Exploring the impact of social climate on job satisfaction: A comprehensive analysis

Yakup İZCİ[1] , Cumali KILIÇ[2]

[1]Mardin Artuklu University, The Institute for Graduate Educational Studies, Mardin, Turkiye
[2]Mardin Artuklu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Mardin, Turkiye

Abstract

The social climate fostered in organizations can directly influence job satisfaction by affecting employees' motivation, commitment and performance. The level of job satisfaction among employees is crucial both individually and organizationally. An organization's ability to manage and enhance the social climate is essential for boosting employee job satisfaction and consequently improving organizational performance. Thus, this study seeks to offer a comprehensive review and a novel perspective on understanding the impact of social climate on job satisfaction within organizations and aims to help organizations understand the social climate factors that influence their employees and to develop effective strategies for increasing job satisfaction. Using data collected from 320 employees at Mardin Artuklu University, the research evaluates various dimensions of social climate and their effects on job satisfaction. The findings reveal that social climate factors like interpersonal harmony, organizational support, professional solidarity and non-work relations are significantly and negatively correlated with higher job satisfaction levels. Thus, the study also uncovers positive correlation between job satisfaction and intra-group communication. Also, no relation was found between work ethics and job satisfaction. These results suggest that improving specific aspects of the social climate can enhance employee satisfaction and by extension, organizational performance. Therefore, the results of this study offer valuable insights and can serve as significant guidance for managers in making informed strategic decisions related to social climate management within the business world. The study further concludes by underscoring the critical importance of effectively managing the social climate in organizations, highlighting how such efforts can foster a more supportive, motivating and ultimately satisfying workplace environment which in turn can lead to enhanced employee well-being and overall organizational success.

Keywords: Social climate, job satisfaction, organizational performance, organizational behavior.

Sosyal iklimin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi: Kapsamlı bir analiz

Öz

Örgütlerde oluşturulan sosyal iklim, çalışanların motivasyonunu, bağlılığını ve performansını etkileyerek doğrudan iş tatminini etkileyebilir. Çalışanlar arasındaki iş tatmini düzeyi hem bireysel hem de örgütsel olarak çok önemlidir. Bir örgütün sosyal iklimi yönetme ve geliştirme becerisi, çalışanların iş tatminini artırmak ve dolayısıyla örgütsel performansı iyileştirmek için esastır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma örgütler içinde sosyal iklimin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisini anlamak için kapsamlı bir inceleme ve yeni bir bakış açısı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır ve örgütlerin çalışanlarını etkileyen sosyal iklim faktörlerini anlamalarına ve iş tatminini artırmak için etkili stratejiler geliştirmelerine yardımcı olmayı amaçlamaktadır. Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi'ndeki 320 çalışandan toplanan verileri kullanarak araştırma, sosyal iklimin çeşitli boyutlarını ve iş tatmini üzerindeki etkilerini değerlendirmektedir. Bulgular, kişilerarası uyum, örgütsel destek, mesleki dayanışma ve iş dışı ilişkiler gibi sosyal iklim faktörlerinin daha yüksek iş tatmini düzeyleriyle anlamlı ve negatif bir şekilde ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu nedenle, çalışma ayrıca iş tatmini ile grup içi iletişim arasında pozitif bir korelasyon ortaya koymaktadır. Ayrıca, iş etiği ile iş tatmini arasında bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Bu sonuçlar, sosyal iklimin belirli yönlerini iyileştirmenin çalışan tatminini ve dolayısıyla örgütsel performansı artırabileceğini göstermektedir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın sonuçları değerli içgörüler sunar ve yöneticilerin iş dünyasında sosyal iklim yönetimiyle ilgili bilinçli stratejik kararlar almaları için önemli bir rehberlik görevi görebilir. Çalışma ayrıca, kuruluşlardaki sosyal iklimi etkili bir şekilde yönetmenin kritik önemini vurgulayarak, bu tür çabaların daha destekleyici, motive edici ve nihayetinde tatmin edici bir iş yeri ortamını nasıl teşvik edebileceğini ve bunun da çalışanların refahını ve genel örgütsel başarıyı artırabileceğini vurgulayarak sona ermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal iklim, iş tatmini, örgütsel performans, örgütsel davranış.

Sorumlu Yazar/ Corresponded Author: Cumali KILIÇ, **E-posta/ e-mail:** cumalikilic@artuklu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

The social climate fostered in organizations can directly influence job satisfaction by affecting employees' motivation, commitment and performance. Organizational climate encompasses the feelings, behaviors, and perceptions of individuals regarding their work environment, which are integral to sustaining organizational life. It represents a blend of internal characteristics influenced by the organizational culture, shaping human behaviors within the organization. Thus, organizational climate can be defined as an environment shaped by the interplay of environmental, individual, and organizational quality structures, impacting human behaviors within the organizational context.

When the studies on organizational climate are examined, it is seen that there are different definitions of organizational climate (Diş & Ayık, 2016, p. 502). Deniz and Çoban (2016) define organizational climate as an environment and call organizational climates where expectation levels are high, helpfulness, reliability, credibility, sincerity, openness and participation are dominant as "perfect climate". Aytaç (2003) defines climate as a set of internal characteristics that distinguish organizations from each other and direct the behaviors of employees in the organization. Litwin and Stringer (1968) define organizational climate as the environmental characteristics and personal expectations perceived by organizational members.

An observer from outside the organization can make an assessment of the organizational climate by observing and conversing with the relationships between the employees within the organization. If the observed climate emphasizes formal relationships and rejects informal ones, it can be called a "closed climate" or a "negative climate". On the contrary, if friendly, cordial, amicable and sincere relationships between coworkers are embraced, this situation can be defined as a more "positive climate" (Kurnaz et al., 2024; Özdemir, 2006, p. 10). Organizational climate is an atmosphere formed based on individuals' expectations of working in an organization and their perceptions of how well these expectations are met (Büte, 2011, p. 110). If the employees adopt the culture of the business, the organizational climate becomes positive; otherwise, it may become weak and negative (Dinçer, 1996, p. 211). It is thought that organizational climate plays an important role in adopting the ethical climate in an organization and plays a fundamental function in shaping ethical decisions (Özgener, 2020).

In their research in 1939, Lewin et al. referred to organizational climate using terms such as social climate and atmosphere. Forehand and Von Haller (1964) is one of those who define organizational climate in the broadest scope. According to them, organizational climate is all

of the characteristics that distinguish one organization from another, become established over time and do not change and includes all of the characteristics that affect the behavior of individuals in the organization and define the organization. The presence of different definitions in the literature can be summarized as the concept of organizational climate refers to the perceptions and attitudes of employees towards their organizations after a certain period of time (Momeni, 2009, p. 35). In this context, organizational climate can also be considered as the personality of the organization. According to Halpin, it can be expressed as "What personality is to the individual, personality is to the organization" (1969, p. 178). Gellerman (1970) states that personalities in organizations are not different from the personalities of individuals. Each organizational personality is unique and distinct from others. Organizational personalities emerge as a result of economic, historical and other factors as well as their effects on the members of the organization. On this issue, Neher (1996) states that organizational climate is similar to the psychological states of individuals and therefore resembles individual's and organizational climate and the behavior of organizational members are in constant interaction with each other (Mok & Au-Yeung, 2002, p. 130).

Although there are many different definitions of organizational climate in the studies the generally accepted definition was made by Landy (1989). In this way, organizational climate refers to how the objective characteristics of the organization are perceived by the organization's individuals. When we look at the basic origin of the concept, it is seen that the word climate comes from the Greek word "climate" and carries the meaning of tendency. The word basically describes how one of the members of the organization describes the internal environment and has a psychological dimension in this respect (Karcıoğlu, 2001, p. 268). Therefore, organizational social climate refers to a combination of social relations, values, norms and leadership styles in the work environment. This concept is used to explain the quality of employees' social interactions in the work environment and the factors that affect their work experiences (Ekşi, 2023, p. 32; Özkalp & Kırel, 2001, p. 123).

Nowadays, there is an increased interest in the effects of not only the psychological environment but also the social, situational and organizational environments on individuals' behaviors. A basic assumption is that individuals' behaviors are influenced by their perceptions. Therefore, it is accepted that individual's perceptions are the main focus of climate research (Halis & Uğurlu, 2008, p. 103). Employees perceive their work and management in their organizations depending on the organizational climate structure. Organizational climate can be perceived by employees as people-oriented, work-oriented or cooperation-oriented. These

perceptions enable individuals to have an idea about the organizational climate. Employees' motivation for organizational success, creativity, performance and productivity are based on their perceptions of organizational climate as much as their individual structures (Tutar & Altınöz, 2010, p. 197). In this context, factors affecting organizational climate consist of internal and external variables. These factors are considered to have a significant impact on the climate of an organization and affect employees in many ways (Landy, 1989, p. 583-584).

- *Managerial Values:* Managers' actions that influence decisions are an important factor determining the climate of the organization. Managerial values determine elements such as the formal or informal structure, participation and democracy of the organization.

- *Leadership Type:* The behavior of leaders shapes the climate of the organization. A leadership style that encourages trust and participation can create a different climate than one of tight control and unilateral decision-making.

- *Economic Conditions:* Market conditions affect managers' courage and propensity to take risks. In good economic times, organizations may be more courageous and risk-taking, while in times of recession tighter decisions may be taken.

- *Organization Structure:* The structure of the organization has a broad impact on climate. Bureaucratic structures can create a cold and closed climate, while more flexible structures can provide a more welcoming climate.

- *Employee Characteristics:* Employees' personality traits contribute to the organizational climate. More educated and enthusiastic employees can create a more friendly climate.

- *Unionization:* The existence of trade unions affects organizational relations. Union activities can lead to more formal and adversarial relations.

- *Size of the Organization:* The size of organizations affects the climate. Large organizations often create a more bureaucratic and rigid climate, while small organizations can be more innovative.

- *Nature of Work:* The type of work determines the organizational climate. Different industries and job types can create different climates.

Organizations need to be flexible to succeed in an environment of increased competition. Traditional hierarchical and bureaucratic structures may have difficulty adapting to globalization. The most appropriate structure is self-managing groups (Güzelcik, 1999, p. 91). In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, business was shaped by classical management

principles. Today, however, businesses are emerging as open and flexible systems that are compatible with environmental dynamism. With change, businesses have to pursue knowledge and innovation. Dynamic and flexible structures succeed over mechanical and bureaucratic structures (Gerloff, 1985, p. 51-52). In summary, dynamic and flexible structures are organizations that can adapt to changing environmental conditions and are constantly learning. Such structures can survive and be successful in the long run and thus provide a competitive advantage in terms of employee satisfaction. For this reason, it is necessary to explain the concept of job satisfaction in detail in the next section of the study.

Job satisfaction is a variable and complex concept that is derived from the Latin word "satis", which means enough; it is a variable and complex concept that includes individual, emotional and social characteristics, cannot be observed by others in terms of content, and can only be felt by the individual concerned, and defines inner peace (Örücü et al., 2006, p. 49-50). Job satisfaction has a great impact on the work, profession and the involuntary structures that cover them (Koçak et al., 2016, p. 42). Therefore, it is one of the most researched, discussed and evaluated issues in businesses and organizational behavior sciences (Soysal & Tan, 2013, p. 46). Herzberg (1968) defined job satisfaction as a multidimensional attitude that covers the satisfaction of the employee depending on job-specific activities, working conditions at the workplace, prestige, sense of security and earnings obtained with the job. In this respect, the concept refers to the feelings that an individual feels about work and includes attitudes or feelings about work-related situations and different aspects of work (Spector, 1997, p. 2).

Managers try to increase employees' job satisfaction by taking into account intrinsic and extrinsic factors. However, the employee's enthusiasm for work and integration with work involves an emotional and cognitive context related to the work itself, rather than only external factors such as salary or working hours. In this respect, the concept is the totality of an individual's positive attitudes about the scope of the work and the work environment (Özgen et al., 2010, p. 329). In general, job satisfaction refers to the satisfaction of employees with their jobs. Job satisfaction occurs when the characteristics of the job and the desires of the employees are compatible and it is a phenomenon that determines the satisfaction of the employee with his/her job. According to another definition, job satisfaction refers to the individual's relaxing and soothing feelings about work, which is caused by factors such as the work environment, work itself, managers, work group and work organization (Cribbin, 1972, p. 155). In order for job satisfaction to occur, the employee must complete his/her job successfully and feel the meaning, necessity and importance of the job (Irabor & Okolie, 2019).

In order for job satisfaction to occur in a concrete way, there must be harmony between the characteristics of the job and the expectations of the employees. In other words, the level at which the job meets the needs of the employees should be at the same level (Ay et al., 2014, p. 47). Therefore, it can be said that if the level of the employee's sense of satisfaction with his/her job is high, the level of satisfaction with his/her job is also high (Başaran, 1982, p. 34). If the attitude of the employee towards his/her job is positive, it is thought that job satisfaction is also accepted in a meaningful way. If the attitude formed after the experience, gains and experiences gained by the employee in his/her job is negative, it is thought that there is no job satisfaction and the individual is not satisfied with his/her job (Türk, 2007, p. 12).

The first job satisfaction research was conducted by F.W. Taylor within the framework of the scientific management approach (Bağcı, 2018, p. 314). Taylor thought that only a salary increase would satisfy employees and laid the foundations of the incentivized salary system. However, the Hawthorne studies conducted by Elton Mayo and his team revealed that social factors should also be taken into consideration and concluded that only salary increase was not enough. Theories of job satisfaction are generally divided into two main categories within the concept of motivation: scope and process theories. Scope theories aim to reveal the situations that constitute motivation, while process theories focus on the factors used to meet individual needs (Şimşek et al., 2015).

Job satisfaction is a subject that is especially focused on the managerial dimension, because the positive results of the work are usually directly related to the job satisfaction of the employee (Yousef, 1998, p. 184). When job satisfaction is high, productivity increases, turnover rates decrease and commitment to the organization increases (Aşık, 2010, p. 35). Satisfying employees in the organization is one of the most important tasks of management. Job satisfaction leads to improved results of trust, commitment and quality. Job satisfaction has a dynamic nature and requires managers to focus on strategies (Tietjen & Myers, 1998, p. 226). When job satisfaction is low, labor productivity decreases, work engagement decreases and turnover increases. This situation can also have a negative impact on the health status of the employee and cause nervous and mental problems (Miner, 2005, p. 119). In addition, in an organization with poor job satisfaction, employee problems increase, complaints increase, disciplinary actions increase and turnover may increase (Kahn, 1973, p. 94). In this context, job satisfaction should be considered as an important element in the organizational social climate for a healthy organizational structure. Employees cannot be expected to be productive in a structure in which they are not satisfied with the organization they are in. In this context, before

discussing the job satisfaction of the employees in the organization in the research sample and its relationship with organizational climate, it would be appropriate to take a look at the previous studies in the literature.

Addressing the previous studies on the subject of the research is very important for the development of the existing knowledge in the literature. In this context, some studies stand out when we look at the studies on the subject. Yılmaz and Akay (2022, p. 83) examined the effect of organizational culture on job satisfaction in a study in which the organizational culture and job satisfaction status and perceptions of the employees working in chain restaurant businesses in Turkey were measured. As a result of the study, it was determined that organizational climate positively affects job satisfaction. Similarly, in another study, it was determined that organizational climate has a positive effect on job satisfaction (Yeşil et al., 2017, p. 34-35). Yılmaz et al. (2023, p. 65) and Adıgüzel et al. (2014, p. 18) also reached similar findings and found that organizational climate has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

Korkmaz and Bağcı (2020, p. 9-10), on the other hand, concluded that organizational climate has an effect on job satisfaction in a study conducted on a sample of bank employees. In addition, there are many studies in the literature (Adams & Bond, 2000; Bell et al., 2018; Boyle et al., 2006; Dickens et al., 2022; Leipoldt et al., 2019; McLennan, 2005; Newman & Maylor 2002; Tonkin, 2016; Utriainen & Kyngas, 2009) that argue that social climate has positive effects on job satisfaction.

In addition, there are some studies that examine the effect of the dimensions of social climate on job satisfaction. Among these studies, the studies conducted to examine the effect of organizational support, which is among the dimensions of social climate, on employees' job satisfaction and found that organizational support has a positive effect on job satisfaction (Baker et al., 2003; Dunn et al., 2005; Nal & Tarım, 2017). In addition, there are also studies (Joseph & Deshpande, 1997; Verplanken, 2004) that argue that ethical conditions within the organization have an effect on job satisfaction. In addition, there are studies (Belias & Koustelios, 2014; Ennida & Allouani, 2023; Paliwal & Meshram, 2021) that argue that individuals' interpersonal interactions within the group, within the organization and outside the organization have an impact on job satisfaction.

However, social climate is not always effective on job satisfaction. There are some studies in the literature (Flarey, 1993; Mumford, 1972; Ravari et al., 2012) that find that social climate does not affect job satisfaction at a decisive level. In this context, in the conclusion section of

the study, these findings obtained from the literature are discussed and compared with the results of the study. This comparison is important in order to systematically see in which ways the results of the study enrich the literature. However, before moving on to the findings, conclusion and discussion sections of the study, a methodology section is included in order to explain the methods and tools by which the findings compiled within the scope of the study were obtained.

METHOD

This part of the paper outlines the chosen research methodology, model, universe, sample and analysis characteristics and sets the stage for subsequent analytical processes. The tools and techniques for data collection are systematically presented and additionally a detailed exposition highlights sample analysis procedures, ensuring the robustness and reliability of gathered data. This methodological framework acts as a roadmap for the research process, enhancing academic rigor by emphasizing the systematic approach to obtaining and analyzing research data.

Research group

The universe of the study consists of academic, administrative and supportive staff working at Mardin Artuklu University in Mardin province between May 1-31, 2024. Of the 1232 (N) personnel in the research population, as a result of the calculations made with the formula below, $N = \frac{N \cdot t^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{d^2(N-1) + t^2 \cdot p \cdot q}$ a sample was drawn and this number was calculated as minimum 294 (n) (Kurnaz & İraz, 2024, p. 175; Kılıç & Atilla, 2017, p. 1679; Kocacık & Çağlayandereli, 2009, p. 31). In this formula; N presents the number of individuals in the universe, p (0.5) shows the frequency of occurrence, q (0.5) shows the frequency of non-occurrence, t (1.96) shows the table value at a certain level of significance, d (0.05) shows the sampling error accepted according to the frequency of occurrence and lastly n means the minimum number of sample units. Among the data obtained, 320 of the 336 responses were included in the research as returned and valid questionnaires. The survey link was delivered to the employees via the university information system and the necessary information about the study was given in the official letter and ethical concerns were addressed. The participants participated digitally through the address communicated to them and thus the research data was collected. Also, the Ethics Committee Approval of this research were obtained from Mardin Artuklu University, dated and numbered 29/02/2024-135162. Now in the next section, how the research data was collected and which instruments were used during this process are explained.

Data collection tools

A questionnaire was applied to the research participants in order to collect information in line with the study objectives. The social climate scale developed by Eren-Bana and Bekaroğlu (2017) and the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (Weiss et al., 1967), which is frequently used in the literature, were used in the study. The questionnaire created with these scales consists of three parts:

- In the first part, there are questions prepared by the researcher to collect demographic information of the individuals.

- In the second part, a 49-question scale about social climate in organizations was applied to the individuals. It was tried to measure to what extent and in which direction which situations related to the organization, working conditions, colleagues and work environment affect the social climate.

- In the third part, a 20-question scale was applied to aim examining the job satisfaction levels of individuals of the organization they are in.

A Likert-type seven-point scale consisting of "Totally Agree", "Agree", "Partially Agree", "Uncertain", "Partially Disagree", "Disagree" and "Strongly Disagree" was used to evaluate the scale statements. How the data obtained as a result of these applications were analyzed is explained in the next section.

Data collection/processing method

The research was organized according to descriptive method and relational survey model. Data were collected without making any changes in the existing characteristics of the subjects and their opinions about the current situation were tried to be obtained. The descriptive method is a research approach that aims to describe a past or current situation as it is. The event that is the subject of the research is tried to be defined as it is in its current conditions and circumstances (İslamoğlu & Alnıaçık, 2019, p. 40-41). No effort is made to change or influence the conditions and the important point here is to observe and try to determine what is desired to be known. Relational survey models, on the other hand, are research models that aim to determine the existence and/or degree of change between two or more variables (Kılıç, 2023, p. 2331).

In this context, the purpose of this study is to conduct a research to determine the effect of social climate in organizations on job satisfaction. This research will help to raise awareness about the importance of social climate for increasing job satisfaction and improving the

performance of organizations. In this context, job satisfaction is very important as it is a concept that directly affects factors such as employees' attitudes towards the organization, job performance, commitment to the organization, turnover rates and occupational health. Therefore, job satisfaction levels appear as a necessary element for the success and sustainability of organizations today. The hypotheses put forward in order to make evaluations for the purpose of the research are as follows.

H1: Social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2: Social climate dimensions have a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2a: The interpersonal dimension of social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2b: The organizational support dimension of the social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2c: The intragroup communication dimension of social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2d: The work ethics dimension of social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2e: The professional solidarity dimension of the social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

H2f: The non-work relations dimension of the social climate has a significant effect on job satisfaction.

These hypotheses are assumptions predetermined by the researcher and can be confirmed or rejected by the results of the research. In this context, as the study aims to examine the impact of social climate in organizations on job satisfaction based on the above hypotheses, it is important to understand how social climate can be managed and improved to increase employees' job satisfaction levels. The results of this study can help identify the factors that influence job satisfaction and make the management of these factors more effective. This in turn can help organizations to achieve higher performance and employees to lead a happier and more satisfied work life. As a result, since this study focuses on the importance of job satisfaction and examines the effect of social climate, it can be considered as an important study to increase job satisfaction levels and improve the performance of organizations. In this context, it would be appropriate to briefly explain the population in which the sample determined in the

selection of the individuals in which the research was conducted and the population in which this sample is located.

Data analysis

The research was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, a conceptual framework was drawn by reviewing the literature. In the second stage, hypotheses were determined based on the conceptual framework and the application part was put forward by collecting data through field research. In this study, a questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The questionnaire form was delivered to the participants in digital environment and filled in. The participants were informed about the research, they were told that the confidentiality of the data would be ensured and they participated on a voluntary basis. All this application and data collection process was carried out between May 1-31, 2024. The survey results obtained in this way were analyzed and reported with the help of SPSS 20.0 (Statistical Packet for the Social Science) program.

The data obtained were analyzed in line with the research model. In this context, factor analysis was applied to the social climate scale data among the variables in the research model. Factor analysis (FA) can be defined as a multivariate statistic that aims to find and discover a small number of conceptually meaningful new variables (factors, dimensions) by bringing together a large number of interrelated variables (Çemrek, 2018, p. 419-420). Also, the analysis is a technique designed to examine the structure of a group of variables and to explain the relationships between these variables in terms of a much smaller number of unobservable hidden variables called factors (Uygur et al., 2023, p. 299).

In order to conduct these analyses, the "assumption of homogeneity of variances" must be met and the data must conform to a normal distribution. As can be seen in Table 1, as a result of the normality tests, both Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were significant and it was concluded that the data were normally distributed. Because the Sig. value for both tests is greater than 0.05. The values needed to perform the necessary analyzes and to check whether the distribution is normal are as follows. All these values show that the data used in the research exhibited a normal distribution and does not constitute any obstacle for the factor analysis application. In these tests, whether data distributions are normal, Kolmogorov-Smirnov is used when the number of observations is more than 29, Shapiro-Wilk is used when the number of observations is less than 29.

Table 1. Normality test I

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Shapiro-Wilk
Social Climate	Sig. 0,192	Sig. 0,381

In addition, the reliability of the scales was tested during the research and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the social climate scale was calculated as 0.894 (see table 2) and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the job satisfaction scale was calculated as 0.788 (see table 3).

Table 2. Reliability analysis of the social climate scale

Frequency	Cronbach's Alpha
49	0.894

Table 3. Reliability analysis of job satisfaction scale

Frequency	Cronbach's Alpha
20	0.788

These values being greater than 0.7 are considered sufficient for the scales to be considered reliable, and in the light of these values, the scales used in the research are also reliable (Kayış, 2005, p. 405). Therefore, the question marks in the reader's mind about the reliability of the research data have been eliminated. After the elimination of all these question marks for the implementation of the analyses, there is no obstacle to proceed to the findings of the study. In this context, in the next section of the study, the prominent findings of the study are presented in a systematic manner.

FINDINGS

Before moving on to the quantitative findings, which include the results of the analyzes put forward within the scope of the study, this section includes the demographic information obtained about the individuals involved in the research in order to examine the research problem. This information is the findings obtained as a result of processing the data collected with the help of the specified scales into the SPSS 20.0 program. The explanations and interpretations derived from the results obtained are as follows.

Table 4. Demographic distribution of the individuals participating in the study

Variables	n	Percentage (%)	Variables	n	Percentage (%)
Age (Year)			Experience		
18-25	22	6,9	0-5	72	22,5
26-35	98	30,6	6-10	88	27,5
36-45	140	43,8	11-15	84	26,3
45+	60	18,8	15+	76	23,8
Total	*320*	*100,0*	*Total*	*320*	*100,0*
Gender			Marital Status		
Female	76	23,8	Married	240	75,0
Male	244	76,3	Single	80	25,0
Total	*320*	*100,0*	*Total*	*320*	*100,0*
Profession			Residence		
Academic	138	43,1	Mardin	308	96,3
Administrative	152	47,5	Diyarbakır	10	3,1
Support	30	9,4	Ankara	2	0,6
Total	*320*	*100,0*	*Total*	*320*	*100,0*
Number of People Working in the Unit			Duration of Employment at the University		
0-30	160	50,0	0-5	108	33,8
31-60	84	26,3	6-10	124	38,8
61-90	60	18,8	11-15	76	23,8
90+	16	5,0	16+	12	3,8
Total	*320*	*100,0*	*Total*	*320*	*100,0*
Education			Income		
Primary-secondary	18	5,6	15	8	2,5
High School	26	8,1	15-25	6	1,9
Associate Degree	26	8,1	25-35	56	17,5
Bachelor	80	25,0	35-50	116	36,3
Master's Degree	70	21,9	50+	134	41,9
PhD	100	31,3	*Total*	*320*	*100,0*
Total	*320*	*100,0*			
Status					
Staff	264	82,5			
Administrator	56	17,5			
Total	*320*	*100,0*			

When the individuals constituting the research sample are analyzed on the basis of the age variable, 22 of the 320 individuals, i.e., 6.9%, are between the ages of 18-25; 98, i.e. 30.6%, are between the ages of 26-35; 140, i.e. 43.8%, are between the ages of 36-45 and 60, i.e. 18.8%, are over the age of 45. The fact that the 36-45 age group is higher than the other age groups with 43.8% shows that the majority of the employees in the organization are middle-aged.

When analyzed on the basis of the gender variable of the participants, 76 of the 320 individuals constituting the research sample, i.e. 23.8%, are women and 244 of them, i.e. 76.3%, are men. In this case, it is revealed that there are more men working in the organization than women. When the participants are analyzed on the basis of marital status, it is seen that 240 of the 320 individuals constituting the research sample, i.e. 75.0%, are married and 80 of them, i.e. 25.0%, are single. The reason for this situation can be seen when it is considered that the majority of the participants are in the age group that can also be called the marriage age.

When analyzed with respect to the occupational variables of the participants, 138 of the 320 participants, i.e. 43.1%, were academic staff; 152 of them, i.e. 47.5%, were administrative staff and 30 of them, i.e. 9.4%, were supportive staff. The time spent by individuals within the organization or in their working life is considered as seniority and the question "Your Experience in the Profession?", as can be seen in Table 4, 22.5% (72 people) of the total consists of individuals with 0 to 5 years of experience; 27.5% (88 people) of individuals with 6 to 10 years of experience; 26.3% (84 people) of individuals with 11 to 15 years of experience, and 23.8% (76 people) of individuals with 15 years or more of experience.

On the basis of the education variable of the participants constituting the research sample 18 of the 320 individuals, i.e. 5.6%, have Primary-Secondary degree; 26 of them, i.e. 8.1% have High School degree; also 26 of them have Associate's Degree; 80 of them, i.e. 25% are have Bachelor's Degree; 70 of them, i.e. 21.9%, have Master's Degree and 100, i.e. 31.3%, have Doctoral Degree. When the education variable of the participants is analyzed, it is seen that 31.3% of the employees have a PhD level of education, the main reason for this can be considered as the fact that the sampling area is a university and most of the employees are academic staff. When we look at the income level of the individuals, out of 320 people who make up the research sample, 8 people, i.e. 2.5%, have an income of -15,000 TL; 6 people, i.e. 1.9%, have an income of 15,000-25,000 TL; 56 people, i.e. 17.5%, have an income of 25,000-35,000 TL; 116 people, i.e. 36.3%, have an income of 35,000-50,000 TL and 134 people, i.e. 41.9%, have an income above 50,000 TL. The fact that the majority of the sample has above average income can be considered in connection with the low number of contracted or permanent supportive staff in the university and in the study sample.

When analyzed on the basis of the province of residence of the participants, it is seen that 308 of the 320 individuals, i.e. 96.3%, live in Mardin; 10 of them, i.e. 3.1%, live in Diyarbakır and 2 of them, i.e. 6%, live in Ankara. It was observed that the majority of the participants live in Mardin, and this is due to the fact that the organization they work for is located in Mardin. On the other hand, a small number of employees reside in Diyarbakır, which can be attributed to the close proximity of Diyarbakır to Mardin.

When analyzed in terms of the status variable of the participants, out of the 320 individuals constituting the research sample, 264 people, i.e. 82.5%, don't have administrative duties and 56 people, i.e. 17.5%, work as decision making administrative positions. In addition, when analyzed based on the variable of the number of people working in the unit to which the

65

individuals are affiliated, 50.0% (160 people) of the 320 individuals who make up the research sample are working in units which has number of employees between 0-30 people; 26.3% (84 people) are more than this (between 31 and 60 people); 18.8% (60 people) are working in more crowded units (between 61-90 people) and 5.0% (16 people) are individuals working in units with more than 90 staff. When the variable of the number of people working in the unit is examined, it is seen that there are different numbers of employees working in different units due to the fact that the work and operations of each unit are different, the workload and the existence of different departments within the unit.

Finally, when the participants are analyzed in terms of professional experience variable, 33.8% (108 people) of the 320 people who are in the research sample are individuals with 0 to 5 years of work experience; 38.8% (124 people) are individuals with 6 to 10 years of work experience; 23.8% (76 people) are individuals with 11 to 15 years of experience and 3.8% (12 people) are individuals with 16 years of work experience or more. The reason behind this situation is may be that Mardin Artuklu University is a relatively young institution.

Following the demographic information, it would be appropriate to move on to the detailed analysis results of the research. Within the scope of the research, factor analysis was first applied to the social climate scale. In the factor analysis application, the factor weight should be 0.40 or above (Akyüz, 2018, p. 187; Filiz & Kaya, 2014, p. 96). In this context, variables with factor weights above 0.40 were brought together to form factor component.

Table 5. Social climate scale factor loads

	Organizational Support	Intragroup Communication	Interpersonal Harmony	Professional Solidarity	Non-work Relations	Work Ethics
Q18	0.835					
Q17	0.810					
Q19	0.804					
Q15	0.786					
Q16	0.703					
Q10	0.625					
Q11	0.622					
Q14	0.536					
Q13	0.480					
Q12	0.431					
Q21		0.734				
Q24		0.730				
Q45						0.713
Q27						0.702
Q30						0.699
Q22		0.699				
Q23		0.693				
Q46						0.693
Q29						0.665

	Organizational Support	Intragroup Communication	Interpersonal Harmony	Professional Solidarity	Non-work Relations	Work Ethics
Q26						0.632
Q28		0.628				
Q20		0.572				
Q31						0.563
Q32		0.466				
Q7			0.731			
Q2			0.715			
Q5			0.669			
Q3			0.636			
Q4			0.630			
Q1			0.612			
Q8			0.601			
Q41			0.570			
Q9			0.566			
Q6			0.560			
Q47			0.473			
Q34				0.652		
Q35				0.648		
Q36				0.645		
Q33				0.550		
Q42				0.565		
Q37				0.544		
Q25				0.405		
Q44					0.726	
Q49					0.726	
Q43					0.693	
Q48					0.568	
Q39					0.550	
Q38					0.488	
Q40					0.460	

Following the factor loads, the social climate scale was divided into sub-dimensions. In this context, research hypotheses were developed and an application was carried out to address the relationship between these sub-dimensions and job satisfaction. The situation that emerged as a result of this application can be seen in Table 6 below. The table shows the indicators of whether the relationship between the sub-dimensions of social climate and job satisfaction is significant or not. Before proceeding to the evaluation of these indicators, it should be reminded that the sub-dimensions of social climate are considered from the perspective of university staff and the research questions are updated in this context. Because this situation is important in terms of interpreting the relationships between variables.

Table 6. Relationship Between Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction

Variables		Interpersonal Harmony	Organizational Support	Intragroup Communication	Work Ethics	Professional Solidarity	Non-work Relations
Job Satisfaction	Coef.	-0.439	-0.593	0.368	-0.272	-0.389	-0.372
	p	0.188	0.406	0.283	0.182	-0.199	-0.148

Before reading the table above, it is necessary to know what the data indicate within the scope of the study. In correlation coefficients, it should be known that a value between 0.00 and 0.25 indicates a "very weak" relationship, a value between 0.26 and 0.49 indicates a "weak" relationship, a value between 0.50 and 0.69 indicates a "moderate" relationship, a value between 0.70 and 0.89 indicates a "strong" relationship, and a value between 0.90 and 1.00 indicates a "very strong" relationship (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2014, p. 264). In the interpretation of the research findings, an evaluation was made in this context. In this context, the relationship between the social climate dimensions that address the research hypotheses and job satisfaction is discussed.

When the results of the research are considered, it is determined that there is a significant relationship between the "interpersonal harmony" dimension of social climate and job satisfaction based on the statistical significance of the correlation coefficient (p=0,188). There is a weak relationship between the two variables. This situation shows us that interpersonal harmony in terms of social climate within the organization is important for job satisfaction. According to this finding, it can be said that when interpersonal harmony increases, job satisfaction will increase, otherwise it will decrease. The findings of the study show this for the employees of Mardin Artuklu University. Interpersonal harmony within the organization affects the psychological and mental performance of the employees and is effective on the level of satisfaction within the organization.

A similar situation is also valid for "work ethics", one of the dimensions of social climate. In terms of this dimension, similar to the above situation, a statistically significant but very weak relationship was found (p=0.182). This shows that employees in the organization have certain concerns in terms of work ethics, but the effect of these concerns on job satisfaction is weak. As it can be seen in the table above, a significant relationship was found in terms of "intragroup communication" and "organizational support" dimensions of social climate. In terms of these dimensions, the level of relationship is stronger than the previous dimensions. But it should be said that the relationship here is weak, not very weak as in the previous hypotheses. In this case, it can be said that individuals' intragroup relations within the organization and the support they receive from their institutions have an effect on their job satisfaction.

Among the dimensions of social climate, there are also dimensions that have negative relationships with job satisfaction. Among these dimensions, "non-work relations" has a

negative and significant relationship with job satisfaction. In this case, it can be said that a decrease in employees' non-work relations increases their job satisfaction. In addition, there is a similarly negative relationship in terms of another dimension, "professional solidarity". In this case, as professional solidarity decreases, job satisfaction increases. Although these relationships are weak, it is noteworthy that while professional solidarity is expected to increase job satisfaction, the opposite finding is found in here. The reason behind this situation can be addressed as a separate study topic and perhaps it can be investigated in depth with qualitative techniques such as semi-structured interviews that provide more in-depth information.

Another technique used in the study is regression analysis. Regression analysis is defined as a statistical method that allows estimating the value of a dependent variable using an independent variable or multiple independent variables that have a cause-effect relationship between them (Arkes, 2023). Regression analysis is used to determine the effect and direction of the independent variable (variable that takes a value) on the dependent variable (variable that changes depending on the independent variable) (İslamoğlu & Alnıaçık, 2019, p. 377). In this context, regression analysis was applied in the study to analyze the effect of social climate on job satisfaction in organizations. In the study, social climate was considered as the independent variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable and was included in the regression model. Within the scope of the analysis, the main hypotheses H1 and H2 and the sub-hypotheses H2a, H2b, H2c, H2d, H2e and H2f were tested and the effect of social climate on job satisfaction was statistically evaluated.

Table 7. The impact of social climate on job satisfaction

Variables	Coefficients		Model Summary		ANOVA				
Independent Variable	**B**	**SH.**	**ß**	**T**	**R**	**R^2**	**Corrected R^2**	**F**	**P**
Social Climate	-0.453	0.094	-0.358	-4.818	0.358	0.128	0.123	23.209	0.000
Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction									

Table 7 shows the regression analysis results showing the effect of social climate on job satisfaction. Social climate was included in the regression analysis as an independent variable and job satisfaction as a dependent variable and the model created as a result of the analysis was found to be statistically significant (P=0.000). According to the analysis results, social climate explains job satisfaction by 0.12% and the effect of social climate on job satisfaction is negative and significant (ß=-0.358; p<0.05), which shows that hypothesis H1 is supported. The regression analysis results evaluating the effect of social climate dimensions in determining job satisfaction are given in Table 8 and it was found that social climate sub-dimensions have a

statistically significant effect on job satisfaction (p=0.000), therefore hypothesis H2 was also supported.

Table 8. The impact of social climate dimensions on job satisfaction

Variables	Coefficients					ANOVA
Independent Variable	**B**	**SH.**	**ß**	**T**	**P**	
Interpersonal Harmony	-0.405	0.062	-0.459	-6.498	0.000	R = 0.460
Organizational Support	-0.287	0.032	-0.577	-8.745	0.000	R² = 0.211
Intragroup Communication	0.230	0.043	0382	5.202	0.000	F = 42.72
Work Ethics	-0.082	0.064	-0.110	-1.235	0.168	P = 0.000
Professional Solidarity	-0.285	0.053	-0.395	-5.458	0.000	
Non-work Relations	-0.270	0.055	-0.362	-4.854	0.000	

According to the findings in Table 8, the effects of different dimensions of social climate on job satisfaction were analyzed. According to the results obtained, it was seen that social climate dimensions had a significant and meaningful effect on job satisfaction (R = 0.460; R² = 0.211; F = 42.72; p = 0.000). Accordingly, interpersonal harmony (ß = -0.459; p < 0.05), organizational support (ß = -0.577; p < 0.05), intragroup communication (ß = 0.382; p < 0.05), professional solidarity (ß = -0.395; p < 0.05) and extra-work relationships (ß = -0.362; p < 0.05) create significant effects on job satisfaction. Particularly, interpersonal harmony (ß = -0.459; p < 0.05), organizational support (ß = -0.577; p < 0.05), professional solidarity (ß = -0.395; p < 0.05) and non-work relations (ß = -0.362; p < 0.05) dimensions were found to have a negative effect on job satisfaction. Intragroup communication (ß = 0.382; p < 0.05) has a significantly positive effect on job satisfaction. On the other hand, work ethics (ß = -0.110; p > 0.05) does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. This means that the effect of work ethics on job satisfaction is not statistically significant. As a result, social climate dimensions create effects on job satisfaction to different degrees and according to these effects, hypotheses H2a, H2b, H2c, H2e and H2f are supported, while hypothesis H2d is not supported.

As can be seen in the interpretations above, statistically significant results were obtained between social climate and job satisfaction in organizations according to the findings obtained within the scope of the research. When the general structure and results of the studies on the relationship between social climate and job satisfaction are examined, it is observed that these concepts are applied to different working groups in different sectors and organizations and that the number of studies on the subject has increased in Turkey. The similarities or differences between the findings obtained in terms of the social climate conditions that are effective on individuals and its effect on job satisfaction according to the groups and the results of the studies in which applications have been made in recent years and this research has been discussed within the scope of the research. The results and inferences obtained are important in terms of

whether the research is compatible with other sectors and occupational groups, whether the results are similar or not and can be compared with other studies in the literature. In this context, a general evaluation of the findings and discussion of the results in the next section in the light of other findings in the literature constitute the next part of this study.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this study conducted on a sample of employees working at Mardin Artuklu University, the relationship between social climate and job satisfaction was examined. When the relationship between the sub-dimensions of the social climate created as a result of the study was examined, it was determined that 4 dimensions (interpersonal harmony, organizational support, professional solidarity and non-work relations) had a negative effect on job satisfaction. A positive effect was determined for 1 dimension (intra-group communication) and no significant effect was determined for the other dimension created within the scope of the study (work ethics). When the research results were examined based on these data, it was seen that the social climate conditions of the organization in which employees are located affected their job satisfaction and that this situation was reflected in their performance in some ways. For example, the interaction that employees experience with other colleagues in the organization and intra-group communication affect their job satisfaction. Similarly, the support that employees receive from their institutions and the conditions created by ethical principles in the workplace also affect their job satisfaction.

Based on these conclusions, it is seen that the social climate conditions of the organization in which the employees work affect their job satisfaction and this situation is reflected on their performance in some aspects. For example, the interpersonal harmony and Professional solidarity that employees experience within the organization affect their job satisfaction. Similarly, the support employees receive from their organizations and non-work relations also affect their job satisfaction. Similar to this situation, there are studies in the literature that argue that social climate is effective on job satisfaction (Adams & Bond, 2000; Adıgüzel et al., 2014; Bell et al., 2018; Boyle et al., 2006; Dickens et al, 2022; Korkmaz & Bağcı, 2020; Leipoldt et al. 2019; McLennan, 2005; Newman & Maylor, 2002; Tonkin, 2016; Utriainen & Kyngas, 2009; Yeşil et al., 2017; Yılmaz et al., 2023; Yılmaz & Akay, 2022). In this respect, the study has parallel results with other studies in the field.

On the other hand, social climate is not always effective on job satisfaction. There are some studies in the literature (Flarey, 1993; Mumford, 1972; Ravari et al., 2012) that find that

social climate does not affect job satisfaction at a decisive level. In this context, the findings of our study supports these results in the literature on work ethics issue. In addition, there are studies (Joseph & Deshpande, 1997; Verplanken, 2004) that argue that the social climate created in the workplace and the ethical conditions within the organization have an impact on job satisfaction. In this study, results are not similar to the findings in the literature because we found that work ethics has no significant effect on job satisfaction. In addition, in terms of interpersonal harmony and intragroup communication dimensions, the findings in the literature revealed similar results (Belias & Koustelios, 2014; Ennida & Allouani, 2023; Paliwal & Meshram, 2021). In these aspects, the study is in line with the results of other studies in the literature.

Moreover, it was also found that employees' job satisfaction was also affected in terms of the level of non-work relations and professional solidarity. However, the fact that the relationships here are negative has led to the conclusion that an increase in these conditions decreases employees' job satisfaction, whereas in the opposite case, it increases their job satisfaction. There are studies in the literature that reveal findings to the contrary (Baker et al., 2003; Dunn et al., 2005; Nal & Tarım, 2017: 138). This result is also supported by the research in the literature, as can be seen in the discussion section of the study. Considering that increasing organizational support in the ordinary course of life will increase job satisfaction, it is remarkable that the findings of this study tell us the opposite. Although the reason behind this finding is not yet fully known, this situation can be presented as a suggestion for further studies. Researchers can take this study further and investigate the reasons underlying this situation, and they can investigate the issue in detail with studies that can obtain more in-depth information in this direction.

In organizational structures shaped by the influence of social climate conditions, it can be expected that employees feel ethical, relational and social tensions. All these conditions can affect employees' organizational satisfaction in different ways. Considering the rapid transformation of globalization and technological developments, the impact of these conditions on social climate and job satisfaction should be addressed. In the information age we are in, technological developments affect our lives in almost every sense, which makes this situation important. However, the impact of these conditions has not been addressed in this study for now. Studies that can be put forward in this field in the future are important in terms of enriching the literature on the subject.

Besides, the fact that the research was conducted on a sample of a single university staff can be considered as a limitation in terms of the study. Since we do not yet have the opportunity to conduct a larger-scale research in terms of financial means, the sample was limited to the employees of a single organization. In order to generalize the results to the country or the world, the selection of a single organization in a single province as the population and sample imposes limitations. It would be useful to conduct future research with a larger or wider sample in order to reach more general results. Because the results may be valid only on the selected sample since the study is a sample-based study. Due to the structural and cultural differences of the organizations where the research was conducted, the results may vary for different organizations. Other factors that may emerge during the process of the research may affect the outcomes and the results may not have a general validity. Therefore, due to the versatility of the concepts of social climate and job satisfaction, this study may not be able to fully address the scope of the research. On the other hand, another research issue that can be addressed is to make evaluations in the light of the demographic characteristics of the participants in the study. Due to the preferred research questions and hypotheses, the study did not make an evaluation in this context. This limitation has been imposed in order to keep the findings limited for the reader and to prevent the research results from being confused with each other. A more comprehensive research that can be put forward in this direction may be useful in terms of enriching the literature.

Recommendations

This study offers significant insights into the relationship between social climate and job satisfaction within organizations particularly in the context of Mardin Artuklu University. However, several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results. First, the research was confined to a single institution which may limit the generalizability of the findings. The social climate in universities, especially those in smaller cities, may differ significantly from that in larger institutions or private-sector organizations. Therefore, future research should consider a broader sample including organizations from various sectors and geographical locations to enhance the external validity of the findings. Cross-cultural studies could also be valuable as organizational climate and job satisfaction are likely to differ in other cultural contexts due to diverse work ethics, communication styles and hierarchical structures.

Another limitation of this study lies in its reliance on self-reported data, which is susceptible to various biases, such as social desirability bias and recall bias. Employees may over-report positive aspects of their job satisfaction or under-report negative experiences either

consciously or unconsciously. To address this, future studies could incorporate multiple data collection methods such as observations, peer assessments or interviews to triangulate the findings and obtain a more nuanced understanding of how social climate influences job satisfaction. Combining qualitative and quantitative methods, such as using semi-structured interviews alongside surveys could provide deeper insights into the lived experiences of employees in relation to the social climate within their organization.

The scope of this research primarily focused on the dimensions of social climate and their direct impact on job satisfaction. However, future studies could expand the scope by examining the mediating or moderating effects of other organizational factors such as leadership styles, team dynamics or employee engagement initiatives. It would be useful to explore how these factors interact with the social climate to either amplify or mitigate their impact on job satisfaction. For instance, transformational leadership styles might strengthen the positive effects of a supportive social climate, while autocratic leadership could exacerbate the negative effects of a toxic work environment. Such studies could offer more comprehensive insights into how organizations can create a more conducive work atmosphere that fosters employee satisfaction and retention.

Additionally, considering the increasing prevalence of hybrid and remote work environments, it would be valuable to examine how these evolving work arrangements affect the social climate and job satisfaction. The current study was conducted in a traditional work environment, where face-to-face interactions are the norm. However, with the growing shift toward remote and hybrid work settings future research could investigate whether the absence of physical presence and reduced informal interactions among employees weaken or alter the dimensions of social climate, particularly interpersonal harmony and professional solidarity. Studying the dynamics of virtual teams and their impact on job satisfaction would provide valuable insights for organizations adapting to new work models.

Lastly, this study did not account for the possible effects of demographic variables such as age, gender or tenure. Future research could explore whether different demographic groups experience social climate and job satisfaction differently. For example, younger employees may prioritize different aspects of the social climate compared to older employees, or those with longer tenure may have different perceptions of the organizational climate compared to new hires. Investigating these demographic factors would allow organizations to tailor their social climate strategies to better meet the needs of a diverse workforce.

In summary, while this study has contributed valuable knowledge on the relationship between social climate and job satisfaction, expanding the scope of future research by incorporating broader samples, mixed methods and additional organizational and demographic factors would provide a more comprehensive understanding. These further investigations would enable organizations to develop more targeted strategies to enhance employee satisfaction and organizational performance.

REFERENCES

Adams A., & Bond S. (2000) Hospital nurses' job satisfaction, individual and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *32*, 536-543. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01513.x

Adıgüzel, O., Batur, Z., Erdoğan, A., & Özkan, D. S. (2014). Sağlık sektöründe örgüt iklimi ve iş tatmini arasındaki ilişki. *In: International 2004 Conference in Economics*. Czech Republic: Prague.

Akyüz, H. E. (2018). Yapı geçerliliği için doğrulayıcı faktör analizi: Uygulamalı bir çalışma. *Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(2), 186-198. https://doi.org/10.17798/bitlisfen.414490

Arkes, J. (2023). *Regression analysis: A practical introduction*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003285007

Aşık, N. A. (2010). Çalışanların iş doyumunu etkileyen bireysel ve örgütsel faktörler ile sonuçlarına ilişkin kavramsal bir değerlendirme. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, *467*(6), 31-51.

Ay, F. A., Filizöz, B., & Öncül, M. S. (2014). Kariyer yönetimi uygulamalarının iş tatmine etkisi: Kamu ve özel sağlık çalışanlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(2), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.5578/jeas.8995

Aytaç, S. (2003). Çalışma psikolojisi alanında yeni bir yaklaşım: Örgütsel sağlık. *ISGUC: The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, *5*(2).

Bağcı, B. (2018). Birey-örgüt uyumunun iş tatmini üzerine etkisi: Sağlık kurumlarında bir araştırma. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(4).

Baker, J. A., Dilly, L. J., Aupperlee, J. L., & Patil, S. A. (2003). The developmental context of school satisfaction: Schools as psychologically healthy environments. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *18*(2), 206-221. https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.18.2.206.21861

Başaran, İ. E. (1982). *Örgütsel davranışın yönetimi*. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fak Yayınları.

Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). Organizational culture and job satisfaction: A review. *International review of management and marketing*, 4(2), 132-149.

Bell, N., Tonkin, M., Chester, V., & Craig, L. (2018). Adapting measures of social climate for use with individuals with intellectual developmental disability in forensic settings. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *24*(4), 362-378. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2017.1298761

Boyle, D. K., Miller P. A., Gajewksi B. J., Hart S. E. & Dunton N. (2006). Unit type differences in RN workgroup job satisfaction. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *28,* 622-640. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193945906289506

Büte, M. (2011). Etik iklim, örgütsel güven ve bireysel performans arasındaki ilişki. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 25(1), 171-192.

Cribbin, J. J. (1972). *Effective managerial leadership*. American Management Association.

Çemrek, F. (2018). Investigation of the satisfaction of the individuals of the community transportation: The case of Eskisehir province. *Alphanumeric Journal*, *6*(2), 417-426. https://doi.org/10.17093/alphanumeric.477151

Deniz, M., & Çoban, R. (2016). Örgütsel iklimin çalışan bağlılığına etkisi ve bir araştırma. *Birey ve Toplum Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2), 49-72.

Dickens, G. L., Johnson, A., Steel, K., Everett, B., & Tonkin, M. (2022). Interventions to improve social climate in acute mental health inpatient settings: Systematic review of content and outcomes. *SAGE Open Nursing*, *8,* 23779608221124291. https://doi.org/10.1177/23779608221124291

Dinçer, Ö. (1996). *Stratejik yönetim ve işletme politikası (3. Baskı)*, Beta Yayınları.

Diş, O., & Ayık, A. (2016). Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç kaynakları ile örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişki. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (58), 499-518.

Dunn S., Wilson B., & Esterman A. (2005). Perceptions of working as a nurse in an acute care setting. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 13, 22-31. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2004.00452.x

Ekşi, G. G. (2023). Kapsayıcı liderlik. *Scientific Journal of Finance and Financial Law Studies*, *3*(1), 31-40.

Ennida, K., & Allouani, S. A. (2023). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of teacher-researchers through organizational citizenship behavior: A literature review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *11*(3), 164-184. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.113011

Eren-Bana P., & Bekaroğlu S.B. (2017). Örgütlerde sosyal iklim ölçeği geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Research Journal of Business and Management (RJBM)*, *4*(2), 1-15.

Filiz, Z., & Kaya, M. (2014). Doğrulayıcı faktör analizi ve Schutte duygusal zekâ ölçeğine uygulaması. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (25), 86-103.

Flarey, D. L. (1993). The social climate of work environments. *JONA: The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 23(6), 9-15. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-199306000-00004

Forehand, G. A., & Von Haller, G. (1964). Environmental variation in studies of organizational behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *62*(6), 361-382. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045960

Gellerman, S. (1970). *Use of psychology in management*. Collier- MacMillan Publishing.

Gerloff, E. A. (1985). *Organizational theory and design: A strategic approach for management*. McGraw-Hill.

Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri, felsefe-yöntem-analiz (Gözden geçirilmiş ve güncellenmiş 3. Baskı)*, Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Güzelcik, E. (1999). *Küreselleşme ve işletmelerde değişen kurum imajı (1. Basım)*. Sistem Yayıncılık.

Halis, M., & Uğurlu, Ö. Y. (2008). Güncel çalışmalar ışığında örgüt iklimi. *ISGUC: The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources*, *10*(2), 101-123. https://doi.org/10.4026/1303-2860.2008.0075.x

Halpin, A. W. (1969). *Theory and research in administration*. Collier-MacMillan Publishing.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees. *Harvard Business Review*, *65*.

Irabor, I. E., & Okolie, U. C. (2019). A review of employees' job satisfaction and its affect on their retention. *Annals of Spiru Haret University. Economic Series*, 19(2), 93-114. https://doi.org/10.26458/1924

İslamoğlu, A. H., & Alnıaçık, Ü. (2019). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri (6. Baskı)*. Beta Yayınevi.

Joseph J., & Deshpande S.P. (1997) The impact of ethical climate on job satisfaction of nurses. *Health Care Management Review*, *22*, 76-80. https://doi.org/10.1097/00004010-199701000-00010

Kahn, R. L. (1973). The work module: A tonic for lunchpail lassitude. *Psychology Today*, *6*(9), 35-39.

Karcıoğlu, F. (2001). Örgüt kültürü ve örgüt iklimi ilişkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, *15*(1-2), 265-283.

Kayış, A., (2005), Güvenilirlik Analizi, *In: Kalaycı, Ş. (Ed.). SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*, Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

Kılıç, C. (2023). Organizational stress and performance from the perspective of technological developments. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *12*(4), 2323-2343. https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.1308151

Kılıç, C., & Atilla, G. (2017). Hekim ve hemşirelerde stres ve stresle başa çıkma yöntemleri: Denizli ili örneği. *Social Sciences Studies Journal*, *3*(8), 1675-1687. https://doi.org/10.26449/sssj.210

Kocacık, F., & Çağlayandereli, M. (2009). Ailede kadına yönelik şiddet: Denizli ili örneği. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *6*(2), 24-43.

Koçak, O., Duruel, M., Arslan, H., & İşyar, G. (2016). Vasıf gerektiren meslekleri yapanların iş tatmini: İstanbul örneği. *Kent Akademisi*, *9*(26), 40-55.

Korkmaz, H., & Bağcı, Z. (2020). Örgüt ikliminin iş tatmini üzerindeki etkisi: Banka çalışanları üzerinde bir araştırma. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *7*(2), 1-11.

Kurnaz, G., & İraz, R. (2024). Examining the Effect of Five-Factor Personality Traits on Cultural Intelligence. *Uluslararası Ekonomi İşletme ve Politika Dergisi*, *8*(1), 170-184. https://doi.org/10.29216/ueip.1403222

Kurnaz, G., Eroğlu, O., Altun, İ., & Emen, E. (2024). Psikolojik sermayenin örgütsel yabancılaşma üzerindeki etkisinin analizi. *Artuklu Kaime*, *7*(2), 156-170.

Landy, F. J. (1989). *Psychology of work behavior*. Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Leipoldt, J. D., Harder, A. T., Kayed, N. S., Grietens, H., & Rimehaug, T. (2019). Determinants and outcomes of social climate in therapeutic residential youth care: A systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *99*, 429-440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.02.010

Litwin, G., & Stringer, R. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate. Division of research graduate school of business administration*. Printed United States of America.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *10*(2), 269-299. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366

McLennan, M. (2005). Nurses' views on work enabling factors. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, *35*, 311-318. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005110-200506000-00008

Miner, B. J. (2005). *Organizational behaviour 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. M. E. Sharpe.

Mok, E., & Au-Yeung, B. (2002). Relationship between organizational climate and empowerment of nurses in Hong Kong. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *10*(3), 129-137. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2834.2002.00285.x

Momeni, N. (2009). The relation between managers' emotional intelligence and the organizational climate they create. *Public Personnel Management*, *38*(2), 35-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600903800203

Mumford, E. (1972). Job satisfaction: A method of analysis. *Personnel Review*, *1*(3), 48-57. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb055207

Nal, M., & Tarım, M. (2017). Sağlık yöneticilerinin paternalist liderlik davranışlarının çalışanların iş doyumu üzerine etkisi. *Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *3*(2), 117-141. https://doi.org/10.22466/acusbd.341461

Neher, W. W. (1996). *Organizational communication: Challenges of change, diversity, and continuity (1st Edition)*. Pearson.

Newman K., & Maylor U. (2002). Empirical evidence for the nurse satisfaction, quality of care and patient satisfaction chain. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, *15*, 80-88. https://doi.org/10.1108/09526860210421482

Örücü, E., Yumuşak, S., & Bozkır, Y. (2006). Bankalarda çalışan personelin iş tatmini ve iş tatminini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi*, *13*(1), 39-51.

Özdemir, F. (2006). Örgütsel iklimin iş tatmin düzeyine etkisi: Tekstil sektöründe bir araştırma. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü*.

Özgen, H., Öztürk, A., & Yalçın, A. (2010). *İnsan kaynakları yönetimi*. Nobel Kitabevi.

Özgener, Ş. (2020). *İş ahlakının temelleri: Yönetsel bir yaklaşım*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Özkalp, E., & Kırel, Ç. (2001). *Örgüt Kültürü (Örgütsel Davranış)*. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Paliwal, M., & Meshram, M. (2021). Job satisfaction among IT employees: A review of literature. *Journal of Science & Technology (JST)*, *6*(Special Issue 1), 494-501.

Ravari, A., Mirzaei, T., Kazemi, M., & Jamalizadeh, A. (2012). Job satisfaction as a multidimensional concept: A systematic review study. *Journal of Occupational Health and Epidemiology*, *1*(2), 95-102. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.johe.1.2.95

Soysal, A., & Tan, M. (2013). İş tatminini etkileyen faktörlerle ilgili hizmet sektöründe yapılan bir araştırma: Kilis ili kamu ve özel banka personeli örneği. *Niğde Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *6*(2), 45-63.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences (Vol. 3)*. Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549

Şimşek, M. Ş., Çelik, A., & Akgemci, T. (2015). *Davranış bilimlerine giriş ve örgütlerde davranış (9. Baskı)*. Eğitim Yayınevi.

Tietjen, M. A., & Myers, R. M. (1998). Motivation and job satisfaction. *Management Decision*, *36*(4), 226-231. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251749810211027

Tonkin, M. (2016). A review of questionnaire measures for assessing the social climate in prisons and forensic psychiatric hospitals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 60*(12), 1376-1405. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15578834

Tutar, H., & Altınöz, M. (2010). Örgütsel iklimin işgören performansı üzerine etkisi: Ostim imalat işletmeleri çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, *65*(02), 196-218. https://doi.org/10.1501/SBFder_0000002162

Türk, M. S. (2007). *Örgüt kültürü ve iş tatmini*. Gazi Kitabevi.

Utriainen, K., & Kyngas, H. (2009). Hospital nurses' job satisfaction: A literature review. *Journal of nursing management*, *17*(8), 1002-1010. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.01028.x

Uygur, M. N., Çatuk, C., & Uzun, E. (2023). Effect of logistics costs on export and company performance: A research on TRC 1 region companies. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences (IJOESS)*, *14*(51), 293-307. http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoess.3267

Verplanken, B. (2004). Value congruence and job satisfaction among nurses: A human relations perspective. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 41*, 599-605. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2003.12.011

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. https://doi.org/10.1037/t05540-000

Yeşil, S., Mavi, Y., & Ceylan, S. (2017). Etik iklim algısı ve bireysel sonuçlar üzerine etkileri. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (51), 19-38.

Yılmaz, C., & Akay, E. (2022). Organizasyon kültürünün iş tatmini üzerine etkisi: Zincir restoran işletmeleri üzerine bir uygulama. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, *21*, 61-90.

Yılmaz, C., Karataş, Ö., & Akay, E. (2023). Örgüt ikliminin iş tatmini üzerine etkisi: Zincir restoran işletmeleri üzerine bir uygulama. *Sosyal Bilimler Elektronik Dergisi/Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*(12),42-72.

Yousef, D. A. (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower*, *19*(3), 184-194. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729810216694

KATKI ORANI *CONTRIBUTION RATE*	AÇIKLAMA *EXPLANATION*	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR *CONTRIBUTORS*
Fikir ve Kavramsal Örgü *Idea or Notion*	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak *Form the research hypothesis or idea*	Yakup İZCİ Cumali KILIÇ
Tasarım *Design*	Yöntem ve araştırma desenini tasarlamak *To design the method and research design.*	Yakup İZCİ
Literatür Tarama *Literature Review*	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak *Review the literature required for the study*	Cumali KILIÇ
Veri Toplama ve İşleme *Data Collecting and Processing*	Verileri toplamak, düzenlemek ve raporlaştırmak *Collecting, organizing and reporting data*	Yakup İZCİ
Tartışma ve Yorum *Discussion and Commentary*	Elde edilen bulguların değerlendirilmesi *Evaluation of the obtained finding*	Cumali KILIÇ
Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı/ *Statement of Support and Acknowledgment*		
Bu çalışmanın yazım sürecinde katkı ve/veya destek alınmamıştır.		
No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.		
Çatışma Beyanı/ *Statement of Conflict*		
Araştırmacıların araştırma ile ilgili diğer kişi ve kurumlarla herhangi bir kişisel ve finansal çıkar çatışması yoktur.		
Researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other people and institutions related to the research.		
Etik Kurul Beyanı/ *Statement of Ethics Committee*		
Bu araştırma, Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi Etik Kurulunun 29.02.2024 tarihli ve E-135162 sayılı kararı ile yürütülmüştür.		
This research was conducted with the decision of Mardin Artuklu University Ethics Committee dated 29.02.2024 and numbered E-135162.		