychological contract breach and employees' counterproductive work behaviors: The mediating effect of organizational cynicism and work alienation. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01273

Uysal, H. T. (2018). Çalışanlarda İşe yabancılaşmanın üretkenlik karşıtı iş davranışlarına etkisi. *BMIJ, 6*(4), 1434-1454. https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v6i4.405

Viitala, R., Tanskanen, J., & Säntti, R. (2015). The connection between organizational climate and well-being at work. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 23*(4), 606-620. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoa-10-2013-0716

Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organization: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review, 7* (3), 418-428. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1982.4285349

Yildiz, B., & Alpkan, L. (2015). A theoretical model on the proposed predictors of destructive deviant workplace behaviors and

the mediator role of alienation. *4th International Conference on Leadership, Technology, Innovation and Business Management* (s. 330-338). İstanbul: Yıldız Technical University. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.373

Zahid, A., & Nauman, S. (2024). Does workplace incivility spur deviant behaviors: roles of interpersonal conflict and organizational climate. *Personnel Review, 53*(1), 247-265. https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-01-2022-0058

Zhang, J., & Liu, Y. (2010). Organizational Climate and its effects on organizational variables: An empirical study. *International Journal of Psychological Studie, 2*(2), 189-201. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v2n2p189

Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(2), 197–206. https://doi.org/10.1086/651257