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Abstract
Organizational analgesics conceptualized by the author of this study can be defined as suppressing, mitigating or calming the organizational pains through various temporary initiatives on the basis of focusing only the symptoms instead of searching, finding out, and removing the root causes that bring about the pains. Introducing a new concept to the management science, this study aimed mainly to develop a valid scale for measuring the level of usage of organizational analgesics. 33 bachelor and graduate students participated in the preliminary scale development studies. The other analyses were conducted with 207 bachelor and graduate students from Harran University in the academic year of 2014-2015 in Turkey. The results revealed that the scale consisted of 24 items taken place in three factors entitled aims, management, and leadership. Content validity, descriptive statistics, Chronbach’s Alpha coefficients, exploring and confirming factor analyses, and also discriminant validity studies confirmed the validity and reliability of the scale. Based on the results, this study has the implication that the organizations and researchers can determine and evaluate the usage of the organizational analgesics, find out potential risks threaten the life of organizations, and conduct next studies in the management science.
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Introduction

Organizational Analgesics

Analgesic is defined by Merriam-Webster dictionary as “a drug that relieves pain”. It stops you from feeling pain (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2015). Namely, analgesics hinder the nerve impulses derived from the painful element of the body, or hinder the nerve impulses which direct to the section of the brain that is responsible for perceiving pain. Consequently, the analgesics used mostly in the medicine are administrated to kill the pain that the organism feels. As humans, most of us used an analgesic drug at least one time in our life. But we feel mostly their benefits in a short time. In particular, as the pain is nontemporal or is a result of a considerable disease, the analgesics may be ineffective to relieve it, even feeling the side effects can be inevitable. Despite safety of over-the-counter analgesics used primarily for the headaches, other specific pains and febrile illness, abuse of them causes serious side effects (Abbott & Fraser, 1998). The overdose damages the liver and can cause death (BBC, 2015).

More specifically, abuse or side effects of analgesics can damage the nervous system, sensory system, psychological, endocrine, gastrointestinal, urinary tract, sexual function, death, teratogenicity, gastrointestinal problems, nervousness, dizziness, drowsiness, liver damage, psychological distress, toxic effects, mortality, cardiovascular adverse event, skin reaction, asthma, constipation, tiredness/fatigue, hallucinations, nausea, vomiting etc. (Sloot et al., 2015; Roberts et al., 2015; Aronson, 2014; Abbott & Fraser, 1998); lack of information about jobs, fear of rejection, lack of support system (Hong, Polanin, Key, & Choi, 2014).

Like the biological systems, the today’s organization can be accepted as a social system based on the autopoiesis term that refers to reproducing itself. As living bodies, the sociological realities encompass the cells, neurophysiologic systems, immune systems and
etc. In addition, the social systems do not solely change their structure; its self-reference seems in the production of other components referred a decisive componential innovation (Luhmann, 1986).

More important, usage of analgesic can be useless if the pain is not a cause of temporary situation. Maintaining this approach insistently even unconsciously may damage the organs of the organizations. In particular, if a symptom of the pain is the cause of a disease it can disseminate and become intensified. Thus, when approached from a living system perspective, immune system of organizations can play an effective role to cope or prevent a disease appeared as a pain symptom. As organizations do nothing, except trust their immune system and/or use analgesics to cope with the symptom, it can be said that there will be considerable risks for them, even not for only them but also for their environments.

When considered that the effects of the analgesics used in medicine, the organizational analgesics can be defined as suppressing, mitigating or calming the organizational pains through various temporary initiatives, instead of searching, finding out, and removing the root causes which bring about the related pains. The usage of organizational analgesics as a term can be associated implicitly with the organizations that adopt the classic organizational theories, conservative organizational habits, and ignore the organizational facts such as climate, culture, entropy, conflict, and informal groups. More explanations can be given as follows:

The classical organizations see the employees as the interchangeable parts of a machine. These organizations focus on to achieve production-related and economic goals, make systematic researches to find out one best way to organize for production, and try to maximize the production through specialization and division of labor. Further, using the rationale economic principles they approach to the people. In particular, the classical approaches to the organization assumed that there were universally applicable principles for each organization (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2015). To maximize the efficiency of the organizations, the Taylorist approach was adopted in the early educational administration. But its excessive rational or technical point of view to the organization caused to little attention to human elements (English, 2006). Similarly, the big weakness of the bureaucratic organizations is inflexibility to change. For that, through order, procedure, and consistency they adopt to be stable and predictable process (Hales, 2001). Likewise, Engel (1970) demonstrated that professionals in the highly bureaucratic setting were least likely to perceive themselves as autonomous.

Entropy, which means that the organizations will fall and die, occur early or late in the organizations. Open systems can acquire entropy because they store much more energy from their environment than they consume. For that, the organizations should prevent the entropy and make effort to stop it (Can, 2005). At this point, transforming into dramatically different organizations has been a necessity for many organizations to cope with new difficulties in the environment (Daft, 2001). Reorganizing itself has been a continuous process for today’s complex organizations. They cannot made considerable progress with traditional structures (Drucker, 1974). From the system perspective, it is required to focus on the problems emerging from the interrelations, interdependence, and structure of the parts of the organizational systems, instead to focus on the static properties of them (Can, 2005).

Informal organization, which consists of the interrelations of the people and groups, has been a reality for the formal organization. Informal organization in educational organizations consists of many groups, creates important interactive structures, increases cooperation, and contributes to achieve the organizational aims. However, if the administrator winces and opposes the informal organizations, the informal organization has a negative effect on the process and climate of the formal organization (Bursalioglu, 2012). In turn, the administrator
who ignores the informal organization, use organizational analgesics to cope with its reflection.

There are typical expressions in all organizations such as “Well, you can’t get away with that”; “They won’t work together on that”; “There will be friction that we can’t handle or control”. These cause lack of collaboration and to abandon the possible achievements even though we know very well how to enable people to work willingly for common purposes. In turn, breaking the confidence in sincerity and integrity of management is a considerable reason for having limited accomplishments in an organization (Barnard, 2004). In this regard, it can be said that the organizations that lack of confidence sincerity and integrity of management use the organizational analgesics to cope with the challenges emerging from the expressions mentioned above.

The research shows that the climate of the organization is more functional than its structure in educational organizations. In particular, when comparing the industrial organizations, the certain analysis and definition of the work cannot be made in educational organizations because advancing the work specialization is not available for education (Bursalioglu, 2012). Moreover, it can be said that occurring the conflict in the organizations is inevitable. Because the organizations are the structures consisted of the human behaviors. Classic organization theorists accepted that the conflict was an undesirable fact such as irrational, defeatism, and subversion. According to them, the organization should avoid from the conflict. Conversely, the modern organizations see that it is a natural fact, and, to a certain extent, is useful for development of the organization. In this regard, the temporal methods such as avoiding, connivance, softening, using authority, determining a common enemy are ineffective to remove the conflict (Can, 2005). In turn, applying these methods means to use the organizational analgesics.

Organizational Pains

When considered the pain as a reality of the biological system, it can be argued that today’s organizations feel the pains as the living systems do. In this regard, we can say that the organizations feel occasionally various pains, and relive them through various choices such as using analgesics and/or other treatment tools. In terms of usage of the organizational analgesics, it is valuable to examine whether or not the organizations (a) use available dose, (b) use in an available duration, (c) use only to relieve the symptoms of the pain instead of searching main reasons of them and using effective tools for the start of treatment process.

Organization consists of mainly purpose, structure, process, climate, culture and leadership (Bursalioglu, 2010; Hoy and Miskel, 2012). In this regard, it can be said that the pains can occur in these elements of organization. The literature also has shown a wide range of pains or complaints related to these elements of organization. In turn, according to these elements, analyzing of the pains of organization will enlighten the understanding of the problem statement of this study.

Common purpose is one of the compulsory elements of organization. This also can be accepted as a survival issue for sustaining the existence of organization (Barnard, 1968). Common purpose presents unity and identity to the organization (Ackoff, 1971). Consequently, it can be said that if there is no purpose there will be no organization. In addition, purposes of organization should be clear, comprehensible, and coherent with staff needs. Otherwise, many complaints can occur in organization if the purposes are not clear or do not care about both organization and stakeholders’ needs.

Moreover, the organizational pains can occur due to the poorly structured problems (Meczynska, Kmieciak, Michna, & Flajszok, 2014), the legitimacy of the status quo ante, the
legitimacy of society's transaction structure, the problem of social order (Avio, 2002), the organization models designed harshly and not based on the purposes.

Furthermore, the organizational pains can appear because of the unfair or unreasonable administrative decisions, conduct or behavior (The State of Queensland, 2015); financial management, budget issues (Zhang, 2014); the problems of managing the risks in terms of identification, assessment, and prioritization of them (Rybarova, 2014); frequent implementations of information technology (Korunka, Weiss, & Zauchner, 1997); salaries, internal pay equity, health support, over-management (i.e. too many chiefs), merit-pay system, insufficiency of responsiveness of human resources departments to employee questions and concerns, favoritism, communication and availability, facility cleanliness, heavy workload (Heathfield, 2015). Also, without quality managers it is inevitable to see serious organizational pains in human capital management, budgeting, setting tasks, and providing goals (Johansen, 2013). Namely, the mismanagement processes of decision making, planning, organization, communication, effect, coordination, or supervision can cause organizational pains.

Employees need various general and personal leadership behaviors from their supervisor (Breukelen & de Vries, 2011). Indicating multi factorial characteristics, leaders should mostly demonstrate their ideas, affect related people and events with less controlled; be value driven, both knowing one's own values, and respecting others' values, and also do what he or she believes (Grainger & Griffiths, 1998). Further, leadership plays a considerable role in that social groups act to obtain the gains derived from cooperation, coordination, and efficient allocation (Calvert, 1992). Leaders also can influence so much the internal public relations, develop the quality of employee-organization relationships (Men & Stacks, 2014).

More important, leadership is needed to combat continued institutional discrimination (Esmail, 2004); to collect people around a group and reaching both personal and common objectives (Kasapoglu, 2013); to obtain successful task shifting (Henderson, Paterson, Burmeister, Thomson, & Young, 2013); to keep pace, let alone be innovative and creative in an environment of increasingly rapid change (Ebersole, 2013); to develop safety information for products (Crowe, Brueckner, Beasley, & Kulkarni, 2013); to set up a participative environment which contributes that organization focuses on learning, flexibility, and rapid response (Yitmen, 2012); to get occupational therapy (Townsend, Polatajko, Craik, & von Zweck, 2011); to evaluate the quality improvement educational programs (Filardo et al., 2009); to bring about a serious commitment to continuous quality improvement (Darling, 1998); to transform the culture, as well as to train, coach, and sustain the behavior crew resource management demands (Nielsen & Mann, 2008); to reduce substantially the cultural conflict, and to focus on new loyalties, high morale and a sense of community (Harman, 2002). Nevertheless, the needs for leadership in organization cannot be limited to the literature mentioned earlier. As a result, it is valuable to note that the organizational pains can appear unless the organizations have effective leadership.

Moreover, the climate of organization can be affected negatively owing to the various factors such as bad human relations, misbehaviors, not working with enthusiasm, low expectations, and bad communication. In addition, cultural problems related to the norms, values, ethic principles, and other informal group approaches can occur in organization. Besides, employee absenteeism (Mateo, Tanco, & Santos, 2014); workplace bullying (Fox & Cowan, 2015); psychological violence in the workplace (AbuAlRub & Al-Asmar, 2014); reputation management in terms of the politics problem, the consistency problem, the charisma problem, the uniqueness problem, and the excellence problem (Waeraas & Byrkjeflot, 2012); the obstacles such as old learning concepts, old learning methods and old learning system that restrict the construction of a learning organization (Xin & Bi, 2011);
gendered challenges (Kelly, Ammons, Chermack, & Moen, 2010); ethical problems such as harassment, discrimination, theft, violence (Spiro, 2010); unavailable management succession, management relations, operational, motivation and labour discipline (Lockett, 1988); barriers for meeting the professional development needs, decreasing of job satisfaction with profession (OECD, 2014); harsh disciplinary penalties, misbehaviors of another employee (Gennard & Judge, 2005); breach of a collective agreement, unavailable holiday allocation for meeting family circumstances, delay of bonus paid, introducing new working practices without prior consultation, grading a staff job at an inappropriate level (Gennard & Judge, 2005).

The organizational pains also can be result of the tools or machinery have not been properly maintained, poor or inadequate canteen facilities, dark, too cold or unhealthy workplaces, safety (Gennard & Judge, 2005). Some serious pains may appear in the organization due to the health complaints such as job stress (Carayon, Smith, & Haims, 1999); tiredness, eyestrain, anxiety, sleep problems, voice disorder, shoulder pain, neck pain, headache, cold/flu, and lower-back pain (Chong & Chan, 2010).

Finally, the organizational pains may appear in various elements of organization such as purpose, structure, process, climate, culture and leadership. In line with exploring the organizational pains, the purpose of this study was to develop a valid scale for measuring the level of usage of organizational analgesics.

Method

Participants

The preliminary scale development studies were conducted with 33 volunteer participants (19 men, 14 women) with fourth grade (n=21) bachelor, and the graduate students receiving teacher-training courses (n=12), whose subject are Geography (n=21) and Biology (n=12) at Harran university in the academic year of 2014-2015.

Increasing representability, eight faculty departments with different potential student groups were chosen. After rejecting 11 student questionnaires due to filling incompletely, coding same response for all items and/or making patterns; factor analyses were conducted with 207 volunteer university students who were interested in contributing to this study (105 men, 102 women) with second grade (n=52), third grade (n=30), fourth grade (n=68) bachelor and graduate students receiving teacher-training courses (n=57), whose subject are Turkish Language and Literature (n=15), Geography (n=29), Religion and Ethics (n=54), Primary School Teaching (n=26), Painting (n=11), Music (n=11), Biology (n=12), Physical Education (n=6), Math (n=9), Chemistry (n=23), and Physics (n=11) at Harran university in the academic year of 2014-2015.

As investigated the related literature, it seems that there has been little consensus on whether the sample size should be sufficient for developing scale studies. Reviewing a literature in Pub Med between 2009 and 2011, Anthoine, Moret, Regnault, Sébille, & Hardouin reported that around 90% of articles used sample greater than or equal to 100 through the subject/item ratio greater than or equal to 2. DeVellis (2012) emphasized that even though 300 sample sizes are enough, the practical experiences showed the successful studies with smaller sizes. Indicating that “samples size as a function of the number of variables was not an important factor in determining stability”, Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) concluded that minimum of 150 observations were enough with strong inter-correlations for moderate component saturation (.60). Consequently, the size of participants of this study seems adequate for the validity and reliability analyses in the studies of scale development.
Procedure

In the first step in developing the scale, investigating the related literature an item-pool reflecting the main elements of contemporary management such as aims, structure, processes, culture, climate, health, sources, leadership and etc. were created. While writing the items, the keywords such as the complaints, needs, suppressing, mitigating or calming, finding temporary or rooted initiatives were considered within the management. In this regard, the items were written for evaluation of to what extent organizational analgesics were used in the face of organizational matters. After this procedure of writing 50 potential items, three academicians as specialist group and the participants taken place in the preliminary scale development study were interviewed to check the content validity, and face validity. Also their suggestions on clearness, understandability, and adding or removing items were investigated. Next, the draft-scale consisting of 33 items (17 of them were reversely coded) with five-point Likert scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) were decided. The high scores of the scale show high level usage of organizational analgesics.

After applying the draft-scale to 207 participants, the received results were analyzed through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) by SPSS® and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) by LISREL®. Before analyzing the results, the related items were reversely coded. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with the method of principal component analysis was conducted to determine the structure of the scale. To ensure distinctiveness, less than 0.30 values of factor loadings were accepted as the weak loading and extracted from the analysis. Further, to prevent that the items with more than one factor coincide with another one, at least 0.10 differences among the factor loadings were preferred as a criteria; otherwise the unfit items were extracted. Convenience of the sample size for factor analysis was evaluated with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure. The appropriateness of the correlations among the items was checked with Bartlett’s test of sphericity. Also, the varimax rotation procedures were implemented for receiving the factor structures in terms of simplicity.

CFA was applied for checking whether the construct of scale received from EFA studies was consistent or not. At this point, standardized factor loadings, t-values, and most preferred goodness of fit indices as chi-square/degrees of freedom, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) were evaluated (Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). In addition, mean, standard deviation of items, Skeweness and Kurtosis values, Chronbach’s Alpha coefficients, and the correlations between factors were evaluated for validity and reliability studies.

Results

Table 1 indicates the descriptive statistics of the scale items with means, standard deviations, Skeweness, and Kurtosis values. The means of the items ranged from 2.67 to 3.58. Skeweness and Kurtosis values, used to investigate how much a variable’s distribution deviates from normal curve, ranged from -0.99 to 0.41; thus, the values were acceptable for confirming normal univariate distribution (Morgan and Griego, 1998; Bachman, 2004).
Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Based on the criteria of EFA, the followings were examined to test the availability of the data. The sample of this study applied for EFA was found as adequate in terms of correlations according to Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO)=0.84. The result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity with $X^2=1553.47$, df=276, $p<0.001$ showed the suitable correlations in terms of multicolinearity.

Next, EFA was conducted and its results were given in Table 2. According to the results of EFA based on the varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization, 24 items of 33 items were found available in the three factors with the eigenvalue greater than 1.0. The factor loadings of the items taken place in three factors ranged from 0.50 to 0.77 and explained 45% of total variance. The factors were entitled (1) aims, (2) management, and (3) leadership in accordance to the convenience of the content of the items. 13 of 24 items (s10, s12, s15, s16, s20, s22, s25, s28, s30, s33, s39, s42, and s45) were found reversely coded and taken place in the management subscale.
Table 2. The Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Moreover, Chronbach’s Alpha coefficients were estimated 0.72 for whole scale items. The subscales also were estimated 0.70 for aims, 0.75 for management, and 0.78 for leadership. Garver and Mentzer (1999) suggested that the values of Cronbach's coefficient with greater than or equal to 0.70 enough for ensuring reliability of scale. Consequently, these results indicated that the scale was reliable in terms of internal consistency.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

Using LISREL® software, CFA was conducted to check the convergent validity of the model established on the basis of the factor structure derived from the results of EFA. The results were summarized in the Table 3.

Through this process, the goodness of fit indices were estimated as follows: \(X^2/df=465.57/249=1.86\); RMSEA = 0.06; NFI=0.90; Tucker-Lewis Index =0.92; CFI = 0.93. Further, it was estimated that \(t\)-values related the standardized values were statistically significant \((p < 0.01)\). When investigated the unidimensionality for reasonable fit, Garver and Mentzer (1999) noted that relative \(\chi^2\) less than or equal to 2.00, RMSEA values less than or equal to 0.08, and GFI, NFI, NNFI, and CFI values greater than or equal to 0.90 might be acceptable. Thus, the CFA results indicated that the model with each subscales established through EFA was statistically and reasonably acceptable.
Table 3. CFA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items (In my institution ...)</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loadings</th>
<th>t-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1. temporary solutions are found for the obstacles arose whilst people realize their aims</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s2. temporary solutions are searched for the obstacles arose when the aims are not followed</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s3. when uncertainty of the aims makes inconvenience, this matter is not gone over in-depth</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s4. the problems arose from the conflicts emerging between the organizations’ aims are not solved completely</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s10. substantial solutions are found for the complaints related to tasks</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s12. effective solutions are found for complaints related to taken decisions</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s15. effective solutions are found for complaints related to taken plans</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s16. needed solutions are found for problems of related to planning process</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s20. substantial solutions are produced for the problems related to equipping</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s22. effective solutions are found for the problems arose in communication channels</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s25. the complaints related to style of administrators’ approaches to motivate people are taken into consideration</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s28. effective solutions are found for the complaints arose whilst coordination among departments are not established</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s30. effective solutions are produced for complaints related to supervision process</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s33. effective solutions are produced for complaints related to human relations</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s34. endeavors are made to mitigate complaints related to misbehaviors of people</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s37. complaints related to mobbing are mitigated</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s39. vacation needs of people are taken into consideration</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s42. effective solutions are found for complaints towards machinery and equipments</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s45. effective solutions are produced for complaints related to material shortage</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s46. demands with regard to situations which needed leadership of administrators are shared over</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s47. demands with regard to importance of leadership are ignored</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s48. complaints on leadership behaviors of administrators are shared over</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s49. leadership need for achieving aims of institution is considered insufficiently</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s50. leadership need while people achieve their aims is designed</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 465.57 df=249; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.06; Normal Fit Index (NFI)=0.80; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)=0.92; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.93. **reversely coded items

**Discriminant Validity**

To check the discriminant validity, the factor correlations were computed and given in Table 4. The correlations between factors were low values that indicated the scale as validated in terms of distinctness.

Table 4. Factor correlations of aims, management, and leadership subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aims</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>352**</td>
<td>212**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01**
Conclusion

Approaching through the open-system theories, use of the organizational analgesics appears to be one of the vital issues of the organizations, as a metaphor of the use of analgesics for human body. At this point, it is inevitable that the pains exist in the social organization not only at now, but in the future, since the organizations rely on the human factor. More important, the organizations cannot survive with suppressing, mitigating or calming its pains, instead of searching, finding out, and removing the root causes that bring about the related pains. To enlighten this problem statement, to find out the potential risks threaten the life of organizations, and to help the organizations and the researchers, this study illustrates what kind of analgesics are used and how they can be measured in an organization.

To conclude, a validated and reliable scale, given in Appendix I, was developed for measuring the organizational analgesics. The scale consisted of 24 items taken place in three factors entitled aims, management, and leadership. Content validity, descriptive statistics, Chronbach’s Alpha coefficients, exploring and confirming factor analyses, and also discriminant validity studies confirmed the validity and reliability of the scale. In addition, the validity and reliability analyses of the scale were conducted in Turkish forms. However, the author suggested an English version of the scale, given in the Appendix II, to contribute to the potential studies for checking validity and reliability, and adaptation to other languages.

It is also noteworthy that introducing a new concept to the management science, this study can be accepted as a pioneer study for next organizational studies. On the other hand, the new ideas, concepts, developments or innovations are not perfectly established. Not surprisingly, they bring out new matters that are waited to cope with, or to be an issue for new discussions, rejections or improvements. In turn, this study with its conceptual explanations and the developed scale is open to take contributions.
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Appendix I. Orgutsel Agrikesiciler Olcegi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maddeler</th>
<th>Katılma Derecesi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hıç</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AMAÇLAR FAKTORÜ

- s1- İnsanların amaçlarını gerçekleştirmeleri karşısında yaşanan sorunlara geçici çözümler aranır. 1 2 3 4 5
- s2- Amaçlara uymulmadığında ortaya çıkan sorunlar için geçici çözümlere gidilir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s3- Amaçların belirsizliği rahatsızlık verdiginde bunun üzerinde fazla gelilmemelidir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s4- Kurumun amaçlarıyla insanların amaçlarının çatışmasından doğan sorunlar köken çözülemez. 1 2 3 4 5

### YÖNETİM FAKTORÜ

- s10- Görevlerle ilgili şikayetlerin köklü çözümler üretir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s12- Alanın karsılara ilgili rahatsızlıkların etkisi çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s15- Planlarla ilgili rahatsızlıkların etkisi çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s16- Planlamaya ilgili sorunların çözülmesi için genelettir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s20- Donanımla ilgili sorunların çözülmesi için genelettir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s22- İletişim belirtildiği yaşanan sorunların etkisi çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s25- Yöneticilerin insanları motive edebilme ve etmenlikle ilgili yakınlıklar düşüktür. 1 2 3 4 5
- s28- Birimlerarası Đầudulğan sağlanması sağlanmasıyla gelişen şikayetler için etkili çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s30- Denetimle ilgili şikayetler için etkili çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s33- İnsan slowsteinyle ilgili yakınlıklar için etkili çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s34- İnsanların hatalı davranışlarıyla ilgili yakınlıklar hafifletilmeye çalışılır. 1 2 3 4 5
- s37- Psikolojik baskı konusundaki şikayetler hafifletilmeye çalışılır. 1 2 3 4 5
- s39- İnsanların tahlı ihtiyacları farklıdır. 1 2 3 4 5
- s42- Makineleye ve teşhizata yönelik şikayetler için etkili çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5
- s45- Malzeme sıkıntısıyla ilgili şikayetler için etkili çözümler bulunur. 1 2 3 4 5

### LIDERLİK FAKTORÜ

- s46- Yöneticilerin liderlik etmeleri gereken durumlarla ilgili talepler geceşmittir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s47- Liderliğin olması konusundaki talepler pek ilgi görmez. 1 2 3 4 5
- s48- Yöneticilerin liderlik etmeleri etkisi rahatsızlıklar idare edilir. 1 2 3 4 5
- s49- Kurumun amacılara ulaşılmasında liderliğe olan ihtiyac pek dikkate alınma. 1 2 3 4 5
- s50- İnsanların amaçlarına ulaşılmasında liderliğe olan ihtiyaçların karşılanır. 1 2 3 4 5

*Note: The related items are reversely coded.*
Appendix II. The English Version of Organizational Analgesics Scale Suggested by Author*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1 strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my institution ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIMS FACTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1- temporary solutions are found for the obstacles arose whilst people realize their aims</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s2- temporary solutions are searched for the obstacles arose when the aims are not followed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s3- when uncertainty of the aims makes inconvenience, this matter is not gone over in-depth</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s4- the problems arose from the conflicts emerging between the organizations' aims are not solved completely</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT FACTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s10-substantial solutions are found for the complaints related to tasks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s12- effective solutions are found for complaints related to taken decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s15- effective solutions are found for complaints related to taken plans</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s16- needed solutions are found for problems of related to planning process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s20- substantial solutions are produced for the problems related to equipping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s22-effective solutions are found for the problems arose in communication channels</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s25- the complaints related to style of administrators’ approaches to motivate people are taken into consideration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s28- effective solutions are found for the complaints arose whilst coordination among departments are not established</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s30-effective solutions are produced for complaints related to supervision process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s33- effective solutions are produced for complaints related to human relations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s34- endeavors are made to mitigate complaints related to misbehaviors of people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s37- complaints related to mobbing are mitigated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s39- vacation needs of people are taken into consideration</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s42-effective solutions are found for complaints towards machinery and equipments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s45- effective solutions are produced for complaints related to material shortage</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEADERSHIP FACTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s46-demands with regard to situations which needed leadership of administrators are shared over</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s47-demands with regard to importance of leadership are ignored</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s48-complaints on leadership behaviors of administrators are shared over</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s49-leadership need for achieving aims of institution is considered insufficiently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s50- leadership need while people achieve their aims is despised</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Important Note: The validity and reliability of scale developed in the present study was conducted in Turkish language in Appendix I. For that, the English version is suggested by author, and does require further validation and reliability analysis. ** These items are reversely coded.