Developing a Series of Scales for Generations' Values in the Age of New Media: Validity and Reliability Study of Uskudar XYZ Generation Differences Scale

Nevzat TARHAN
Prof., Department of Psychiatry, Uskudar University, NPIstanbul Neuropsychiatry Hospital, Istanbul, Turkey
nevzat.tarhan@uskudar.edu.tr
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6810-7096

Aylin TUTGUN UNAL
Assoc. Prof., Department of Journalism, Faculty of Communication, Uskudar University, Istanbul, Turkey
aylin.tutgununal@uskudar.edu.tr
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2430-6322

ABSTRACT
In this research, it is aimed to develop a series of scales to determine the changing values and behaviors of different generations in society today, where new media environments are diversifying day by day. In the study, which took into account the generation classification made with the focus of technological tools, generation X was considered as "Radio Generation", Y generation as "Television Generation", generation Z as "Social Media Generation". Thus, the study group consisted of 1083 people classified as generation X (over 45), Y (30 – 45 years old), and Z (15 – 30 years old). 12 independent scales were obtained as a result of validity and reliability studies. These scales are formed in a dimensional structure within themselves, and each scale and subscales are named with appropriate names. The names of the scales revealed in the study are as follows: (1) Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale, (2) Self-Assessment Scale, (3) Friendship Bond Scale, (4) Popular Culture Scale, (5) Impulse Control Scale, (6) Technology Use Scale, (7) Social Norms Acceptance Scale, (8) Multiple Attention Scale, (9) Work Loving Scale, (10) Internal Control Scale, (11) Impatience Scale, (12) Family Values Scale. All scales are valid and reliable. It is hoped that the resulting scales will be used independently by the researchers individually or together as a battery.
Keywords: New Media, Generation, XYZ, Scale Development, Validity

INTRODUCTION

As the development of communication technologies progressed rapidly, the rapid transformation of communication habits and ways of doing business was witnessed from radio technology to new media technologies, including multisensory organs and interaction. The fact that a person who grew up as a radio generation has reached the social media generation today has led to the need to revisit the so-called generational differences on a technology-based basis.

When the concept of generation is examined, it is included in the field research area on various subjects with definition, classification, characteristics, differences, and generational approach. It is emphasized that the researches focus on issues such as education, business life, use of technology, values, and behaviors, and even perspectives on life and that generations differ from each other by exhibiting distinct characteristics. (Adıgüzel & et al., 2014; Deniz & Tutgun-Ünal, 2019; Ekinci & et al., 2021; Ekşili & Antalyalı, 2017; Özdemir, 2021; Morsümbül, 2014; Tarhan, 2020; Tolbize, 2008; Toruntay, 2011; Tutgun-Ünal, 2021; Zemke & et al., 2013). Focus group studies on the need to address intergenerational communication differences with a focus on technology are also found (Tarhan & Tutgun-Ünal, 2021; Yıldırım Becerikli, 2013).

In the 2000s, the rethinking of generations in the new media age was influenced by technological development and the consequent spread of new media technologies around the globe, replacing communication habits with digital communication. Facebook has left its name to "Meta" as the use of social media, the most well-known popular of new media technologies spread rapidly in all countries around the world. As we transition from the age of social media to the Metaverse age, generations will also face new communication and behavioral habits in the Metaverse universe and new differences will have to be addressed. In this respect, it can be said that the concept of generation is a dynamic concept, not a static one. (Alwin & McCammon, 2007).

When the generation definitions are examined, it is seen that it is classified as Silent Generation (1927-1945), Baby Boomer (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1979), Generation Y (1980-1999), and Generation Z (2000 and beyond), according to the birth date ranges of generations worldwide. (Berkup, 2014; Ekşili & Antalyalı, 2017; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013; Zemke, 2013). In another classification taking into account the development of technological

tools, generation X is called radio generation (45 years and older), Y generation is called television generation (30-45 years) and generation Z (15-30 years) is called social media generation and those under 15 years of age are called Alpha generation. (Döğer, 2020; Özdemir, 2021; Tarhan, 2020). In this study, XYZ generations were classified and classification according to technological tools was taken into account.

Since the proliferation of computer technologies and increasingly mobile technologies took place during the Y-generation period, millennials took part in research as a generation where differences were felt most prominently. (Akdemir & et al., 2013; Asmafiliz & Şalvarcı Türeli, 2018; Bayramoğlu & Şahin, 2017; Berkup, 2014; Çetin Aydın & Başol, 2014; Engizek & Şekerkaya, 2016; Ekşili & Antalyalı, 2017; Kelgökmen İlic & Yalçın, 2017; Kuyucu, 2017; Tutgun-Ünal, 2013; 2021; Türk, 2013). Nowadays, it is emphasized that the communication habits and values, and behaviors of the generation Z, who met technological devices earlier and grew up with mistakes, have become completely different. (Latif & Serbest, 2014; Özdemir, 2021; Süer & et al., 2017; Tarhan, 2020; Taş & et al., 2017).

Values are defined as a guidance that guides behaviors. Values are common concepts accepted by society as a common. Today, many kinds of research are carried out on the values system of young individuals focusing on academic success. (Deniz & Tutgun-Ünal, 2019; Morsümbül, 2014; Tarhan, 2015; Tutgun-Ünal, 2021). In these researches, business life, perspectives on life, tolerance to differences, marriage and family life perspectives are examined and it is discussed whether values are fully formed in young people. (Börü & Yurtkoru, 2016; Tarhan, 2020; Tutgun-Ünal & Deniz, 2020). However, studies have been found that emphasize that the values system has evolved into an online values system with the effects of social media. (Tutgun-Ünal & et al., 2021). Therefore, building values on solid foundations is seen as extremely important for psychological well-being today. (Seligman, 2019).

Tarhan (2015) refers to two types of values as vehicle values and purpose values, and it is seen as important to create measuring instruments to cover this context. Thus, "Objective values" indicate more abstract purposes in a person's life. "Tool values" are a way for the person to achieve their goals in life. Although the objective values can be classified in themselves, they have virtues such as love, trust, being compassionate, enjoying doing goodness, having social boundaries, being honest and fair, being tolerant and peaceful, sharing. Tool values are values that eliminate negative emotions such as being organized, congratulating success, saying nice words, showing relaxing and flexible qualities that are appropriate by others, trying to do his job, being canny, being soft and flexible in the face of situations, being polite to people and making appropriate comments that are not in the wrong. (Tarhan, 2015). On the other hand, considering that values are universally and culturally divided, it is clear that the values of this means and purpose will vary from culture to culture and even from nation to world. From this point on, it is seen as important to measure generational differences to include these values.

However, psychometric scales are needed to measure the existing situation in determining generational differences not only in terms of technology use but also in determining values and related behaviors. The fact that these scales are multidimensional and contain many issues is important for the multifaceted handling of measurements and it is possible to achieve more complementary results together. When literature is examined, a study of three scales called social media usage scale, working life scale, acceptance scale of differences for generations is found (Deniz & Tutgun-Ünal, 2019). On the other hand, researches on applying scales focused on a single topic to generations provide data to focus on a single topic, while multiple scales are needed that provide a holistic view of generations. However, by using a combination of versatile measurements, the differences of the generations will be understood in more detail and the effects of many factors can be measured in terms of their effects on each other.

Thus, in this research, it is aimed to develop scales containing these tangible and intangible objectives by addressing the values in terms of objective values and tool values. For this purpose, the development of valid and reliable scales that can be used in psychometric processes that can measure values within the scope of topics such as "Belonging, trust, self-confidence, individualism, convenience, friendship bond, popular culture, impulse control, acceptance of social norms, multiple attention, love to work, internal control, impatience, haste, family values" together with the use of technology constitutes the problem of this research.

METHOD

Research Group

The sample of the study was composed of 1083 people in Turkey (Female n: 857 (79.1%); Male n: 226 (20.9%)). Distribution of participants by generation is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of the study group by generation

Generations	Age range	n	%
Generation X	>45	93	8,6
Generation Y	30-45	288	26,6
Generation Z	15-30	702	64,8

The age range of the study group ranges from 15 to 67 and the mean age is 29. When the education status is examined, 60.2% are at the university, 14.6% are at the level of Master's, 10.1% are high school, 9.2% are at the School and 1.4% are at the elementary level.

Data Collection Tool

Uskudar XYZ Generation Differences Scale (USGDS)

In the process of developing the scale, the resources related to the characteristics and differences (behaviors, values, social media use, etc.) specified in the field for generations were examined and the item pool was built up. When preparing the item pool, the topics were determined and the subordination of the items linked to these headings was applied. The scale is prepared as a 5-point Likert type scale and is rated as "Not Suitable for Me", "Less Suitable for Me", "Medium Suitable for Me", "Very Suitable for Me" and "Completely Suitable for Me" to determine the participation in each expression. The high score from the draft scale indicates that the relevant value is high and at the same time the characteristics attributed to “generation Z” are at a high level; low score can be evaluated at a low level and at the same time it is assumed that the characteristics attributed to "generation X" are exhibited.

After the final arrangements were made on issues such as the expressions and contents of the articles by taking expert opinions, the draft scale was applied to a pilot group (n:15) from a different age to test the clarity and it was decided that it could be applied with 126 articles with the final expression arrangements made. When exploratory factor analysis was applied to the data obtained, the results were not satisfactory and did not show a meaningful structure. Thus, it was decided to apply the exploratory factor analysis separately by parsing the topics represented by the measuring instrument. In this context, 12 dimensions have been studied. Each dimension was treated as a separate scale under the USGDS heading, and validity and reliability studies were carried out on the dimensions separately.

Process

Translation Work: To obtain the Turkish form of the Uskudar Generation Differences Scale (USGDS), the items in the original inventory was first translated into Turkish by an expert who is competent both in Turkish and English. Then, it was ensured that the sentences were understandable by checking them by two field experts who knew both languages well.

Application of USGDS: Ethical approval was given to the research by the Uskudar University Non-Interventional Research Ethics Committee with the number 61351342/TEMMUZ2021-23. The data collection process was carried out voluntarily by using an online survey form from 1st to 15th December 2021. The study group sample was randomly selected and consisted of people aged 15 and over. USGDS were administered to the participants via an online questionnaire and it took an average of 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficient was used for the linguistic equivalence of USGDS, which is to determine the consistency between the Turkish and English forms. It has been tested with the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test for validity and reliability studies on whether items of each scale are suitable for factor analysis. KMO value of 0.70 and above is "good" in terms of ensuring sample proficiency (Sipahi, Yurtkoru & Çinko, 2008); 0.80 and above is considered "excellent" (Sharma, 1996). Similarly, Bartlett Sphericity is expected to be $p<0.05$. No limit was imposed on the number of factors during factor analysis. The findings of each scale study are described under separate headings. If the difference between the items is 0.10, the relevant items are considered to be boarding and removed from the scale. Within the scope of the structure validity of the scale, the relationships of the resulting factors with each other and the total were also calculated. In the interpretation of the correlation values obtained, the relationship values between 0.30-0.70 are medium; Values above 0.70 are also considered to indicate a high relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2002:32).

For discriminant validity of the scale, the total validity of the sum of the scale and the subscales were viewed to the difference validity of the subscales. After the scale was scored, the scores were sorted and an independent

group t-test was applied to determine the difference between the scores of the people who were in the subgroup of 27% and the people who were in the upper group.

Within the scope of the reliability studies of the scale, the coefficients of item analysis and internal consistency (Cronbach α) were calculated. Sipahi, Yurtkoru & Çinko (2008) Cronbach α value is considered reliable in cases where the value of 0.70 or higher is considered reliable and in cases where the number of questions is less, 0.60 and above will suffice. In this study, the internal coefficients of consistency of the scales α Cronbach were interpreted and these values were accepted as criteria.

FINDINGS

Linguistic Equivalence Study of USGDS

The English and Turkish forms of the USGDS were administered to 20 postgraduate students at the Department of Psychology from Uskudar University three weeks apart in Turkish and English. After the applications, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated. The time interval between the two tests is specified as 2 to 4 weeks or 3 to 6 weeks according to different opinions in the literature (Özgüven, 1994).

It was made for two applications with USGDS including 12 scales. When the Pearson correlation coefficients were examined, the lowest value for scales was .45 and the highest value was .84, and the correlation coefficient between the total scores of the items in the Turkish and English forms was also found to be positive and significant (r: .77; $p<0.001$). In addition, according to the independent group t-test for scales, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the two applications (t: .36; df: 21; $p>0.05$). The results obtained showed that the consistency between the two applications of the scales was acceptable.

1. Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale

In this part of the study, evaluations were made on the scale-covered under the heading Organizational Commitment and Authority. Originally published as 14 items on draft scale and basic components analysis applied within the scope of scale's structure validity. When the Eigenvalue is 1 and the factor load interrupting value is released, it is observed that 3 items receive a low factor load. Thus, the process was repeated by removing 3 items from the scale. The suitability of the scale for the analysis of key components was evaluated by Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test. According to the results obtained, the KMO value was found to be 0.92 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value was 7135,510 (p:55; $p<0,000$). The KMO sampling adequacy value found suggests that the relationships between the variables are perfectly suited to factor analysis. Similarly, it is understood that there is a sufficient relationship between variables of the scale being developed to have a Bartlett Sphericity value of $p<0.05$.

Table 2 provides factors arising as a result of factor analysis, item factor loads, factor eigen value, and variance percentage of each factor. These subscales are called "Belongingness" and "Trust" by looking at the content of the items in the resulting subscales.

Table 2. Factor analysis results of Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Belongingness	1. I believe that to advance my career, I must stay in the same institution and work for a certain time.	0,69	5,76	52,43
	2. I believe that you have to be patient and work to step up in business.	0,70		
	3. My career or education is the most important part of my life.	0,54		
	4. I work hard for the success of the institution/group I am in, even if the financial value is not sufficient enough.	0,70		
	5. Being at peace at work is more important than wages.	0,62		
	6. I'd like to work in a place where teamwork comes to the fore.	0,64		
Trust	7. It's very important to me to go where I work lovingly.	0,53	1,11	10,09
	8. I feel like doing the opposite of what the bossy one told me.	0,78		

	9. In the environment where I work, fear should be the exception, trust must be essential.	0,70	
	10. It is very important to me that the leader is fair and reassuring.	0,77	
	11. I care about someone else's rights and needs in human relations.	0,71	
Total			62,52

The relationship between the subscales that make up the Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale that occurs after factor analysis is medium (r: 0.50) and the relation to the total is high (Belongingness r: 0.96; Trust r: 0.72).

Within the scope of the validity of the difference of the Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale, the discriminant of each item, subscale and scale were looked at. In this context, an independent group t-test was applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27% after the scores were sorted from high to low. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at $p<0.001$ and the results were given in Table 3.

Table 3. Independent group t-test analysis of scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Belongingness	Upper Group	400	20,15	3,4	798	51,01	,000
	Lower Group	400	10,07	2,0			
Trust	Upper Group	400	14,97	1,2	798	49,84	,000
	Lower Group	400	10,95	1,0			
Organizational Commitment & Authority Scale	Upper Group	400	34,38	4,5	798	48,12	,000
	Lower Group	400	21,96	2,4			

Later, when internal consistency Cronbach Alpha coefficients were examined, it was observed that the sum of the Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale was 0.69% internal consistency coefficient. The internal coefficient of consistency of the Belongingness dimension containing 6 items was found to be 0.81 and the Trust dimension containing 5 items was found to be 0.76. It has been concluded that the values provide internal consistency reliability. When evaluating the scale, all items except items 7 and 8 are reverse-coded. The lowest score on the scale is 11 points, and the highest score is 55. According to this; 13-29 points are considered as "Less level", 30-47 points as "Moderate", 48-65 points as "High Level".

2. Self-Evaluation Scale

Basic Components Analysis has been applied under the construction validity of the draft scale for evaluations of the scale addressed under the assessment title. In the initial factor analysis calculations with item 13, when the Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cutting value are released, it was observed that the 3 items were found to be involved in more than one factor by boarding and the analysis of the basic components was repeated by removing these items.

In the analysis of the basic components with 10 items, the suitability of the scale for factor analysis was evaluated by Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test. According to the results obtained, the KMO value was found to be 0.76 and the Bartlett Sphericity chi-square value was 2511,196 (df:45; $p<0,000$). The values found showed that the relations between variables were in line with factor analysis. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue and variance percentages that emerged as a result of factor analysis are given in Table 3. The content of the items in the resulting subscales is examined and named "Individualism and Convenience" and "Self- Esteem, and Self-Expression".

Table 4. Factor analysis results of a self-assessment scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Individualism and Convenience	1. For me, the priority is my own needs, others come later.	0,56	3,157	31,56
	2. I avoid setting goals that I'll have a hard time with.	0,71		
	3. I'm happy with what I get without effort.	0,67		
	4. When I'm faced with adversity, I don't tire myself out.	0,79		
	5. The idea of spending the day in peace rather than investing in the future is tempting.	0,60		
Self-Esteem and Self-Expression	6. I have complete confidence in myself in every environment, I do not shy away from anyone.	0,78	1,727	17,27
	7. Even if I disagree with where the elders are, I can say my opinion differently in an appropriate style.	0,77		
	8. I express myself more freely on social media.	0,57		
	9. I'm confident on social media, I use aliases.	0,50		
	10. I can easily express an opposing opinion on social media without thinking about the consequences.	0,61		
Total				48,84

The relationship between the subscales that make up the two-dimensional Self-Assessment Scale that occurs after factor analysis (r: 0.33) and its relation to the total (Individualism and Convenience r: 0.79; Self-Esteem and Self-Expression r: 0.83) examined, mid-level and changing relationships were detected. Within the scope of the validity of the Self-Assessment Scale, the discriminant of the sum of the scale and the subscales were looked at. In this context, an independent group t-test was applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27% after the scores were sorted from high to low. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at $p<0.001$ and the results were given in Table 5.

Table 5. Independent group t-test analysis of Self-Assessment Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Individualism and Convenience	Upper Group	400	14,95	2,6	798	52,07	,000
	Lower Group	400	7,07	1,4			
Self-Esteem and Self-Expression	Upper Group	400	17,71	2,5	798	55,46	,000
	Lower Group	400	9,04	2,9			
Self-Assessment Scale	Upper Group	400	30,91	4,4	798	49,90	,000
	Lower Group	400	17,62	2,9			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.75; 0.73 of individualism and convenience consisting of 5 items; the dimansion of self-esteem and self-expression of 5 items was found to be 0.70. These values were found to be sufficient for the reliability of the scale. There are no reverse-coded items when calculating the scale score. At least 10 points and up to 50 points can be obtained from the scale. According to this; 11-25 points are considered as "Less level", 26-40 points "Moderate", 41-55 points as "High Level"

3. Friendship Bond Scale

The draft scale, which is considered the Friendship Bond Scale, consists of 6 items. It was first applied with the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test, which were used to determine the suitability of the data set for factor analysis, and the results in which KMO value was found to be 0.70 and Bartlett Sphericity square value to 791,840 (df:15; p<000). The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis. The 2-factor structure is obtained when Eigenvalue is 1 and factor cutting value is

released. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, factor self-values, and variance percentages emerged as a result of factor analysis in Table 6 are given. The contents of the items in the resulting subscales were examined and named "Care" and "Escape".

Table 6. Factor analysis results of Friendship Bond Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Care	1. I prefer my social media relationships to my daily relationships.	0,77	1,844	30,73
	2. Friendship bond is important, social media is not his replacement.	0,84		
	3. I care about the opinions of my friends, but my inference comes first.	0,63		
Escape	4. After my family, I trust my friends the most.	0,77	1,524	25,39
	5. I make friends quickly on social media, but as soon as it starts, it's over quickly.	0,73		
	6. I don't think communication tools like TV, social media are at the center of my life.	0,66		
Total				56,12

The relationship between the subscales that make up the two-dimensional Friendship Bond Scale that occurs after the factor analysis (r: 0.55) and its relationship to the sum (Care r: 0.75; Escape r: 0.79) examined, mid-level and changing relationships were detected. Within the scope of the validity of the Friendship Bond Scale, the discriminant of the sum of the scale and the subscales were looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, an independent group t-test was applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at $p<0.001$ and the results were given in Table 7.

Table 7. Independent group t-test analysis of Friendship Bond Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Care	Upper Group	400	7,45	1,8	798	43,24	,000
	Lower Group	400	3,28	0,4			
Escape	Upper Group	400	10,28	1,8	798	58,77	,000
	Lower Group	400	4,11	0,9			
Friendship Bond Scale	Upper Group	400	15,94	2,1	798	56,59	,000
	Lower Group	400	8,59	1,5			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.62; The importance dimension of 3 items is 0.60; the Escape dimension of 3 items was found to be 0.64. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. There are no reverse-coded items when calculating the scale score. At least 6 points and up to 30 points can be obtained from the scale. The 2nd, 4th, 6th items on the scale are inverted. According to this; 9-20 points are considered as "Less level", 21-32 points as "Moderate", 33-45 points as "High Level".

4. Popular Culture Scale

The draft scale considered as popular culture scale consists of 15 items. First of all, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) used in determining the suitable of the data set for factor analysis and the KMO value is applied by the Bartlett Sphericity test and according to the results obtained 0.85 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 4770,135 (df: 78; $p <0.000$) has been found. The values found that the relations between variables are appropriate to the factor analysis. When the Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cutting value are released, the factor of the 2 items is lower than the factor load value is less repeated with 13 items, and a 3-factor structure was obtained. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages emerged as a result of factor analysis in Table 8. The

contents of the items on the resulting subscales were examined and named "Venue", "Consumption" and "Nostalgia".

Table 8. Factor analysis results of Popular Culture scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Venue	1. Shopping mall, cafes make me happy, I want to spend more time .	0,72	4,466	34,35
	2. I like to socialize outside instead of spending time alone at home with a smartphone .	0,56		
	3. Sitting and eating at the restaurant makes me happier than eating at home.	0,82		
	4. I feel more satisfied when I'm in popular places.	0,63		
	5. I'd rather eat out than cook at home.	0,60		
Consumption	6. I'd rather buy and wear electronics or appropriate clothes, even if I don't need them.	0,55	2,132	16,39
	7. I see the need to save money, to live thrifty.	0,59		
	8. I review popular people's sites on social media like Instagram and try to apply their beauty recipes.	0,70		
	9. I get bored with electronics or clothes I buy quickly.	0,76		
	10. I keep track of new trendy outfits, music, venues.	0,65		
Nostalgia	11. It's a waste of me to spend too much money to beautify myself or look good.	0,67	1,011	7,77
	12. New songs don't impress me, I'm happy to listen to nostalgic songs from the past.	0,85		
	13. I always think previous songs are up to date.	0,80		
Total				58,53

The relationship of the subscales that make up the two-dimensional Popular Culture Scale that occurs after factor analysis (Venue & Consumption r: 0.49; Venue & Nostalgia r: 310; Consumption & Nostalgia r:0.40) and its relation to the total (Venue r: 0.76; Consumption r: 0.77; Nostalgia r: 0.52) examined, mid-level and above changing relationships were detected. Within the scope of the validity of the Popular Culture Scale, the discriminant of the sum of the scale with the subscales was looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 9.

Table 9. Independent group t-test analysis of Popular Culture Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Venue	Upper Group	400	14,57	1,57	798	47,78	,000
	Lower Group	400	9,86	1,18			
Consumption	Upper Group	400	13,30	3,2	798	45,34	,000
	Lower Group	400	5,74	0,7			
Nostalgia	Upper Group	400	11,19	1,4	798	63,76	,000
	Lower Group	400	4,89	1,3			
Popular Culture Scale	Upper Group	400	35,98	4,6	798	47,01	,000
	Lower Group	400	23,25	2,7			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.73; Venue dimension of 5 items is 0.71; Consumption dimension consisting of 5 items is 0.76; Nostalgia dimension consisting of 3 items was found to be 0.70. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. 2nd, 3rd, 11th, 12th, 13th articles on the scale are inverted. The lowest score on the scale is 13 and the highest score is 65. According to this; 7-15 points are considered as "little level", 16-25 points as "Moderate", 26-35 points as "High Level".

5. Impulse Control Scale

The draft scale considered as Impulse Control Scale consists of 4 items. Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test were used to determine the eligibility of the data set for factor analysis and according to the results obtained 0.85 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 4770,135 (SD: 78; p <0.000) were found. The values found that the relationships between variables are appropriate to the factor analysis. Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cutting value is released, the single-factor structure was obtained. Accordingly, the factor of a factor in Table 10 is given the factor of the item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentage.

Table 10. Factor Analysis Results of Impulse Control Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Impulse Control Scale	1. When I see new season clothes or electronics in storefronts, I want to buy them right away, even if I don't need them.	0,77	2,082	52,04
	2. Even if I'm not hungry in cafes and restaurants, I want to eat new dishes and desserts.	0,75		
	3. I'm always active on social media, and every time I try to disconnect, I say, "One more minute."	0,75		
	4. I follow the ideas of phenomena on social media if the comments on their pages are useful.	0,57		
Total				52,04

Within the scope of the discriminant validity of the one-dimensional Impulse Control Scale that occurs after factor analysis, the distinguishing of the scale total was looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 11.

Table 11. Independent group t-test analysis of Impulse Control Scale total score distinguishing

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Impulse Control Scale	Upper Group	400	11,78	1,9	798	45,99	,000
	Lower Group	400	6,65	1,0			

Within the scope of reliability studies, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the 4-item scale was found to be 0.67. All items must be reverse-coded when calculating the score of the scale, which can be scored at least 4 points and a maximum of 20 points. According to this; 4-8 points are considered as "Less level", 9-14 points "Moderate", 15-20 points as "High Level".

6. Technology Use Scale

The draft scale discussed as the use of technology use is initially 12 items. First, the Kaiser Meyer Old (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test were used to determine the suitable of the data set for factor analysis and the KMO value is 0.89 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 4886,080 (df:55; p<0.000) has been found. The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis. When the Eigenvalue of 1 and the factor cutting value are released, the factor load value of 1 item is eliminated because it is low, analysis is repeated with 11 items and a 3-factor structure is obtained. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages emerged as a result of factor analysis in Table 12 are given. The contents of the items in the resulting subscales were examined and named "Loyalty", " Satisfactoriness" and "Traditional Media Preference".

Table 12. Factor analysis results of the Technology Usage Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Loyalty	1. When I'm away from my smartphone, I feel incomplete, uneasy.	0,78	4,817	43,79
	2. I always check my social media accounts before I go to sleep and immediately after I wake up.	0,76		
	3. I am constantly online/active with my mobile devices (tablets, phones, etc.).	0,75		
	4. I don't disconnect from social media while I'm reading and working.	0,65		
Ability	5. I can do every job using social media and internet.	0,76	1,320	12,00
	6. I can manage all my activities (talk, game, bank shopping etc) over social media.	0,79		
	7. I active social media in all areas of my life.	0,71		
	8. I use at the same time both tablets, smartphone etc. and can do my other work too.	0,73		
Traditional Media Preference	9. My habit of listening to music on the radio isn't just on social media.	0,68	1,068	9,70
	10. I prefer to watch series and movies on the TV, rather than their classic mediums.	0,73		
	11. I think I should get help using technological devices.	0,63		
Total				65,50

The interrelated subscales that make up the three-dimensional Technology Usage Scale that occurs after factor analysis (Loyalty & Ability r: 0.66; Loyalty & Traditional Media Preference r: 0.24; Ability & Traditional Media Preference r:0,23) and its relation to the total (Loyalty r: 0.85; Qualification r: 0.86; Traditional Media Preference r: 0.71) examined, mid-level and changing relationships were detected. The discriminant of the subscales and the sum of the scale was looked at within the scope of the validity of the Technology Usage Scale. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at $p<0,001$ and the results were given in Table 13.

Table 13. Independent group t-test analysis of Technology Usage Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Loyalty	Upper Group	400	14,68	2,41	798	63,07	,000
	Lower Group	400	5,94	1,35			
Ability	Upper Group	400	15,25	2,57	798	63,18	,000
	Lower Group	400	5,92	1,43			
Traditional Media Preference	Upper Group	400	13,26	2,57	798	51,26	,000
	Lower Group	400	8,04	1,75			
Technology Usage Scale	Upper Group	400	39,37	4,70	798	55,85	,000
	Lower Group	400	23,74	3,03			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.78; Loyalty dimension of 4 items is 0.83; Ability dimension of 4 items is 0.87; Traditional Media Preference dimension consisting of 3 items was found to be 0.69. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. 9th, 10th, 11th items on the scale are encoded in

reverse. The lowest score on the scale is 11 and the highest score is 55. According to this; 11-25 points are considered as "Less level", 26-40 points as "Moderate", 41-55 points as "High Level".

7. Social Norms Acceptance Scale

The basic components analysis was applied within the scope of the construct validity of the draft scale to be evaluated as the evaluations of the scale considered as an acceptance scale of social norms. In the analysis of key components initially, with 9 items, the suitability of the scale for factor analysis was evaluated by Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test. According to the results obtained, the KMO value was found to be 0.80 and the Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value was 4080,815 (df:36; p<0,000). The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis.

Calculations were made by releasing Eigenvalue 1 and factor cutting value in basic components analysis. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages that emerged as a result of factor analysis are given in Table 14. The contents of the items in the resulting subscales are examined and named "Tolerance" and "Acceptance".

Table 14. Factor analysis results of the Social Norms Acceptance Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Tolerance	1. It bothers me to have intimate friends of different races, religious beliefs.	0,55	4,040	44,88
	2. I don't get intimate with people from different ethnic groups.	0,67		
	3. I feel sorry for someone who's got a nose ring/piercing on various parts of his body.	0,62		
	4. If I were an employer, I wouldn't prefer someone with tattoos all over their body.	0,74		
	5. I immediately disconnect from those who have an outlier view on social media.	0,78		
	6. I don't want to see people with outlier value choices in my family circle.	0,85		
	7. It bothers me to be friends with someone with an outlier lifestyle..	0,82		
Acceptance	8. I can join collaborating groups with people of different races, religious beliefs.	0,85	1,443	16,03
	9. I consider it culturally natural to wear ornament (piercings) on your nose, eyebrows, tongue.	0,83		
Total				60,92

The relationship between the subscales that make up the two-dimensional Social Norms Acceptance Scale that occurs after factor analysis (r: 0.31) and its relation to the sum (Tolerance r: 0.94; Acceptance r: 0.59) examined, mid-level and above changing, relationships were detected. Within the scope of the validity of the Social Norms Acceptance Scale, the discriminant of the sum of scale and the subscales were looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 15.

Table 15. Independent group t-test analysis Social Norms Acceptance Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Tolerance	Upper Group	400	33,63	1,48	798	53,15	,000
	Lower Group	400	21,10	4,47			
Acceptance	Upper Group	400	9,58	0,65	798	72,30	,000
	Lower Group	400	4,36	1,29			
Social Norms	Upper	400	42,04	2,33	798	57,07	,000

Acceptance Scale	Group						
	Lower Group	400	26,92	4,75			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.83; Tolerance dimension of 7 items is 0.86; Acceptance dimension of 2 items is 0.71. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. All other items are inversely encoded except items 8 and 9 when calculating the scale score. A minimum score of 9 points and a maximum of 45 points can be obtained from the scale. According to this; 9-20 points are considered as "Less level", 21-32 points as "Moderate", 33-45 points as "High Level".

8. Multiple Attention Scale

To make evaluations of the scale treated as Multiple Attention Scale, basic components analysis was applied within the scope of the structure validity of the draft scale. In the analysis of key components initially, with 7 items, the suitability of the scale for factor analysis was evaluated by Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test. Chi-square value. The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis.

Two factors emerged in the calculations made by releasing the Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cut value in the analysis of the basic components. When the content of the items on the subscales is examined, it is decided that it is related to "Multi-Attention" and "Single Focus". Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages that emerged as a result of factor analysis are given in Table 16.

Table 16. Factor analysis results of Multiple Attention Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Multiple Attention	1. I can pay attention to several technological devices (tablets, smartphones, TVs) at the same time.	0,84	2,643	37,75
	2. I can easily track them when I open multiple apps on my computer or smartphone.	0,85		
	3. Since I'm too sensitive to the surroundings, I can also notice another person or events while listening to one person.	0,73		
	4. And when I'm busy with my phone, I can listen to what the other people are saying.	0,79		
Single Focus	5. I think I can focus on one job at a time.	0,80	2,164	30,91
	6. When I'm reading a book or a newspaper/magazine, I can't focus on anything else at the same time.	0,85		
	7. When I'm given another job doing my job, I think I can't be productive.	0,84		
Total				68,66

The relationship between the subscales that make up the two-dimensional Multi-Attention Scale that occurs after factor analysis (r: 0.42) and its relation to the total (Multiple Attention r: 0.80; Single Focus (r: 0.63) examined, mid-level and above changing relationships were detected. The discriminant validity of the Multiple Attention Scale looked at the distinguishing of the sum of scales with subscales. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 17.

Table 17. Independent group t-test analysis of Multiple Attention Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Multiple Attention	Upper Group	400	16,13	2,29	798	62,90	,000
	Lower Group	400	7,16	1,68			
Single Focus	Upper	400	11,86	1,49	798	68,80	,000

	Group						
	Lower Group	400	4,86	1,38			
Multiple Attention Scale	Upper Group	400	25,52	3,50	798	50,26	,000
	Lower Group	400	14,45	2,67			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.70; Multiple Attention dimension consisting of 4 items 0.82; Single Focus dimension consisting of 3 items is calculated as 0.79. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. 5th, 6th, 7th items are inverted when calculating scale scores. At least 7 points and up to 35 points can be obtained from the scale. According to this; 7-15 points are considered as "Less Level", 16-25 points as "Moderate", 26-35 points are considered as "High Level".

9. Work Liking Scale

To make evaluations of the scale treated as The Work Liking Scale, basic components analysis was applied within the scope of the structure validity of the draft scale. In the analysis of key components initially, with 8 items, the suitability of the scale for factor analysis was evaluated by Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test. According to the results, the KMO value was found to be 0.75, and Bartlett's Sphericity Chi-square value was 3574,999 (df:21; p<0,000). The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis.

In the calculations made by releasing the Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cutting value in the analysis of the basic components, the operation was repeated by removing the 1 item factor load from the scale because it was low and two factors emerged. When the content of the items on the subscales is examined, it is decided that it is related to "Abstain from Work" and "Belief in Working". Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages emerged as a result of factor analysis in Table 18.

Table 18. Factor analysis results of the Work Liking Scale

Factors	**Items**	**Factor Load**	**Eigen Value**	**Variance Percentage**
Abstain from Work	1. The idea of making money from hard work comes to me attractive.	0,85	3,153	45,04
	2. I'd rather work a lot of work I can jump in a short time.	0,83		
	3. I would be unhappy while working	0,70		
Belief in Working	4. I believe I can come somewhere by working.	0,84	1,873	26,76
	5. I'm not restless when working I'll believe that I'll get the worth later.	0,86		
	6. I don't even think of my goal even if I'm experiencing difficulties while working.	0,88		
	7. While the conditions get hard I believe I have to finish the work I started.	0,86		
Total				71,80

The relation of the subscales that form the two-dimensional work-liking scale of the two-dimensional operation after the factor analysis (R: 0.37) and the total relationship between each other (escape from work: 0.53; belief r: 0.76) were examined, moderate relationships were examined. Within the scope of the validity of the work-liking discriminant, the distinguishing of the sum of the scale with the subscales was looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 19.

Table 19. Independent group t-test analysis of Work Liking Scale and subscales

Factors	**Groups**	**N**	**X**	**Sd**	**df**	**t**	**p**
Abstain from Work	Upper Group	400	10,66	1,68	798	64,35	,000

	Lower Group	400	4,26	1,04			
Belief in Work	Upper Group	400	13,03	2,60	798	61,17	,000
	Lower Group	400	4,65	0,83			
Work Liking Scale	Upper Group	400	20,79	2,35	798	59,14	,000
	Lower Group	400	11,02	2,31			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.73; Escape from Work dimension of 3 items is 0.72; The Belief in Working dimension consisting of 4 items was calculated as 0.89. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th items are reverse-coded when calculating scale scores. At least 7 points and up to 35 points can be obtained from the scale. According to this; 7-15 points are considered as "Less Level", 16-25 points as "Moderate", 26-35 points as "High Level".

10. Internal Control Scale

The draft scale considered as an internal control scale consists of 20 items. First of all, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) used in determining the suitability of the data set for factor analysis and is applied by Bartlett Sphericity test and according to the results obtained 0.89 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 6753,434 (sd: 153; p <0.000) has been found. The values found that the relationships between variables are appropriate to the factor analysis. The Eigenvalue 1 and factor cutting value is released when the factor load value of the 2 items is low, the analysis was repeated with 18 items and a 3-factor structure was obtained. Accordingly, factors, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages arising as a result of factor analysis are given in Table 20. The content of the items in the resulting subscales was examined and named "Emotional Control", "Desire Control" and "Sexual Control".

Table 20. Factor analysis results of Internal Control Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Emotional Control	1. If it lowers my mood, I'd rather avoid the truth.	0,66	5,512	30,62
	2. Most of the time I can't control my fears .	0,67		
	3. I can't control my anger most of the time.	0,56		
	4. I don't like it when I'm criticized.	0,61		
	5. I can't stand it when I'm asked stupid questions.	0,66		
	6. I can't rest until I convince the other person that I know right.	0,54		
	7. My mood changes when I don't have something I want.	0,69		
Desire Control	8. I can make a realistic assessment of the afterlife.	0,60	2,565	14,25
	9. I'm usually positive, I don't despair.	0,72		
	10. I can control my sexual desires .	0,67		
	11. I think I'm humbled.	0,75		
	12. When I'm shopping, I stop and think and then I decide.	0,73		
	13. I can think solution-oriented, not problem-oriented, by facing problems.	0,82		
	14. You could say I usually live on a plan.	0,72		
	15. I can adjust my sleep patterns most of the time.	0,61		
	16. I can be happy with little things .	0,71		
Sexual Control	17. I don't think comfortable sex life is a problem.	0,82	1,319	7,32
	18 I can be with someone I meet on social media.	0,73		
Total				52,20

The relationship of the subscales that make up the three-dimensional Internal Control Scale that occurs after factor analysis (Emotional Control & Desire Control r: 0.31; Emotional Control & Sexual Control r: 0.30; Desire Control & Sexual Control r:0.69) and its relationship to total (Emotional Control r: 0.45; Desire Control r: 0.66; Sexual Control r: 0.32) examined, moderately changing relationships were detected. Within the scope of the validity of the Internal Control Scale, the discriminant of the sum of the scale and the subscales were looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 21.

Table 21. Independent group t-test analysis of Internal Control Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Emotional Control	Upper Group	400	24,48	3,36	798	54,96	,000
	Lower Group	400	12,97	2,49			
Desire Control	Upper Group	400	29,67	5,56	798	51,30	,000
	Lower Group	400	13,96	2,55			
Sexual Control	Upper Group	400	6,91	1,55	798	58,77	,000
	Lower Group	400	2,20	0,40			
Internal Control Scale	Upper Group	400	52,99	4,29	798	55,67	,000
	Lower Group	400	35,59	4,53			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.65; Emotional Control dimension consisting of 7 items is 0.77; Desire Control dimension consisting of 9 items is 0.88; Sexual Control dimension consisting of 2 items was found to be 0.60. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. All items (range 8 to 16) in the size of desire control on the scale are inverted. The lowest score on the scale is 18 and the highest score is 90. According to this; 18-41 points are considered as "Less level", 42-65 points as "Moderate", 66-90 points as "High Level".

11. Impatience Scale

The draft scale, which is considered the Impatience Scale, consists of 5 items. It was applied with the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test used to determine the suitability of the data set for factor analysis, and the results in which KMO value was found to be 0.77 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 1080,201 (df:10; p<0,000) was found. The values found showed that the relationships between variables were in line with factor analysis. The single-factor structure is obtained when Eigenvalue 1 and factor cutting value are released. Accordingly, the factor resulting from factor analysis in Table 22, item factor loads, eigenvalue and variance percentage is given.

Table 22. Factor analysis results of the Impatience Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Impatience Scale	1. I can't usually stand waiting in line at places like banks, grocery stores, hospitals.	0,71	2,46	50,00
	2. I can apply to the internet immediately to get something I want.	0,65		
	3. Even if I can't afford it, I try to find an opportunity to get something I like.	0,72		
	4. When I don't get what I want at that moment, I get depressed.	0,77		
	5. It's a grind to be patient with people who think differently.	0,62		

Total	50,00

Within the scope of the discriminant validity of the one-dimensional Impatience Scale that occurs after factor analysis, the distinguishing of the scale total was looked at. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, an independent group t-test was applied between the 400-person sub-and Upper Groups, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0.001 and the results were given in Table 23.

Table 23. Independent group t-test analysis of Impatience Scale

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Impatience Scale	Upper Group	400	16,76	2,73	798	55,58	,000
	Lower Group	400	7,86	1,65			

Within the scope of reliability studies, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the 5-item scale was found to be 0.74. A minimum score of 5 and a maximum of 25 points can be obtained. According to this; 5-11 points are considered as "Less level", 12-18 points as "Moderate", 19-25 points as "High Level".

12. Family Values Scale

The draft scale treated as family values scale consists of 16 items. First of all, the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett Sphericity test were used to determine the eligibility of the data set for factor analysis, and according to the results obtained 0.88 and Bartlett Sphericity Chi-square value 9067,163 (df:120; p<0.000) has been found. The values found that the relationships between variables are appropriate to the factor analysis. Eigenvalue 1 and the factor cut value is released, 3-factor structure was obtained. Accordingly, factors arising as a result of factor analysis, item factor loads, eigenvalue, and variance percentages are given in Table 24. The contents of the items in the resulting subscales were examined and named "Importance to Marriage", "Escape from Marriage" and "Freedom".

Table 24. Factor analysis results of the Family Values Scale

Factors	Items	Factor Load	Eigen Value	Variance Percentage
Importance to Marriage	1. I think marriage increases love and trust between couples.	0,82	5,505	34,40
	2. Marriage ensures that someone will be happen who will be able to eliminate my loneliness and share my feelings.	0,83		
	3. I think marriage is important for the continuation of the generation.	0,80		
	4. I think a life without marriage would be incomplete.	0,70		
	5. I think marriage also played a role in streamlining income planning.	0,77		
	6. I consider the family institution important as the basic building block of society.	0,72		
	7. Marriage prevents unnecessary expenses.	0,58		
Escape from Marriage	8. I don't think marriage is necessary to have children.	0,83	3,413	21,32
	9. The idea that marriage provides a regular life does not appeal to me.	0,55		
	10. No marriage is required to live life together.	0,85		
	11. I would see more appropriate to live together without a wedding.	0,82		
Freedom	12. I think marriage is a hindrance to my freedom.	0,73	1,367	8,54
	13. I don't think it's entirely possible to live a comfortable life as long as there's a marriage.	0,77		
	14. If I'll marry/I'm married, I think I can't spend as easily as I did before.	0,79		

15. When I'll marry/I'm married when I don't get what I want, I think I'm going to miss/I miss my previous way of life.	0,78	
16. I think I'll live more comfortably if I'm not married.	0,61	
Total		64,27

The relationship of the subscales that make up the three-dimensional Family Values Scale that occurs after factor analysis (Importance to Marriage & Escape from Marriage r: 0.34; Importance to Marriage & Freedom r: 0.82; Marriage Escape & Freedom r:0.54) and its relationship with the total (Importance to Marriage r: 0.74; Escape from Marriage r: 0.78; Freedom r: 0.66) examined, moderately changing relationships detected. The discriminant of the subscales and the sum of the scale was looked at within the scope of the validity of the family values scale. Thus, after the scores were sorted from high to low, independent group t-tests were applied between the lower and upper groups of 400 people, which amounted to 27%. All items of the scale were found to be distinctive at p<0,001 and the results were given in Table 25.

Table 25. Independent group t-test analysis of Family Values Scale and subscales

Factors	Groups	N	X	Sd	df	t	p
Importance to Marriage	Upper Group	400	26,79	3,63	798	69,50	,000
	Lower Group	400	11,36	2,54			
Escape from Marriage	Upper Group	400	12,39	3,60	798	46,51	,000
	Lower Group	400	4,00	0,50			
Freedom	Upper Group	400	16,81	3,76	798	51,73	,000
	Lower Group	400	6,52	1,29			
Family Values Scale	Upper Group	400	50,73	8,33	798	53,15	,000
	Lower Group	400	25,81	4,29			

Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficients of subscale and scale were examined as part of reliability studies. Internal consistency of the scale total Cronbach Alpha coefficient is 0.86; The "Importance to Marriage" dimension consisting of 7 items is 0.87; The dimension of "Escape from Marriage" consisting of 4 items is 0.86; The dimension of "Freedom" consisting of 5 items was found to be 0.83. These values are sufficient for the reliability of the scale. The "Importance to Marriage" dimension on the scale, i.e. the first 7 items, are inversely encoded. The lowest score to be taken from the scale is 16, the highest score is 80. According to this; 16-36 points are considered as "Less Level", 37-58 points "Moderate", 59-80 points as "High Level".

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study, several scales have been developed to reveal the technology use, value, and behavior of different generations. The common point of the scales is that the items are attributed to different generations (values and behaviors). Thus, if high scores are obtained from the scales, the perspective of the generation is added to the measured subject. If high scores are obtained from the scales, proximity to generation Z can also be evaluated as proximity to generation X if a low score is obtained.

Uskudar XYZ Generation Differences Scale consists of 12 independent scales in itself. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis studies carried out with a single pool of items initially built up, it was decided to separate the items originally built up according to the subjects and to carry out validity and reliability studies separately. Validity and reliability studies carried out in this direction have revealed the appropriate structures. It has been observed that the scales are divided into subscales within themselves and exhibit a suitable relationship. In the discriminant studies, it was found that the characteristics to be measured can be measured, that is, the dimensions and scale totals provide distinctiveness.

Thus, the scales resulting from the scale development study are given appropriate names. Accordingly, the items and dimensions of each of the scales called (1) Organizational Commitment and Authority Scale, (2) Self-Evaluation Scale, (3) Friendship Bond Scale, (4) Popular Culture Scale, (5) Impulse Control Scale, (6) Technology Use Scale, (7) Social Norms Acceptance Scale, (8) Multiple Attention Scale, (9) Work-Liking Scale, (10) Internal Control Scale, (10) Internal Control Scale, (11) Impatience Scale (12) Family Values Scale are explained under separate headings. For the evaluation of scales, the highest score and the lowest score are divided into three equal ranges, with evaluation intervals of "Low Level", "Intermediate" and "High Level" determined. The evaluation intervals of each scale are calculated and indicated above. The scales are of 5-point Likert type and are rated as "Not Suitable for Me", "Less Suitable for Me", "Medium Suitable for Me", "Very Suitable for Me" and "Completely Suitable for Me" to determine the participation in each expression.

As a result, the Uskudar XYZ Generation Differences Scale consists of 12 independent scales in itself, so each can be used individually or can produce stronger results when used in an all-in-one. Generational work is needed with this series of scales that emerge as valid and reliable. Validity and reliability studies of scales can be re-performed in studies in different sample groups, and linguistic equivalence studies can be performed and adapted to different languages by making linguistic equivalence.

REFERENCES

Adıgüzel, O., Batur, H. Z., & Ekşili, N. (2014). Kuşakların değişen yüzü ve y kuşağı ile ortaya çıkan yeni çalışma tarzı: Mobil yakalılar [Generation's changing side and the newly arisen work style after y-generation: mobile collars]. *Journal of Suleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences, 19*(1), 165–182.

Akdemir, A., Konakay, G., Demirkaya, H., Noyan, A., Demir, B., Ağ, C., and et.al. (2013). Y kuşağının kariyer algısı, kariyer değişimi ve liderlik tarzı beklentilerinin araştırılması [The investigation of relationship between organizational an investigation of expectations of career perception and change, and leadership style of generation y]. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *2*(2), 11–42.

Alwin, D.F. ve Mccammon, R.J. (2007). Rethinking generations. *Research in Human Development*, *4* (3-4), 219–370.

Asmafiliz, E., & Şalvarcı Türeli, N. (2018). Y kuşağı bireylerin sosyal medya kullanım sıklığı üzerine amprik bir araştırma [An empirical research on the frequency of social media use of millennials.]. *5th International Conference on Social Sciences and Education Research, Proceeding Book,* 294–312.

Bayramoğlu, G., Şahin, M. (2017). Field study investigating the expectations of employment and tendencies of the generations Y. *Journal of Labour Relations*, *8*(2), 56–75.

Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(19), 218–229.

Börü, D. E. & Yurtkoru, E. S. (2016). Yeni kuşakların iş yaşamı tarzları üzerine ölçek geliştirme çalışması [A scale development study on the business life styles of new generations.]. *Adana Çukurova University IVth Organizational Behavior Congress Proceeding Book*, 64–68.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı [Handbook of data analysis for social sciences]. PegemA Publishing.

Deniz, L. & Tutgun Ünal, A. (2019). Sosyal medya çağında kuşakların sosyal medya kullanımı ve değerlerine yönelik bir dizi ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Development of a set of scales toward the use of social media and values of generations in social media age]. *OPUS–Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi [International Journal of Society Researches]*, *11*(18), 1025–1057. DOI: 10.26466/opus.557240

Ekinci, Y., Tutgun-Ünal, A., Bayse, R., Ekinci, A. & Tarhan, N. (2021). Siberkondri, sağlık okuryazarlığı ve sosyo-ekonomik statü ilişkisi bağlamında x ve y kuşağına yönelik bir araştırma [A research of x and y generations in the context of the relationship between cyberchondry, health literacy and socio-economic status]. *İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi İletişim Çalışmaları Dergisi [Istanbul Arel University Communication Studies Journal]*, *9*(20), 117–148.

Ekşili, N., & Antalyalı, Ö.L. (2017). Türkiye'de Y kuşağı özelliklerini belirlemeye yönelik bir çalışma: Okul yöneticileri üzerine bir araştırma [A study to determine the characteristics of generation y in Turkey: A survey on school administrators]. *Humanities Sciences* (NWSAHS), 12(3), 90–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2017.12.3.4C0219

Engizek, N., & Şekerkaya, A. (2016). X ve Y kuşağı kadınlarının karar verme tarzları bakımından incelenmesi, *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *13*(36), 242–271.

Kelgökmen İlic, D., & Yalçın, B. (2017). Y jenerasyonunun farklılaşan iş değerleri ve liderlik algılamaları [Differentiated job values and leadership perceptions of gen y]. *Journal of Yaşar University*, *12*(46), 136–160.

Kuyucu, M. (2017). Y kuşağı ve teknoloji: Y kuşağının iletişim teknolojilerini kullanım alışkanlıkları [Y generation and technology: The use of communication technologies in y generation]. *Gümüşhane*

Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Elektronik Dergisi [Gümüşhane University e-Journal of Faculty of Communication], *5*(2), 845–872.

Latif, H., & Serbest, S. (2014). Türkiye'de 2000 kuşağı ve 2000 kuşağının iş ve çalışma anlayışı [Generation 2000 in Turkey and generation 2000's business and working concept]. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(4), 132–163.

Morsümbül, Ş. (2014). Kültürel değerlerin üç kuşak arasındaki değişimi üzerine bir inceleme: Ankara örneği [A study on the cultural value change across three generations: Ankara sample]. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi [University Journal of Turkish Studies/HÜTAD*], 21, 137–160.

Mücevher, M. H. (2015). X ve Y Kuşağının Birbirlerine Karşı Özellik ve Etkileşim Algıları: SDÜ Örneği [Characteristics and interaction perceptions of x and y generations against each other: SDU sample]. *Unpublished Master Thesis*, Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey.

Özdemir, Ş. (2021). Sosyal medya çağında kuşakların medya kullanım alışkanlıklarının incelenmesi [Examination of media use habits of generations in the age of social media]. *İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi İletişim Çalışmaları Dergisi [Istanbul Arel University Communication Studies Journal]*, 9(20), 281–308.

Özgüven, İ. E. (1994). Psikolojik testler [Psychological tests]. Yeni Doğuş Matbaası, Ankara, Turkey.

Seligman, M. (2019). Positive Psychology: A Personal History. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 15, 1–23.

Sharma, S. (1996). Applied Multivariate Techniques. John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York.

Sipahi, B., Yurtkoru, E.S., & Çinko, M. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS'le veri analizi [Data analysis with SPSS in social sciences]*. Beta.

Süer, S., Sezgin, K., & Oral, B. (2017). Z kuşağındaki öğrencilerin internete ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi: Bir metafor çalışması [Generation z students' perceptions of internet: A metaphor study]. *Elektronik Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi [Electronic Journal of Educational Science]*, 6(12), 190–203.

Tarhan, N. (2015). *Değerler Psikolojisi ve İnsan [Psychology of values and human]*. Timaş Publishing.

Tarhan, N. (2019). *10 Adımda Pozitif Psikoloji [10 steps positive psychology]*. Timaş Publishing.

Tarhan, K. N. (2020). "*Doğru bir politika üretemezsek Z kuşağı kayıp kuşak olacak*", Access: https://www.nevzattarhan.com/dogru-bir-politika-uretemezsek-z-kusagi-kayip-kusak-olacak.html

Tarhan, N., & Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2021). *Sosyal medya psikolojisi [Social media psychology]*. Der Publishing.

Taş, H. Y., Demirdöğmez, M., & Küçükoğlu, M. (2017). Geleceğimiz olan Z kuşağının çalışma hayatına muhtemel etkileri [Possible effects of future architects' z generation on business life]. *OPUS-Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi [International Journal of Society Researches]*, *7*(13), 1031–1048.

Tolbize, A. (2008). *Generational differences in the workplace*. Research and Training Center on Community Living: University of Minnesota.

Toruntay, H. (2011). Takım rolleri çalışması: X ve Y kuşağı üzerinde karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi [Unpublished Master Thesis],* İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2013). Nesiller ayrılıyor: X, Y ve Z nesilleri [XYZ Generations]. Açıkbilim, Access: http://www.acikbilim.com/2013/09/dosyalar/nesiller-ayriliyor-x-y-ve-z-nesilleri.html

Tutgun-Ünal, A. (2021). Social media generations' levels of acceptance of diversity. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 20*(2), 155–168.

Tutgun-Ünal, A., & Deniz, L. (2020). The Comparison of Work Values of Social Media Generations in terms of Giving Importance to Work and Obeying The Rules in Turkey. *Azerbaijan Journal of Educational Studies,* 690, 199–220. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/edu.102.

Tutgun-Ünal, A., Tarhan, N., Muradi, P., & Kurt, A. (2021). The adaptation of The Instagram Addiction Scale (TIAS) into Turkish: Validity and reliability studies. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET*, 20(4), 76-89. Access: http://tojet.net/articles/v20i4/2048.pdf

Türk, A. (2013). Y kuşağı [Y Generation]. İstanbul, Turkey: Kafekültür Publishing.

Yıldırım Becerikli, S. (2013). Kuşaklararası iletişim farklılığı: Bilim teknoloji ve yenilik haberleri üzerinden bir odak grup çalışması [Communication differences between generations: A focus group study through science, technology and innovation news]. *Selçuk İletişim [Journal of Selcuk Communication]*, 8(1), 5–18.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). Generations at work: Managing the clash of boomers, gen Xers, and gen Yers in the workplace (2nd Ed. b.). USA: Amacom.