

Investigation of Relationship between Organizational Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Research on Health Sector

Serdar Öge, Pınar Erdogan

Abstract—The main objective of this research is to describe the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior. In order to examine this relationship, a research is intended to be carried out in relevant institutions and organizations operating in the health sector in Turkey. It will be researched that whether there is a statistically significant relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior through related scientific research methods and statistical analysis. In addition, relationships between the dimensions of organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior subscales will be questioned statistically.

Keywords—Organizational climate, organizational citizenship, organizational citizenship behavior, climate.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN today's competitive business world, in achieving sustainable competitive advantage for organizations, the role of the human factor is very important. To be able to survive and protect its assets for organizations, the need for human resources, which are not only limited with formal job descriptions but use time efficiently, law-abiding, volunteers supporting to upgrade organizational performance, is increasing with each passing day. These and similar types of behavior are expressed as organizational citizenship behavior, and especially due to their effects on organizational success, are gaining ground as a concept attracted the attention of researchers in recent years. In creating a high level of job satisfaction, which is one of the important pioneers of Organizational Citizenship Behavior, ensuring healthy and appropriate working environment for the organization's human resources has a paramount importance. That is exactly at this point, we encounter "Organizational Climate" concept. Organizational climate is a concept that is defined as psychological relevant to organizations, and refers to the quality of human relations in organizations. In short, the psychological environment of the organization is called organizational climate. To demonstrate the expected behavior in an organization by human resources is evaluated in the context of organizational climate. To enable human resources to conduct additional role behaviors, an organizational climate, which is participative, encourages them in this

direction, and an interactive exchange of information is seen as important, will be needed.

II. CLIMATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Climate, as lexical meaning, is used in the sense of the air, the atmosphere [1]. Etymologically, the concept comes from Greek and means trend. The concept does not include only meteorological phenomena such as heat, pressure, and humidity, but also includes how individual members of the organization portray the environment within the organization [2]. Climate concept helps, first, to understand the impact of organizations on person and personality. In addition, it allows considering multiple dimensions of human behaviors in organizations under a general heading. Again, understanding the climate helps to understand the impact of different forms of management on individuals working in the organization, work performed by the organization and the health of the organization [3].

Researches related to contributing to the formation of the concept of organizational climate, and topics underlying the organizational climate started in 1900s. For the first time in 1939, the concept of organizational climate was used in the context of social climate, social atmosphere by Lewin, Lippitt and White in a work they did [4]. The concept has gained popularity with studies of Litwin and Tagiuri. According to these researchers, the concept of organizational climate is thesaurus with environment, surrounding, culture, air and emotion, and reflects the intrinsic quality of the organization, and reflects especially the lives of individuals within the organization, and makes up the psychological environment of the organization [5]. The concept is conceptually similar to the meteorological climate, too. As the air is composed of variables such as temperature, humidity, and precipitation, the organizational climate is composed of factors such as friendship, supporting each other, risk, and taking responsibility [6].

Organizational climate concept has been examined in different ways and defined by different researchers. Davis [7] says that although we cannot see and touch it, it is there and just like the air in a room surrounding and affecting everything that is occurring in the organization; B. V. H. Gilmer [8] identifies the concept as characteristics affecting the behaviors of individuals of the organization, and separating the organization from other organizations.

The definition in R. Tagiuri and G. H. Litwin's book, the *Organizational Climate: Explanations of A Concept*, a main

S. Öge is with the Selçuk University, Faculty of Economics And Administrative Sciences, Konya, Turkey (e-mail: soege@selcuk.edu.tr).

P. Erdogan is with the Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya, Turkey.

source for organizational climate is "Organizational climate is relatively permanent nature of the organization's internal environment, which is (a) perceived by organization members, (b) influencing their behaviors, and (c) can be defined with nominal values consist of a certain set of properties of the organization [9]. Yet, in G. H. Litwin and R. A. Stringer's [10] book titled *Motivation and Organizational Climate*, which is another source, the definition is;

"Organizational climate is a measurable set of features of business environment which is perceived directly or indirectly by individuals living and working in this environment, and is putative to affect their motivations and behaviors"

Then, organizational climate is focused on what kinds of feelings individuals have about the organization or its some specific aspects [11]. Climate that exists within the organization is effective on employees' degree of satisfaction from work, as well as on quality of employee performance and level [12]. Again, climate is quite important because it is related to behaviors affecting employees' performance, and their individual characteristics affecting the trust [13]. Climate plays a direct role on efficiency of the organization and job satisfaction in affecting all organizational and psychological operations. Therefore, individuals in the organization are directly affected by the climate, and the greatest impact on their behaviors is created by the climate conditions [14].

III. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DIMENSIONS

In the literature of management and management psychology, many of dimensions related to organizational climate are mentioned. These dimensions, in a way, are considered as the factors cared by the researcher and suppose they affect the organizational climate [15]. In our study, we will deal with organizational climate dimensions in the six categories, expediently with the shape recognized by Litwin and Stringer [16];

- a) Organizational Structure; Organizational structure is an important variable affecting individual and group behavior. It affects employees' feelings to the degree of formality in the workplace, behavioral freedom, and behavioral restrictions. In short, structure makes employees organize well and feel well within the organization.
- b) Personal Responsibility; Organizational climate emphasizing personal responsibility is effective in alerting "success" motivation. Success motivation exists in a climate, which enables individuals to have more responsibilities. Responsibility will enable employees to do their jobs better, plan it carefully, take precautions against problems, follow the results of work, and undertake it when a problem occurs.
- c) Standards; Performance standards alert "success" motivation. If organizational climate gives importance and weight to performance standards, highly motivated individuals will show interest and take care of relevant standards in order to please their superiors and colleagues.

- d) Reward and Punishment; A climate giving weight to rewarding rather than disabling punishment is an appropriate climate in order to alert the motivation of success and reduce the fear of failure. Rewarding climate creates more "success" and "commitment" incentive than punitive climate. On the other hand, a punitive climate will not be able to motivate a highly success motivated individual because it will not interest them.
- e) Sincerity and Solidarity; It is a perception to the degree of sincerity and mutual solidarity of employees and manager to each other. Researches have shown that sincerity and solidarity atmosphere are not effective in alerting "power" motivation. In other words, power motivation is not affected by this dimension. This climatic dimension most clearly stimulates "commitment" incentive. If sincerity and solidarity are low, employees feel themselves lonely.
- f) Organizational Commitment; It is an organizational climatic dimension in which the employees identify themselves with organizational goals, give importance to organizational membership, and have a desire to work hard for organizational goals. "Commitment" incentive is the only incentive that will be directly affected by this climatic dimension. Individuals with a high commitment incentive will react positively to an environment providing organizational commitment and integrity. Having a low-level commitment is considered that employees stay indifferent to organizational goals and the organization itself.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Showing a superior effort voluntarily on behalf of the organization by Human Resources is closely related to seeing themselves as a part of the organization that this case is referred as organizational citizenship behavior in the literature. Much more effort of human resources than expected in a voluntarily way for the organization without expecting anything, namely, showing organizational citizenship behavior leads to useful results in terms of both themselves and the organization. Individuals, showing organizational citizenship behavior, seem that they care about others, they try to do something for others, they are volunteers to show behaviors beyond minimum behaviors expected from them, they react with tolerance without complaining to displeasure, and discomfort occurring both within the organization, and outside the organization, they inform others before they do something or make a decision that will affect their work, and they voluntarily participate decisions and meetings against events affecting the organization considering themselves responsible [17].

The concept began to be subject to organizational researches in 1980s, and it was used for the first time in an article published by Dennis W. Organ. According to Organ [18], the concept is expressed as an optional, voluntarily, voluntary individual behavior which contributes to the effective and efficient execution of organizational functions without considering the formal reward system. The expression optional stated in this definition should be understood as

behaviors not based on any order, out of formal roles, that will be revealed with one's own choice and consent. Then, organizational citizenship behavior is expressed as behaviors that employees like and display without expecting anything and any rewards in return, not responding with a punishment when it is not fulfilled, not stated in work, and task definitions. Out of formal roles, individuals show extra effort to do more than they are expected; and in terms of its results, it contributes to the employee and the organization positively [19].

These can be shown as examples of organizational citizenship behavior; doing others' tasks when they come late or do not come, starting the shift on time, using initiative for newcomers to get used to the job. In addition, taking less day off and working more, covering and saving the organization against any kinds of negations, always obeying organizational rules without any need to be controlled, not revealing negative behaviors such as complaining, quarrelling are examples of organizational citizenship behavior too [20].

V. DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Organizational citizenship behavior will be examined through tackling it with its five dimensions that are the most widely accepted in the literature.

- a) Altruism; It is stated as thinking others and altruism, as well [21]. Selflessness expresses helping others in the face of problems directly and voluntarily [22]. In other words, it means individuals who are working together, helping each other willingly and voluntarily [23]. These kind of behaviors increase the sense of unity and togetherness, enable them to cooperate. Again, these kinds of behaviors increase employees' performances working in the organization, and this contributes to organizational success [24].
- b) Conscientiousness; Conscientiousness is employees' being willing to exhibit a behavior beyond the minimum role expected from them. In other words, it means more behaviors shown by employees voluntarily than expected from them [25]. For example, making more effort in their business, doing their business on time and completing it accurately, obeying all formal and informal rules related to their business, not causing need to monitor and inspect their behaviors [26]. Individuals with high conscientiousness are reliable, responsible, character-wise, hardworking, and success-oriented. With conscientiousness dimension, conducting the work of the organization neatly and in a systematic manner will be possible, and this will provide organizational effectiveness [27].
- c) Sportsmanship; It can be expressed as meeting the discomfort among the employees themselves, between employees and managers, and discomforts against other people directly or indirectly in relationship with the organization with tolerance [28]. These can be counted among gentleman ship dimension; being respectful to colleagues, taking a constructive role in issues related to organization problems, not making the problems

unnecessarily, protecting the image of the organization, correcting wrongs by providing the environment with accurate information. With gentlemanship dimension, it will be possible to create a much more serene and peaceful business environment, and it will be possible to minimize the disputes and conflicts to the lowest level [29].

- d) Courtesy; It is related to employees' having respect each other's' ideas [30]. This behavior dimension can be characterized as informing the ones that can be affected by the behaviors and decisions, transporting the necessary information in this regard to the relevant people by individuals in the organization [31]. In this dimension, disposal of the advance concrete steps are concerned in order to prevent the emergence of a problem or threat, or reduce the negative effects that will cause problems or threats [32]. With courtesy dimension, exchange of information between employees strengthens, and information can be shared effectively with all individuals within the organization [33].
- e) Civic Virtue; Civic virtue is the behaviors indicating employees' participation to the organization's political life, their high-level commitment and interest. It can be expressed, with this aspect, as supporting the development of the organization [34]. Civic virtue is employees' accepting themselves responsible against issues and events related to the organization, participating to the organizational decisions and behaviors responsibly, and voluntarily [35]. Employees' following the issues on the agenda of the organization, explicitly stating their thoughts and views on these issues, having awareness about organizational policies and practices are attitudes and behavior required for civic virtue [36]. With civic virtue dimension, the participation of employees in the organization is increasing; it can be possible for them to adapt organizational change and development much easily [37].

VI. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Purpose and Importance of Research

The purpose of this research is to determine the levels of organizational climate perception and organizational citizenship behavior in health institutions and organizations operating in the health sector, and to identify the relationship between these two concepts by examining them. To this end, our study has been implemented on the health workers situated in the city center in Konya/Turkey, and working in private sector health institutions providing health care. Thus, measuring organizational climate perceptions of employees working in mentioned health institutions, determining their level of displaying organizational citizenship behavior, and identifying the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational climate in the relevant institutions can be expressed as the basic aim of our research.

B. Research Methodology

Survey technique was used as data collecting means in our research. The questionnaire used is composed of three parts. The first part consists of demographic questions mainly related to the subject of our research work. In the second part, questions related to organizational structure are divided into six dimensions including organizational structure, personal responsibility, standards, rewards and penalties, sincerity, solidarity and organizational commitment. In the third part, questions related to organizational citizenship behavior are located in altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, civic virtue, and courtesy dimensions scopes.

The main bulk of our research is formed by the health workers working in private sector health institutions providing health care operating in Konya province in central borders. Concerning the period we conducted the research, the total number of health staff working in the health institutions the subject of our research is 1622. Our research was carried out on 255 health workers selected by random sampling method. The data obtained by questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS 20.0 software package on the computer. The used questionnaire was prepared in accordance with 5 Likert Scale. The data was put to reliability analysis for determining internal consistency (alpha values), to correlation analysis for determining one to one relationships among variables, to Kruskal-Wallis H-test and Mann-Whitney U test for determining the relationship between demographic characteristics and organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior.

C. Hypothesis of the Study

- H1.** Perception levels of health workers for organizational climate and dimension is high.
- H2.** The levels of displaying organizational citizenship behavior of health workers are high.
- H3.** There is a significant difference between organizational climate perceptions of health workers and their tasks.
- H4.** There is a significant difference between the organizational citizenship behaviors of health workers and their tasks.
- H5.** There is a significant relationship between the organizational citizenship behavior of health professionals and organizational climate.

D. Research Findings and Evaluation

1. General Findings

All of the findings related to the demographic characteristics of health care workers in our study are shown in Table I. As seen in the Table I, 17% of respondents are doctors, 26% is Nurses, 11% is Anesthesia Technician, 15% is Lab Technician, 13% is X-ray technician, 11% is Physiotherapists, and 7% is Dietitians. Considering the age range; 34% of respondents is 20-30, 28% is 31-40, 25% is 41-50, and 13% is 50+ age category. 65% of the respondents are married, 35% are single. 46% of the subjects is men, 54% is women. The distribution of the subjects in terms of education;

14% high school, 36% undergraduate, 31% graduate, and 19% of them have postgraduate education

TABLE I
 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Task	Frequency	Percentage
Doctor	42	0,17
Nurse	67	0,26
Anesthesia Technician	29	0,11
Lab Technician	38	0,15
X-Ray Technician	34	0,13
Physiotherapist	27	0,11
Dietician	18	0,07
Age		
20-30	87	0,34
31-40	72	0,28
41-50	64	0,25
50+	32	0,13
Marital Status		
Married	167	0,65
Single	88	0,35
Gender		
Male	117	0,46
Female	138	0,54
Educational Status		
High School	35	0,14
Associate Degree	93	0,36
Bachelor Degree	79	0,31
Graduate	48	0,19

2. Scale Reliability

To determine the organizational climate dimensions the obtained data was subjected to factor analysis, and questions were analyzed using "Key Components" (principal components), namely, Varimax rotation method. In order to test the suitability of data sets to factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test sample adequacy and Bartlett sphericity test were applied. The data set was determined to be suitable for factor analysis with KMO value over 0,50, and with the tail probability of Bartlett tests is significant at the 0.05 significance. Because of factor analysis, Likert Scale thirty questions related to organizational climate took part in the survey, and six dimensions - organizational structure, personal responsibility, standards, rewards and punishments, sincerity and solidarity, organizational commitment - were obtained. Yet as a result of factor analysis, twenty questions related to organizational citizenship behavior took part in the survey and five dimensions - altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, civic virtue - were obtained. In calculating the internal consistency of the factors, Cronbach alpha coefficient was measured, and scale reliability on organizational climate was determined as Cronbach alpha ($\alpha_{org.climate}$)=0,788. On the other hand, scale reliability related to organizational citizenship behavior was determined to be Cronbach Alpha ($\alpha_{org.citizenshipbeh.}$)=0,801.

3. Field Related Results

a) Findings Showing Perception Levels of Health Workers towards the Organizational Climate and Its Dimensions

H0. Perception levels health workers towards organizational climate and its dimensions are low.

H1. Perception levels health workers towards organizational climate and its dimensions are high.

TABLE II
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PERCEPTION LEVELS OF HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Dimensions	N	Mean	Ss	Min	Max
Organizational Structure	255	4,0690	,72715	1,82	4,79
Personal Responsibility	255	4,2129	,80472	1,21	4,99
Standards	255	3,9895	,69667	1,00	5,00
Reward and Punishment	255	4,3965	,77965	1,00	4,85
Sincerity and Solidarity	255	4,4523	,81254	1,18	5,00
Organizational Commitment	255	4,1168	,71321	1,00	5,00
Organizational Climate	255	4,0365	,68951	1,56	4,23

When Table II is analyzed, level of perception of the subjects for the dimensions of organizational climate. They were identified as for organizational structure dimension "High" (4,0690±0,727), for personal responsibility "high" (4,2129±0,804), for standards dimension "medium" (3.9895 ± 0.696), for reward and punishment dimension "high" (4.3965 ± 0.779), for sincerity and solidarity dimension "high" (4.4523 ± 0.812) and for organizational commitment dimension "high" (4.1168 ± 0.713). General organizational climate is "high" (4,0365±0,689), too. According to these results, H1 hypothesis was accepted.

b) Findings Showing Levels of Displaying Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Health Care Workers

H0. Levels of displaying organizational citizenship behavior of health care workers are low.

H1. Levels of displaying organizational citizenship behavior of health care workers are high.

TABLE III
LEVELS OF DISPLAYING ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR OF HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Dimensions	N	Mean	Ss	Min	Max
Altruism	255	3,984	1,089	1,00	5,00
Conscientiousness	255	3,550	0,936	1,00	5,00
Gentlemanship	255	3,710	0,904	1,25	5,00
Courtesy	255	3,970	1,040	1,00	5,00
Civic Virtue	255	3,648	0,921	1,00	5,00
OCB	255	3,774	0,732	1,25	4,85

When Table III is analyzed, level of displaying organizational citizenship behavior of the subjects. They were identified as for altruism dimension "high" (3,984±1,089), for conscientiousness dimension "high" (3.550 ± 0.936), for gentlemanship dimension "high" (3.710 ± 0.904), for courtesy dimension "high" (3.970 ± 1.040), for civic virtue level "high" (3.648 ± 0.921) and for overall organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) level "high" (3,774±0,732). According to these results, H1 hypothesis was accepted.

c) Findings Disclosing the Organizational Climate Perception of Health Care Workers According to Their Professional Duties

H0. There is no significant difference between organizational climate perceptions of health care workers and their duties.

H1. There is a significant difference between organizational climate perceptions of health care workers and their duties.

TABLE IV
DIFFERENTIATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE PERCEPTION OF EMPLOYEES BY THE TASK VARIABLES

	Group	N	SS	X̄	Kruskal Wallis H-Test	
					KW	P
Organizational Structure	Doctor	42	,75806	3,0870	,132	,988
	Nurse	67	,57457	3,0743		
	Technicians	101	,67647	3,0549		
	Other	45	,75550	3,0584		
Personal Responsibility	Doctor	42	,75656	3,4022	2,218	,528
	Nurse	67	,63738	3,1000		
	Technicians	101	,50637	3,1346		
	Other	45	,76290	3,1534		
Standards	Doctor	42	,75196	2,5145	1,034	,793
	Nurse	67	,60987	2,3600		
	Technicians	101	,51647	2,4103		
	Other	45	,60296	2,5114		
Reward and Punishment	Doctor	42	,58048	3,0326	3,405	,333
	Nurse	67	,54905	3,0900		
	Technicians	101	1,04006	2,7115		
	Other	45	,65441	3,1477		
Sincerity and Solidarity	Doctor	42	,58260	3,9022	6,188	,103
	Nurse	67	,79713	3,5000		
	Technicians	101	,96535	3,2308		
	Other	45	,86165	3,7330		
Organizational Commitment	Doctor	42	,64752	3,1739	7,165	,670
	Nurse	67	,56545	3,1840		
	Technicians	101	1,01375	2,6462		
	Other	45	,60251	2,9500		

According to Kruskal-Wallis H test results performed in order to determine whether the subjects' task variables show a significant difference by the organizational climate dimensions. Organizational structure (Kruskal-Wallis = H, 132; p = 988 > 0.05), personal responsibility (= Kruskal-Wallis H = 2.218; p 528 > 0.05), standards (Kruskal-Wallis HR = 1.034; p = 793 > 0.05), reward and punishment (Kruskal-Wallis H = 3.405, p = 333 > 0.05), sincerity and solidarity (Kruskal-Wallis H = 6.188; p = 103 > 0.05) and organizational commitment (Kruskal-Wallis H = 7.165, p = 0.67 > 0.05) there was no significant difference in sub dimensions. According to these results, H0 hypothesis was accepted.

d) Findings Disclosing the Organizational Citizenship Behaviors of Health Care Workers According to Their Professional Duties

H0. There is no significant difference between organizational citizenship behaviors of health care workers and their duties.

H1. There is significant difference between organizational citizenship behaviors of health care workers and their duties.

TABLE V
DIFFERENTIATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIORS OF
EMPLOYEES BY THE TASK VARIABLES

	Group	N	SS	— X	Kruskal Wallis H-Test KW P	
Altruism	Doctor	42	1,29170	3,7065	4,752	,191
	Nurse	67	0,99718	3,9800		
	Technicians	101	0,44488	4,5000		
	Other	45	1,13329	3,9773		
Conscientiousness	Doctor	42	1,01532	3,4239	3,381	,337
	Nurse	67	0,82702	3,5300		
	Technicians	101	0,60843	3,9038		
	Other	45	1,02840	3,5227		
Gentlemanship	Doctor	42	1,09831	3,4674	1,708	,635
	Nurse	67	0,70828	3,7800		
	Technicians	101	0,70085	3,8077		
	Other	45	0,94990	3,7670		
Courtesy	Doctor	42	1,25749	3,7174	5,243	,155
	Nurse	67	0,95492	3,8900		
	Technicians	101	0,42649	4,4808		
	Other	45	1,06257	4,0170		
Civic Virtue	Doctor	42	1,03329	3,5217	3,977	,264
	Nurse	67	0,85999	3,5000		
	Technicians	101	0,59039	4,0192		
	Other	45	0,96467	3,6875		

TABLE VI
THE RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

		Altruism	Conscientiousness	Gentlemanship	Courtesy	Civic Virtue	Organizational Citizenship Behavior
Organizational Structure	S.Correlation	,090	,166	,169	,048	-,008	,137
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,363	,090	,085	,627	,932	,162
Personal Responsibility	S.Correlation	,064	,071	,035	,021	-,076	-,009
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,514	,474	,726	,834	,442	,928
Reward and Punishment	S.Correlation	-,112	,002	,146	,021	-,197(*)	-,060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,254	,988	,137	,829	,044	,544
Standards	S.Correlation	-,036	-,042	,055	-,081	-,163	-,114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,712	,673	,576	,412	,098	,249
Sincerity and Solidarity	S.Correlation	,112	,123	,277(**)	-,099	-,039	,101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,257	,211	,004	,315	,693	,306
Organizational Commitment	S.Correlation	-,056	,103	,223(*)	-,002	-,082	,033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,571	,295	,022	,980	,407	,739
Organizational Climate	S.Correlation	,000	,096	,205(*)	-,019	-,137	,022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,998	,328	,036	,847	,162	,823

**Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

There was not a statistically significant relationship between the "organizational structure" first sub-dimensions of organizational climate and any sub dimensions of OCB. There was not a statistically significant relationship between the "personal responsibility" the sub-dimensions of organizational climate and any sub dimensions of OCB. There was a statistically significant positive but low relationship between the "reward and punishment" the other sub-dimensions of organizational climate and the "civic virtue" sub dimensions of OCB ($r=-0,197$; $p=0,044 < 0,05$). There is not a statistically significant relationship between the reward and punishment dimension and other sub dimensions of OCB. No statistically significant relationship was found between another dimension "standards" of organizational climate and any sub dimensions of OCB between "sincerity and solidarity" organizational

climate dimension, and gentlemanship sub dimension of OCB. No statistically significant relationship was found between another dimension "standards" of organizational climate and any sub dimensions of OCB. Between "sincerity and solidarity" organizational climate dimension and gentlemanship sub dimension of OCB, there was a statistically significant low level positive relationship ($0,277$; $p=0,004 < 0,01$). Between sincerity and solidarity dimension and any other sub dimension of OCB, no statistically significant relationship was found. Between "organizational commitment" sub dimension of organizational climate and gentleman ship sub dimension of OCB, statistically significant but low level relationship was found ($0,223$; $p=0,022 < 0,05$). Between subs dimension of organizational commitment and OCB's any other sub dimension, statistically significant

e) Findings Disclosing the Relationship between Organizational Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Health Care Workers

H0. There is no significant difference between organizational citizenship behaviors of health care workers and organizational climate.

H1. There is a significant difference between organizational citizenship behaviors of health care workers and organizational climate.

relationship is out of question. Lastly, between organizational climate and OCB, yet no statistically significant relationship was found. However, between organizational climate and gentleman ship sub dimension of OCB, statistically significant but low level positive relationship was found (0,205; $p=0,036<0,05$). In the light of these results, H_1 was rejected.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this research, the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior were investigated. For this purpose, the research was applied to health care workers employed in the private sector health institutions operating in the health sector and providing health care.

Employee perceptions of organizational climate working in relevant health institutions are a high-level. In terms of sub-dimensions, sincerity and solidarity is the highest, and standards dimension is the lowest. According to the obtained results, we can say that outlook perceptions of those working in health sector to business and working environment is positive. We can express that this case is important in terms of raising employees' job satisfaction and performance. Protecting and raising productivity levels of healthcare workers in and intense and stressful work environment depends on a positive level of organizational climate. The most important task in this regard belongs to managers.

Level of displaying organizational citizenship behavior of employees who work in relevant health institutions is high, too. In this respect, when the obtained results are evaluated in terms of sub dimensions, altruism dimension is at the highest value, and conscientiousness dimension is at the lowest. Altruism involves the behavior of individuals of working in cooperation with each other within the organization, leads the employees to consider their job seriously. This dimension's high level is extremely important in terms of the quality of health care in health institutions. A high level of organizational citizenship can be interpreted as self-sacrificing work of health professionals. Only to engage in formal behavior of employees could cause results to impossible compensation. In addition, extra-role behavior in the health sector is a necessity rather than voluntary. It is important to support health care workers with high extra role behavior appreciating them at every opportunity by managers. There is not a statistically significant relationship between perceptions of health workers to organizational climate sub dimensions and their professional duties. On the other hand, a significant difference between employees' organizational citizenship behavior and their professional duties has emerged.

When the findings disclosing the results of the relationship between organizational climate and organizational citizenship behavior is analyzed, although there are statistically significant relationships between some sub dimensions of organizational climate and some sub dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior, we state that there isn't any effect of organizational climate, in general, on organizational citizenship behavior of employees. It will not be wrong to say that this case will lead to increase the

voluntary behaviors exhibited for the benefit of organizations defined as extra-role performance of the moderate work environment the employees create with each other and with the managers, and the management style supporting their ideas.

REFERENCES

- [1] Basak Gerecek, "The Relationship between Organizational Climate and Information Security in Healthcare Organizations" *Dokuz Eylul University Institute of Health Sciences*, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Izmir, 2012.
- [2] Yucel Ertekin, *Organizational Climate*, TODAIE Publishing, Issue Number: 253, Ankara, 1993.
- [3] Serdar Oge, *Ergonomics for Organizational Effectiveness*, Cizgi Bookstore, Konya, 2014.
- [4] R. T. Barth, "Organizational Commitment and Identification of Engineers as a Function of Organizational Climate" *Industrial Relations*, 29(1), pp. 185-199, 2003.
- [5] Renato Tagiuri, and George H. Litwin, *Organizational Climate, Explanations of a Concept, Division of Research*, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1968.
- [6] R. Wayne Mondy, and Robert E. Holmes, Edwin B. Flippo, *Management: Concepts and Practices*, Second Edition, Allyn and Bacon Inc., USA., 1983.
- [7] Keith Davis, *Human Behavior at Work, Human Relations and Organizational Behavior*, Fourth Edition, Mc Graw-Hill, Inc., USA, 1985.
- [8] Beverly Von Haller Gilmer, *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Mc Graw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1971.
- [9] Renato Tagiuri, and George H. Litwin, *Organizational Climate, Explanations of a Concept, Division of Research*, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1968.
- [10] George H. Litwin, and Robert A. Stringer, *Motivation and Organizational Climate*, Division Of Research, Harvard Business School, Boston, 1968.
- [11] Robert L. Mathis, John H. Jackson, *Personnel, Contemporary Perspectives and Applications*, Second Edition, West Publishing Company, St. Paul, 1979.
- [12] R. Wayne Mondy, and Robert E. Holmes, Edwin B. Flippo, 1983.
- [13] K.A. Watson "Motivations, Satisfactions and Selected Characteristics Of Arizona 4-H Volunteer Adult Leaders" *The University Of Arizona*, 1984.
- [14] Robert C. Albrook "Participative Management: Time For Second Book", *Fortune*, May, 1969.
- [15] Linda Smircich, "Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, September, 1983.
- [16] M. Scott Myers, *Theories of Human Effectiveness*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1970.
- [17] Derya Ergun Özler, *Current Issues in Organizational Behavior*, Second Edition, Ekin Publisher, Bursa, 2010.
- [18] Dennis W. Organ, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, Lexington Books, Lexington-Massachusetts, 1988.
- [19] Larry Williams and Stella E. Anderson, "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Its Predictors Of Organizational Citizenship And In-Role Behaviours", *Journal Of Management*, 17 (3), 601-617.
- [20] M. Kemal Demirci, *Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Business*, Gazi Bookstore, Ankara, 2008.
- [21] W. Jill Graham, "An Essay On Organizational Citizenship Behaviour", *Employee Responsibilities And Rights Journal* 4 (4), 249-260.
- [22] Oya İnci Bolat, and Tamer Bolat, Oya Aytemiz Seymen, "Investigation of the Relationship between Strengthening Leader Behavior and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors through Social Exchange Theory" *Balikesir University, Institute of Social Science Journal*, 12 (21), pp. 215-239, 2009.
- [23] C. Ann Smith, and Dennis W. Organ, Janet P. Near, "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its Nature and Antecedents", *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 68 (4), pp. 655-663, 1983.
- [24] Mel Schnake, "Organizational Citizenship A Review, Proposed Model And Research Agenda", *Human Relations*, 44 (7), 735-745.
- [25] Dennis W. Organ, "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Its Construct Clean-Up Time", *Human Performance*, 10, 85-97.

- [26] Philip M. Podsakoff, and Scott B. Mackenzie, Julie B. Paine, Daniel G. Bachrach, "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review Of The Theoretical And Empirical Literature And Suggestions For Future Research" *Journal Of Management*, 26 (3) 513-563, 2000.
- [27] Dennis W. Organ, "The Motivational Basis of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour", *Resaarch in Organizational Behaviour*, 12, 44-71, 1990.
- [28] Philip M. Podsakoff, and Scott B. Mackenzie, Julie B. Paine, Daniel G. Bachrach, 2000.
- [29] M. Schnake "Organizational Citizenship: A Review, Proposed Model, and Research Agenda", *Human Resolutions*, 44, 735-759,
- [30] Philip M. Podsakoff, and Scott B. Mackenzie, Julie B. Paine, Daniel G. Bachrach, 2000.
- [31] Feridun Sezgin, "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Conceptual Analysis and Some Implications in terms of school" *Gazi Education Faculty Journal*, 25(1), pp.317-339, 2005.
- [32] Ronit Kark "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: What's Gender Go To Do With It?", *Organization*, 12 (6), 889-917.
- [33] Philip M. Podsakoff, and Scott B. Mackenzie, Julie B. Paine, Daniel G. Bachrach, 2000.
- [34] D. L. Kidder, "The Influence of Gender on the Performance of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors" *Journal Of Management*, 28 (5) pp. 629-648, 2002.
- [35] J.W. Tansky, "Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: What is the Relationship?", *Employee Responsibilities and Rigts Journal*, 3 (6), 195-206.
- [36] Marcia A. Finkelstein, "Dispositional Predictors Of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: Motives, Motive Fulfillment and Role Identity", *Social Behaviour And Personality*, 32(4), 383-398, 2006.
- [37] Jones M. George and Jones Gareth, "Organizational Spontaneity In Context", *Human Performance*, 10(2), 153-170, 2001.