

KIRPIK, G., AKDEMİR, B. (2019). “Does the Level of Organizational Identification Indicate Differences According to Socio-Demographic Variables?: TRC1 (Gaziantep, Adıyaman, Kilis) Zone Example”, Journal of Academic Value Studies, Vol: 5, Issue: 5; pp: 897-915 (ISSN: 2149-8598).

DOES THE LEVEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION INDICATE DIFFERENCES ACCORDING TO SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES?: TRC1 (GAZİANTEP, ADIYAMAN, KİLİS) ZONE EXAMPLE *

Sosyo-Demografik Değişkenler Açısından Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Düzeyleri Farklılık Gösterir mi?: TRC1 (Gaziantep, Adıyaman, Kilis) Bölgesi Örneği

Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülşen KIRPIK [ID](#)

Adıyaman University, Faculty of Pharmacy, Department of Pharmacy Management,
gkirpik@adiyaman.edu.tr Adıyaman / Turkey

Prof. Dr. Bünyamin AKDEMİR [ID](#)

Inonu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, bunyamin.akdemir@inonu.edu.tr Malatya/Turkey

ABSTRACT

Anahtar Kelimeler

Örgütsel Özdeşleşme,
Bilişsel Özdeşleşme,
Duyuşsal Özdeşleşme,
Sosyo-demografik
Değişkenler, TRC1 Bölgesi

Keywords

Organizational
Identification, Cognitive
Identification, Affective
Identification, Socio-
demographic Variables,
TRC1 Zone

In this study, it was investigated whether the perceived organizational identification levels differ in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees. In this context, the data set of the study was reached with the survey method applied to 1,105 employees selected by random sampling method among the employees in the organized industrial enterprises of TRC1 Zone. SPSS 22.0 program was used to analyze the data set. In this study, it was decided to use the organizational identification scale developed by Cheney (1982) in order to determine the organizational identification levels of the employees. However, as a result of extensive researches and investigations, the 18-item scale used by Çakınberk et al. (2011) and Balcı et al. (2012) was used for organizational identification. The reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.927.

As a result of the analysis of the hypotheses of the study with MannWhitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests, significant differences were found between the perceived organizational identification levels in terms of gender, marital status, age and task of the employees ($p < 0.05$). However, no significant differences were found between the perceived organizational identification levels of the employees in terms of education level ($p > 0.05$). On the other hand, although there was a significant difference between the perception levels related to the affective identification dimension ($p = 0.002 < 0.05$), there was no significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension ($p = 0.071 > 0.05$). On the other hand, although there was a significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension in terms of seniority of the participants ($p = 0,014 < 0,05$), there was no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension ($p = 0,073 > 0,05$).

ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, işgörenlerin sosyo-demografik özellikleri açısından algılanan örgütsel özdeşleşme düzeyinin farklılık gösterip göstermediği incelenmiştir. Bu bağlamda, TRC1 Bölgesinin organize sanayi işletmelerindeki işgörenler arasından tesadüfi

* This study was produced from Gülşen KIRPIK's doctoral thesis and presented orally at the 1st International Battalgazi Multidisciplinary Studies Congress on 07-09.12.2018

örneklem türlerinden “basit rastgele örneklem yöntemi” ile seçilen 1.105 işgörene uygulanan anket yöntemi ile çalışmanın veri setine ulaşılmıştır. Veri setinin analizi için SPSS 22.0 programından yararlanılmıştır. Verilerin analizi kapsamında frekans analizi, güvenilirlik analizi, normal dağılım testi ve faktör analizi uygulanmıştır. Örgütsel özdeşleşme ölçeğinin belirlenmesine yönelik yapılan araştırmalar sonucunda, bu çalışmada, işgörenlerin örgütsel özdeşleşme düzeylerini belirlemek için Cheney ‘in (1982) geliştirdiği örgütsel özdeşleşme ölçeğinin kullanılmasına karar verilmiştir. Ancak, yapılan geniş kapsamlı araştırma ve incelemeler sonucunda, örgütsel özdeşleşme ile ilgili olarak Çakınberk ve diğerleri (2011) ile Balcı ve diğerleri (2012) tarafından kullanılan ve örgütsel özdeşleşmenin son hali olan 18 maddelik ölçek kullanılmıştır. Ölçeğin güvenilirlik katsayısı 0.927’dir. Faktör analizi ile örgütsel özdeşleşme ölçeğinin her bir maddesi için elde edilen örneklem sayısının yeterlilik düzeyi Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin testi ile ölçülmüş olup, test sonucu (0,948>0,90 olduğu için) mükemmel çıkmıştır; Barlett küresellik testi ile de ölçeğin maddeleri arasındaki tutarlılık ölçülmüştür ($p<0,01$) ve sonuç anlamlı bulunmuştur. Faktör analizinin “Döndürülmüş Faktör Matrisi” ile örgütsel özdeşleşme ölçeği iki boyutlu bir yapıya ulaşmıştır. Ölçeğin ilk 9 maddesinden oluşan birinci boyutu “bilişsel özdeşleşme” ve son 9 maddeden oluşan ikinci boyutu “duyuşsal özdeşleşme” olarak adlandırılmıştır. Ayrıca, normallik testi sonucunda, verilerin normal dağılım özelliği göstermediği ($p<0,01$) tespit edildiğinden, hipotezlerin test edilmesinde parametrik olmayan analiz yöntemlerinden yararlanılmıştır.

Çalışmanın hipotezlerinin MannWhitney U ile Kruskal Wallis H testleri ile analizi sonucunda, araştırmaya katılan işgörenlerin cinsiyeti, medeni durumu, yaşı ve görevi açısından algılanan örgütsel özdeşleşme düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur ($p<0,05$). Ancak, araştırmaya katılan işgörenlerin eğitim düzeyi açısından algılanan örgütsel özdeşleşme düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$). Diğer taraftan, araştırmaya katılan işgörenlerin aylık gelir düzeyi açısından örgütsel özdeşleşmenin “duyuşsal özdeşleşme” boyutuna ilişkin algı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmasına ($p=0,002<0,05$) rağmen, “bilişsel özdeşleşme” boyutuna ilişkin algı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır ($p=0,071>0,05$). Bununla birlikte, araştırmaya katılan işgörenlerin kıdem düzeyi açısından örgütsel özdeşleşmenin “bilişsel özdeşleşme” boyutuna ilişkin algı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmasına ($p=0,014<0,05$) rağmen, “duyuşsal özdeşleşme” boyutuna ilişkin algı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmamıştır ($p=0,073>0,05$).

1. INTRODUCTION

Rapid changes and developments in the world of technology and informatics have also affected the employer-employee relationship. In order to improve the performance of the employee, the promises made by the employer and the expectations perceived by the employee began to reshape the working rules of the business life. The rapid change in the global technological and cultural field has also affected the social life and the speed of the existing social change. “Human capital is composed of knowledge, skills and capabilities and has a close relationship with the company's products and services” (Kara, 2019: 249). Today, when compared to the past, it is seen that the speed of social change has increased. This rapid change also affects the socio-demographic characteristics of the employees in the enterprises and pushes the enterprises to a constantly renewed management approach.

When the different socio-demographic characteristics of the employees are determined by the business managers and directed and managed in line with the business goals and objectives, the perception of identification towards the organization where the employee works is high. However, the performance of the employee who does not fully adopt the identity of the organization decreases and thus causes organizational failures.

The fact that identification is subjective causes the quality and level of identification between the employee and the organization to depend on the personal characteristics of the employee. The question then comes to mind: Do organizational identification levels differ in terms of socio-demographic variables? In order to find the answer to this question, in our study, it has been studied whether the organizational identification levels of employees differ in terms of socio-demographic variables. As a result of this study, opinions were put forward.

2. LITERATURE SUMMARY

2. 1. Organizational Identification

The concept of identification was first used by Sigmund Freud (1922), and identification was described as the first expression of the emotional bond with another human being. From this definition, Laswell expanded the concept and used it to explain identification with society, such as nationalism (Çırakoğlu, 2010: 5). Foote (1951: 14-21; act. Günbek, 2007: 23; Karabey, 2005: 20), who evaluated the concept of identification from an organizational point of view, identified identification as the basis of motivation and stated that individuals identified with groups and categorized the social life around them.

When the literature is examined, it is seen that the concept of organizational identification is based on social identity theory. Social Identity Theory, which examines the identification of individuals with

groups from socio-psychological aspects, mentions two motives for the concept of identification. The first is the need for self-classification and the second is the need for self-enrichment. The need for self-classification is based on the determination of the place of the individual in the social environment and the need for self-enrichment is based on the understanding that the membership of the group or organization is rewarding the person (Karayığit, 2008: 2; Tümer, 2010: 57). Identity, which is one of the most used concepts in Social Identity Theory, refers to the definition and positioning of the individual according to a social environment (Turner, 1982: 7). Identity affects the identification when looking for an answer to the question of who am I or who we are, by identifying the person as a member of a group both directly and indirectly by communicating with others in the same group (Tüzün and Çağlar, 2008: 1012; Hortaçsu, 2007: 67). Identity and identification are concepts that should not be confused with each other, although they are intertwined with each other. Identity, while presenting the rules and resources available to members of the organization, identification is emerging as an emerging and emerging process in identity (Scott, Cormon and Cheney, 1998: 304).

As stated by Çırakoğlu (2010: 2), individuals divide their social environment, themselves and other individuals into meaningful groups. They form an internal group in which they are included and an external group that they confront. They perceive the internal groups to which they belong as "we" and perceive the external groups they face as "they". Thus, individuals cognitively recognize their environment and place themselves in a social environment.

In the process of identification, individuals accept the characteristics they perceive about the group as their own and form a new self. This new ego causes the other features of the individual to become insignificant. Identification also occurs after this stage (Mael and Ashfort, 1989: 26). Depending on the degree of organizational identification possessed, the self formed by the employees becomes central and when the employees express themselves, they begin to emphasize their organizational identities more than their other identities (Çırakoğlu, 2010: 2). In other words, if the expressions used to describe him / herself are the same as the expressions used to describe the organization they work for, then he / she identifies himself / herself with the organization. Therefore, organizational identification is a cognitive / perceptual concept and in order for organizational identification to occur, it is necessary to establish a psychological connection between himself / herself and the fate of the organization (Mael and Ashfort, 1992: 105). In order for organizational identification to occur, the individual should perceive the corporate identity as striking and classify the self with the organization (Pratt, 1998: 194). In other words, the more similar the expressions that individuals use when describing themselves and their organizations, the higher the identification with the organization (Dutton et al., 1994: 239). In other words, organizational identification is the perception of employees that they are one and similar among their organizations (Polat and Meydan, 2010: 145; Dutton et al., 1994: 239).

Organizational identification is an important determinant for explaining the behavior of the employee. For example, strong organizational identification leads to greater cooperation with other members of the organization, greater efforts to achieve the goals of the organization, and positively affects job satisfaction. In addition, employees with high levels of organizational identification tendency to leave the job is low (Bartels; 2006: 10; Knippenberg et al., 2007: 460; Olkkonen and Lipponen, 2006: 202).

Organizational identification may vary depending on the individual qualifications of the employee. Organizational identification affects organizational commitment, resistance to change, cooperative behaviors, participation in activities organized by the organization, motivation and performance. In addition, organizational identification affects the level of organization / occupational conflict, alienation to work or workplace, cooperation behavior towards organizational goals, positive / negative reactions to work and productivity (Polat & Meydan, 2010: 151).

As seen in the literature, the definition of organizational identification is gathered around some basic concepts. These concepts are commitment, unity of purpose, sense of belonging and harmony. Using these concepts, organizational identification can be defined as the sense of belonging and belonging belonging to the organization, the unity of purpose with the organization of the individual, and the harmony of the individual and organization in this context.

2. 2 Studies Analyzing the Concept of Organizational Identification from Socio-Demographic Perspective

In the study conducted by Kaplan (2018) to analyze the impact of corporate social responsibility and corporate reputation perceptions on organizational identification, a questionnaire was applied to 268 personnel working in 4 and 5-star hotels operating in Nevşehir. As a result of the regression analysis, it was found that institutional reputation has a positive and significant effect on organizational identification. In addition, it has been found that corporate reputation plays a partial mediator role in the relationship between corporate social responsibility and organizational identification. According to the results of the differences analysis; There was no statistically significant difference between the participants' demographic characteristics such as gender, marital status, age, education level, working time, tourism vocational training status, star of the hotel worked, department worked.

In order to determine the mediating role of organizational identification in the relationship between corporate reputation perception and job satisfaction, Işık (2016) conducted a field study for a sample of university employees in the Eastern Anatolia Region. As a result of the research, it has been found that organizational identification is the mediating role between perception of corporate reputation and job satisfaction.

Topçu (2015) conducted a research in the sample of SMEs in order to determine the mediating role of the psychological contract in the effect of the personality characteristics of the employees on the attitudes of the employees. In the study, as a result of the analysis of the data collected from 421 people by questionnaire method, it was found that personality had a decisive role in organizational attitudes and behaviors, and psychological agreement played a mediating role in this relationship.

When the above studies are evaluated together; It is seen that the concept of organizational identification has not been investigated sufficiently in terms of socio-demographic characteristics in the literature in Turkey. This situation draws attention to the importance of examining the concept of organizational identification in the literature in terms of socio-demographic variables and it will be useful for future studies.

3. RESEARCH

The aim and limits of the research, main population and sample, data collection and analysis, research hypotheses, reliability analysis, factor analysis and method of analysis of hypotheses are included under this title.

3. 1 Purpose of the Research

The aim of this study is to investigate whether the organizational identification level of the employees differ in terms of socio-demographic variables. In addition, it was aimed to determine which of the socio-demographic variables could be effective in increasing the organizational identification level of the employee and other related results to guide the various levels of stakeholders (human resources experts, managers, researchers, etc.) and to support the knowledge in the academic literature.

This study is limited to the TRC1 Zone only. a relatively small sample of the Organized Industrial Zone in Turkey were examined. The findings may not be generalized to other employees of national or international scope. Because, environmental conditions (economic, technological and cultural, etc.) that affect employees' perception of organizational identification and socio-demographic variables examined in this study may differ regionally or culturally. In addition, correct understanding and answering of each of the questions constituting the organizational identification scale used as a data collection tool may create differences in terms of socio-demographic variables. However, it was accepted that the respondents understood the questionnaire questions correctly and in the same way and gave answers and information reflecting the real situation.

3. 2 Population and Sample

The main population of this study is the employees in the enterprises operating in the Organized Industrial Zones of TRC1 Zone (Gaziantep, Adiyaman, Kilis). Gaziantep Organized Industrial Zone is divided into 4 active industrial zones and 120.000 employees are employed in total (www.gaosb.org.01.01.2015). When the information of Adiyaman Governorate in 2016 (www.adiyaman.gov.tr.

28.10.2017) is examined, it is seen that the current employment in Adiyaman Organized Industrial Zone is approximately 10.888 people. Furthermore, when the information of the official website of the Directorate of Kilis Organized Industrial Zone in 2015 (www.kilisob.org.tr. 13.07.2015) is examined, it is seen that the current employment in Kilis Organized Industrial Zone is approximately 781 people. Taken together, the main population of this study is 131,669 in TRC1 Zone. In this study, the sample consisted of 1,105 employees selected by random random sampling method. Accordingly, 0.8% of the TRC1 population has been reached.

3. 3 Data Collection and Analysis

In order to collect data from the first hand, the questionnaire was prepared in the form of multiple choice to identify the employees and the questions that should be answered according to the five-point Likert-type scale. The questionnaires were applied by face to face interviews with 1105 employees who participated in the survey in the industrial zones of Gaziantep, Adiyaman and Kilis in April, May, June and July 2017 by simple random sampling method.

In this study, it was decided to use the organizational identification scale developed by Cheney (1982) in order to determine the organizational identification levels of the employees. The first version of the scale had 30 items and was reduced to 25 questions (Cakinberk et al., 2011: 99; Balci et al., 2012: 55). As a result of the researches and investigations, the 18-item scale used by Cakinberk et al. (2011) and Balci et al. (2012) was used for organizational identification.

The questionnaire used in the research consists of two parts. In the first part of the questionnaire, there are questions that determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second part of the questionnaire, it was prepared with a 5-point Likert Type Scale and the questionnaire was given to the participants and they were asked to answer these questions. The data set was formed by coding the questions in the questionnaire form. SPSS 22.0 software was used to analyze the data set.

Before the analysis of the data, the Kolmogrov-Smirnov test was used to determine whether the data in the study showed normal distribution. As a result of Kolmogrov-Smirnov Test applied to the data, it was found that the data did not show normal distribution ($p \leq 0.01$). Since the data were not normally distributed, the non-parametric tests "Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests" were used in the hypothesis testing of the study. In our study, 5% error margin is predicted within 95% reliability limits.

3. 4 Research Hypotheses

The main hypothesis for the purpose of the study and the sub-hypotheses formed in terms of two dimensions of organizational identification are given below.

1.H₀: There is no significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees.

1.H₁: There is significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees.

Sub-Hypotheses

H₀.1.1: There is no significant difference between employees' organizational identification perception levels in terms of gender.

H₁.1.1 There is significant difference between employees' organizational identification perception levels in terms of gender.

H₀.1.1.1: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of the cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of gender of employees.

H₁.1.1.1: There is significant difference between the perception levels of the cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of gender of employees.

H₀.1.1.2: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification of organizational identification in terms of gender of employees.

H₁.1.1.2: There is significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification of organizational identification in terms of gender of employees.

H₀.1.2: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₁.1.2: There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₀.1.2.1: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₁.1.2.1: There is significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₀.1.2.2: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₁.1.2.2: There is significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees.

H₀.1.3: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' educational level.

H₁.1.3: There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' educational level.

H₀.1.3.1: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee education level.

H₁.1.3.1: There is significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee education level.

H₀.1.3.2: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee education level.

H₁.1.3.2: There is significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee education level.

H₀.1.4: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' work experience level.

H₁.1.4: There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' work experience level.

H₀.1.4.1: There is no significant difference between employees' perception of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of work experience level.

H₁.1.4.1: There is significant difference between employees' perception of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of work experience level.

H₀.1.4.2: There is no significant difference between employees' perception of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of work experience level.
H₁.1.4.2: There is significant difference between employees' perception of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of work experience level.

H₀.1.5: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of seniority level of employees.

H₁.1.5: There no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of seniority level of employees.

H₀.1.5.1: There is no significant difference between employees' level of perception regarding the cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of seniority level.

H₁.1.5.1: There is significant difference between employees' level of perception regarding the cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of seniority level.
H₀.1.5.2: There is no

significant difference between employees' level of perception regarding the affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of seniority level.

H_{1.1.5.2}: There is significant difference between employees' level of perception regarding the affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of seniority level.

H_{0.1.6}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{1.1.6}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{0.1.6.1}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{1.1.6.1}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{0.1.6.2}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{1.1.6.2}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status.

H_{0.1.7}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' income level.

H_{1.1.7}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' income level.

H_{0.1.7.1}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee income level.

H_{1.1.7.1}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of cognitive identification dimension of organizational identification in terms of employee income level.

H_{0.1.7.2}: There is no significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification of organizational identification in terms of income level of employees.

H_{1.1.7.2}: There is significant difference between the perception levels of affective identification of organizational identification in terms of income level of employees.

3. 5 Research Reliability and Factor Analysis

In this part of the study, factor analysis, reliability analysis and results are given. The results of factor analysis, Kaiser Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and Barlett Sphericity Test results are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Reliability and Factor Analysis

Survey Question Groups	Number of questions	Kaiser Meyer-Olkin	Bartlett Sphericity Test Sig.	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Cognitive Identification	9	0,899	0,000	0,862
Affective Identification	9	0,919	0,000	0,904
All Scale Questions (Perceived Organizational Identification)	18	0,948	0,000	0,927

The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale used to reveal the organizational identification perception of the employees who participated in this research was found to be 0.927. When reliability results are evaluated together, it is seen that survey questions and research data are highly reliable.

Within the scope of the research, after determining the reliability of the organizational identification scale, it was examined whether the questions related to the scale have the suitability for factor analysis. Accordingly, the Barlett Sphericity Test was applied to determine whether there was a sufficient relationship between the variables and the p value was calculated to be 0.000 ($p \leq 0.05$), and this value was found to be significant (Table 1). Therefore, it was concluded that the variables were suitable for factor analysis. Kaiser Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used for inter-variable correlations and KMO value for organizational identification was calculated as 0.948. Accordingly, it was observed that the variables of the organizational identification scale were highly suitable for factor analysis.

Table 2: Number of Factors Related to Eigenvalue Statistics and Percentage of Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	8,517	47,318	47,318	5,198	28,877	28,877
2	1,407	7,819	55,137	4,727	26,261	55,137
3	,993	5,515	60,652			
4	,788	4,378	65,030			
5	,778	4,320	69,350			
6	,688	3,824	73,173			
7	,560	3,109	76,283			
8	,538	2,989	79,272			
9	,510	2,834	82,105			
10	,457	2,537	84,642			
11	,438	2,431	87,073			
12	,393	2,184	89,257			
13	,369	2,048	91,305			
14	,348	1,932	93,237			
15	,339	1,882	95,119			
16	,313	1,737	96,856			
17	,298	1,657	98,513			
18	,268	1,487	100,000			

In addition, within the scope of factor analysis, the study was carried out to determine the percentage of the total variance of the factors of the organizational identification scale used in the research. In Table 3, the factors of the organizational identification scale explain approximately 55.1% of the total variance. In the studies in the field of social sciences, it is accepted that the cumulative variance is between 40% and 60% (Tavsancil, 2002). Therefore, the percentage of variance described in the organizational identification scale was considered sufficient for this study.

Table 3. Rotated Factor Matrix

Organizational Identification Components	Component	
	1	2
1. Prefer to be in an existing organization instead of other organizations to work	,264	,658
2. Be proud to work in the current organization	,377	,700

3. Thinking that worked organization has a distinctive difference compared to other organizations	,296	,667
4. Thinking that the current organization is more than a workplace for employees	,059	,558
5. Thinking that others see this organization as an example of excellence in business	,256	,721
6. Compared with other organizations, he / she thinks that this organization is an example of excellence in business life.	,252	,738
7. Thinking that there are many things that attract him / her to this organization	,323	,667
8. Be proud of the achievements of the organization	,405	,615
9. Use of the word "we" rather than "they" when talking about worked the organization	,490	,491
10. Be proud to tell people about this organization	,586	,456
11. Considering the success of the organization as his /her own success	,691	,241
12. Feeling like the owner of this organization	,715	,243
13. When someone praises the current organization in which he / she is working, he / she perceives it as a personal compliment.	,780	,133
14. If the values of the organization which he / she is working are similar to their own values, the situation of feeling themselves like belonging to this workplace	,791	,195
15. When someone criticizes the current organization, he / she starts to defend the organization as if it had criticized itself.	,710	,290
16. When he / she started working in the current organization, his / her personal values were very similar to the values of this organization.	,659	,370
17. Its commitment to the present organization is based on the similarity of itself and the values of the organization.	,632	,390
18. The reason why he / she preferred this organization compared to other organizations is the belief that the value judgments of this organization are established.	,596	,405

When the above Rotated Factor Matrix table values are analyzed, it is seen which expressions are collected under factor 1 and 2. In order to name the factors, variables with large weights were grouped under one factor. Accordingly, the variables that take the highest value under factor 1 are related to the affective aspect of organizational identification. The variables that take the highest value under factor 2 are related to the cognitive aspect of organizational identification. Therefore, the first factor can be named as "affective identification" in terms of organizational identification and the second factor as "cognitive identification". In this context, it was seen that the first 9 expressions in the organizational identification scale were related to cognitive identification and the last 9 expressions were related to affective identification. Therefore, firstly cognitive identification and then affective identification were included in the hypothesis of the study and testing of the hypotheses.

3. 6. Data Analysis and Research Findings

In this part of the study, first of all; the descriptive statistics of the employees who participated in the survey were included. Then, the results of the Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests for testing the hypotheses determined within the scope of the research are discussed.

3. 6. 1 Descriptive Statistics

The gender, marital status, education level, work experience level, seniority, duty and income level of the employees participating in the research are given in the tables below.

Tablo 4. Descriptive Statistics of Socio-Demographic Variables

Independent Variable		N	%	Independent Variable		N	%
Education level	Primary education	398	36,0	Gender	Female	272	24,6
	High school	421	38,1		Male	833	75,4

	Associate Degree	159	14,4	Marital status	Total	1105	100,0
	License	107	9,7		Married	644	58,3
	Master's Degree and Doctorate	20	1,8		Single	461	41,7
	Total	1105	100,0		Total	1105	100,0
Seniority Status	Less than 1 year	210	19,0	Work Experience Status	Less than 1 year	126	11,4
	1-3 years	359	32,5		1-5 years	365	33,1
	4-6 years	273	24,7		6-10 years	311	28,1
	7-9 years	100	9,0		11-15 years	158	14,3
	10 years or more	163	14,8		16-20 years	62	5,6
	Total	1105	100,0		21 years and over	83	7,5
	Total	1105	100,0		Total	1105	100,0
Income Level	Less than 2,000 TL	789	71,4	Job Status	Worker	735	66,6
	Between 2.000 TL and 2.999 TL	250	22,6		Shift supervisor	57	5,2
	3000 TL and up	66	6,0		Chef	79	7,1
	Total	1105	100,0		Craftsman	138	12,5
	Total	1105	100,0		Unit Manager / Director Asst.	58	5,2
	Total	1105	100,0		Senior Executive	38	3,4
	Total	1105	100,0		Total	1105	100,0
	Total	1105	100,0		Total	1105	100,0

When the gender distribution of the employees is examined, it is seen that approximately 25% of the participants are women and 75% are men. The fact that the majority of the employees in the research are male, draws attention to the density of male employees in enterprises operating in organized industrial zones. Accordingly, it can be said that most of the employees in the organized industrial zones in the TRC1 Zone are men. In addition, when the distribution of employees according to marital status is examined; 58.3% of the employees are married and 41.7% are single.

The level of education of the employees in the research is divided into groups. When the distribution of the participants according to education groups is examined, 38.1% have high school, 36% have primary education, 14.4% have associate degree and 11.5% have undergraduate and higher education level. Accordingly, it can be said that the majority of the employees participating in the study are primary and high school graduates, and they work in a job where the necessary competencies or job requirements are not very high. Moreover, the fact that the undergraduate and graduate education level among the participants is quite low compared to the other participants shows that the higher education level of the employee is not sought in the job requirements.

The level of work experience of the employees in the research was divided into groups. It is seen that 33% of the participants have 1-5 years of experience, 28.1% of them have 6-10 years of experience and 27.4% of them have 11 years and more work experience. On the other hand, the fact that the number of employees with a work experience of more than 15 years is very low among the total participants (13.1%) in terms of their work experience periods, shows that the employees in TRC1 Organized Industrial Zones have not continued their work for many years. It is seen that the largest

majority (61.1%) consists of employees with 1-10 years of work experience. In addition, when the distribution of employees according to marital status is examined; 58.3% of the employees are married and 41.7% are single.

When the seniority levels of the participants were examined, 32.5% had seniority between 1-3 years, 24.7% had seniority between 4-6 years, 19% had seniority less than 1 year and 14.8% had seniority of 10 years or more. It is seen that the majority of the participants (76.2%) are 6 years and below the seniority status in the enterprise. When the job experience levels of the participants and seniority status in the enterprise are evaluated together, it can be said that the labor turnover rate in enterprises in this zone is high.

The level of work experience of the employees in the research was divided into groups. It is seen that 33% of the participants have 1-5 years of experience, 28.1% of them have 6-10 years of experience and 27.4% of them have 11 years and more work experience. In terms of work experience duration, it is seen that the employees with 15 years and more work experience are at a very low rate among the total participants and that the employees in TRC1 Organized Industrial Zones do not continue their work for many years. It is seen that the largest majority (61.1%) consists of employees with 1-10 years of work experience.

When the seniority status of the participants were examined; It was determined that 32.5% had seniority between 1-3 years, 24.7% between 4-6 years, 19% had less than 1 year and 14.8% had seniority of 10 years or more. It is seen that the majority of the participants (76.2%) are 6 years and below the seniority status in the enterprises. When the job experience levels of the participants and seniority status in the enterprise are evaluated together, it can be said that the labor turnover rate in enterprises in this zone is high.

In terms of the job status of the employees participating in the research; 66.6% were workers, 24.8% were subordinate managers (craftsman, chief and shift supervisor), 5.2% were middle managers (unit managers and assistants) and 3.4% were senior level managers. In testing the hypotheses of the study; The employees who participated in the study were examined as workers, subordinate managers (shift supervisor, chief and master), middle managers (unit managers and assistant managers) and top managers.

When the incomes of the participants are examined; it is seen that 71.4 % of the employees who participated in the survey had less than 2.000.-TL, 22.6 % of the employees had between 2.000.-TL-2.999.-TL and 6 % of the employees had the income of 3.000.-TL and above. According to these results, it was observed that the majority of the participants had income below 2,000.- TL. When the job status and income levels of the participants were evaluated together, it was seen that 96 participants worked at the top and middle management levels (senior managers, unit managers and assistant managers) and 66 participants received 3,000.-TL or more income. Accordingly, it can be concluded that the difference in income level of the participants stems from their job status.

3. 6. 2. Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H Tests Used in the Analysis of Hypotheses

Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis H test results, which are used to test the perceived organizational identification level differences in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of the employees participating in the research, are given separately for the main and sub-hypotheses below.

a) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of gender of employees

Table 5: Mann Whitney U Test Results of Employee Gender Differences in Perceived Organizational Identification Level

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Cognitive Identification	Male	833	572,12	97361,000	-3,491	,000
	Female	272	494,44			
	Total	1105				

Affective Identification	Male	833	576,28	93896,000	-4,255	,000
	Female	272	481,71			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	Male	833	575,68	9,440E4	-4,136	,000
	Female	272	483,55			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 5, statistically significant differences were found between the levels of perceived general organizational identification in terms of gender of the employees involved in the study ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between cognitive identification and affective identification levels which were the dimensions of organizational identification in terms of gender ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). In this context, sub-hypotheses $H_{0.1.1.1}$ and $H_{0.1.1.2}$ of the study were rejected and, on the contrary; the sub-hypotheses $H_{1.1.1.1}$ and $H_{1.1.1.2}$ were accepted. When the Mean Rank values are analyzed, it can be said that male employees' perception levels of both general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions are higher than female employees' perception levels.

b) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test Analysis Results of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Marital Status of Employees

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	Mann-Whitney U	z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Cognitive Identification	Married	644	569,52	137801,000	-2,038	,042
	Single	461	529,92			
	Total	1105				
Affective Identification	Married	644	573,95	134949,500	-2,587	,010
	Single	461	523,73			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	Married	644	573,86	1,350E5	-2,569	,010
	Single	461	523,86			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 6, statistically significant differences were found between the general organizational identification levels of the employees in terms of marital status ($p = 0,010 < 0,05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between the cognitive identification and affective identification levels, which were the dimensions of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees ($p < 0.05$). In this context, sub-hypotheses $H_{0.1.2.1}$ and $H_{0.1.2.2}$ of the study were rejected and, on the contrary; sub-hypotheses $H_{1.1.2.1}$ and $H_{1.1.2.2}$ were accepted. Therefore, $H_{0.1.2}$: "There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees" the hypothesis is rejected and, on the contrary; $H_{1.1.2}$: "There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of marital status of employees" hypothesis is accepted. According to the results, when the mean rank values are analyzed, it can be said that the perception levels of married employees about general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions are higher than those of single employees.

c) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of education level of employees

Table 7. The Results of the Analysis of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Education Level of Employees with Kruskal Wallis H Test

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Education Level	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Cognitive Identification	Primary education	398	547,98	2,624	3	,453
	High school	421	563,81			
	Associate	159	566,75			
	License and above	127	515,67			
	Total	1105				
Affective Identification	Primary education	398	556,76	,405	3	,939
	High school	421	551,91			
	Associate	159	558,70			
	License and above	127	537,70			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	Primary education	398	554,20	1,342	3	,719
	High school	421	556,73			
	Associate	159	563,81			
	License and above	127	523,37			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 7, no statistically significant differences were found between the perceived general organizational identification levels and the perception levels related to the dimensions of organizational identification ($p > 0.05$). In this context, sub-hypotheses $H_{1.1.3.1}$ and $H_{1.1.3.2}$ were rejected and, on the contrary; Sub-hypotheses $H_{0.1.3.1}$ and $H_{0.1.3.2}$ were accepted. Therefore, $H_{1.1.3}$: "There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' educational level" the hypothesis was rejected and, on the contrary; $H_{0.1.3}$: "There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' educational level" hypothesis was accepted. According to these results, it can be said that the differences in the employees' educational level do not create differences in perceived organizational identification levels.

d) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of work experience level of employees.

Table 8: The Results of the Analysis of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Work Experience Level of Employees with Kruskal Wallis H Test

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Work Experience	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Cognitive Identification	0-5 years	491	519,56	20,192	3	,000
	6-10 years	311	548,11			
	11-15 years	158	576,08			
	16 years and over	145	651,57			
	Total	1105				

Affective Identification	0-5 years	491	528,01	12,060	3	,007
	6-10 years	311	544,00			
	11-15 years	158	582,17			
	16 years and over	145	625,16			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	0-5 years	491	521,99	17,867	3	,000
	6-10 years	311	545,73			
	11-15 years	158	579,59			
	16 years and over	145	644,62			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 8, statistically significant differences were found between perceived general organizational identification levels in terms of work experience levels of the participants ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between cognitive identification and affective identification levels which were the dimensions of organizational identification ($p < 0,05$). In this context, sub-hypotheses $H_{0.1.4.1}$ and $H_{0.1.4.2}$ were rejected and, on the contrary; sub-hypotheses $H_{1.1.4.1}$ and $H_{1.1.4.2}$ were accepted. Therefore, $H_{0.1.4}$: "There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' work experience level" the hypothesis was rejected and, on the contrary; $H_{1.1.4}$: "There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' work experience level" the hypothesis was accepted. According to the findings, when the Mean Rank values are analyzed, it can be said that the level of perception of both general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions increases as employees' work experience levels increase.

e) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of seniority level of employees.

Table 9: The Results of the Analysis of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Seniority Level of Employees with Kruskal Wallis H Test

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Seniority Level	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Cognitive Identification	0-3 years	569	529,29	10,548	3	,014
	4-6 years	273	559,36			
	7-9 years	100	561,23			
	10 years or more	163	620,05			
	Total	1105				
Affective Identification	0-3 years	569	534,70	6,953	3	,073
	4-6 years	273	577,68			
	7-9 years	100	524,14			
	10 years or more	163	593,25			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	0-3 years	569	531,13	8,950	3	,030
	4-6 years	273	570,09			
	7-9 years	100	537,48			
	10 years or more	163	610,25			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 9, statistically significant differences were found between the levels of perceived general organizational identification in terms of seniority levels of the participants ($p = 0.030 < 0.05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between cognitive identification, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions in terms of seniority levels of employees ($p < 0.05$). However, there was no statistically significant difference between employees' perception levels of "affective identification" in terms of seniority levels ($p = 0.073 > 0.05$). In this context, sub-hypothesis $H_{0.1.5.1}$ of the study was rejected and, on the contrary; sub-hypothesis $H_{1.1.5.1}$ was accepted. On the other hand, sub-hypothesis $H_{1.1.5.2}$ of the study was rejected. $H_{0.1.5.2}$ sub-hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, $H_{0.1.5}$: "There is no significant difference between the

perception levels of organizational identification in terms of seniority level of employees” the hypothesis was rejected and, on the contrary; H_{1.1.5}: “There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of seniority level of employees” the hypothesis was widely accepted. According to the findings, when the Mean Rank values are analyzed, it can be said that as the employee's seniority levels increase, perception levels related to the “cognitive identification” dimension increase. In addition, the perception of general organizational identification is highest among employees with seniority of 10 years and over, and lowest with employees with seniority of 0-3 years.

f) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of employee’s job status

Table 10: The Results of the Analysis of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Employee’s Job Status with Kruskal Wallis H Test

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Job Status	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Cognitive Identification	Worker	735	527,90	22,214	3	,000
	Sub-Manager	274	574,33			
	Middle Manager	58	693,15			
	Top manager	38	670,80			
	Total	1105				
Affective Identification	Worker	735	525,10	32,460	3	,000
	Sub-Manager	274	569,88			
	Middle Manager	58	710,47			
	Top manager	38	730,63			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	Worker	735	525,17	30,011	3	,000
	Sub-Manager	274	572,50			
	Middle Manager	58	712,66			
	Top manager	38	706,97			
	Total	1105				

As can be seen in Table 10, statistically significant differences were found between perceived general organizational identification levels of employees in the study ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between cognitive identification and affective identification levels which were the dimensions of organizational identification ($p < 0,05$). In this context, sub-hypotheses H_{0.1.6.1} and H_{0.1.6.2} of the study were rejected and, on the contrary; sub-hypotheses H_{1.1.6.1} and H_{1.1.6.2} were accepted. Therefore, H_{0.1.6}: “There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status” the hypothesis was rejected and, on the contrary; H_{1.1.6}: “There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employee's job status” the hypothesis was accepted. According to the findings, when the Mean Rank values are analyzed, it is seen that the highest level of general organizational identification and cognitive identification is seen in middle level employees and the lowest level of perception is in employees. On the other hand, the highest level of affective identification is seen in the employees who are the top managers and the lowest level of perception is in the workers.

g) Analysis of perception levels related to general organizational identification and dimensions of organizational identification in terms of employee’s income level.

As can be seen in Table 11, statistically significant differences were found between perceived general organizational identification levels in terms of income levels of the employees ($p = 0.009 < 0.05$). In addition, statistically significant differences were found between “affective identification” perception levels, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions in terms of employee income levels ($p < 0.05$).

Table 11: The Results of the Analysis of Perceived Organizational Identification Level Differences in terms of Employee's Income Level with Kruskal Wallis H Test

Dimensions of Organizational Identification	Income Level	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Cognitive Identification	Less than 2000.-TL	266	538,00	5,303	3	,071
	Between 2,000-2,999 TL	523	539,57			
	3000 TL and over	316	587,86			
	Total	1105				
Affective Identification	Less than 2000.-TL	266	504,04	12,425	3	,002
	Between 2,000-2,999 TL	523	551,16			
	3000 TL and over	316	597,25			
	Total	1105				
General Organizational Identification	Less than 2000.-TL	266	517,55	9,416	3	,009
	Between 2,000-2,999 TL	523	544,93			
	3000 TL and over	316	596,19			
	Total	1105				

However, there was no statistically significant difference between employees' perception of cognitive identification, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions ($p > 0.05$). In this context, sub-hypothesis $H_{1.1.7.1}$ of the study was rejected and, on the contrary; the $H_{0.1.7.1}$ sub-hypothesis was accepted. On the other hand, sub-hypothesis $H_{0.1.7.2}$ of the study was rejected and, on the contrary; sub-hypothesis $H_{1.1.7.2}$ was accepted. Therefore, $H_{0.1.7}$: "There is no significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' income level" the hypothesis was rejected and, on the contrary; $H_{1.1.7}$: "There is significant difference between the perception levels of organizational identification in terms of employees' income level" the hypothesis was widely accepted. According to the findings, when the Mean Rank values are analyzed, it can be said that the general organizational identification and affective identification perception levels increase as employee income levels increase. On the other hand, according to the descriptive data, it was observed that as the level of income increased, the average mean values of employees towards cognitive identification increased and this difference was not statistically significant.

As can be seen in the results of the above analysis, as a result of testing the main and sub-hypotheses of the study, the main hypothesis of the study that H_0 : "There is no significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees" hypothesis was rejected. In contrast, the hypothesis, H_1 : "There is significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees", is widely accepted.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, Does the level of organizational identification indicate differences according to socio-demographic variables? was searched for. In this context, a questionnaire consisting of organizational identification scale and socio-demographic characteristics was applied to the sample which was selected randomly from the employees in the enterprises in TRC1 Organized Industrial Zone. SPSS.22 package program was used in the analysis of the data set of the study. The main and sub-hypotheses which were created to answer the question that was the subject of the study were tested respectively. As a result of the analysis of hypotheses;

In terms of gender, marital status, job status and job experience levels of the participants, statistically significant differences were found between perceived general organizational identification levels and the levels of cognitive identification and affective identification ($p < 0, 05$). According to the findings, it was found that male employees' perception levels of both general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions were higher than female employees' perception levels. It was found that married employees had higher levels of perception of both general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions than those of single employees. In addition,

it was concluded that the level of perception of both general organizational identification and organizational identification dimensions increased when work experience levels of employees increased. However, the highest level of general organizational identification and cognitive identification in terms of job status was found in middle-level employees and the lowest perception value was in workers; On the other hand, it was concluded that the highest value of affective identification was found in the employees who were the top managers and the lowest perception value was in the workers who were employed.

In terms of seniority levels of employees, statistically significant differences were found between perceived general organizational identification levels and cognitive identification levels, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions ($p < 0.05$). However, in terms of seniority levels of employees, there was no statistically significant difference between affective identification perception levels, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions ($p = 0.073 > 0.05$). According to the findings, it was observed that as the seniority levels of employees increased perception levels related to cognitive identification dimension.

In addition, statistically significant differences were found in terms of employees' income levels, between perceived general organizational identification levels and affective identification perception levels which are one of the organizational identification dimensions ($p < 0.05$). However, in terms of employee income levels, there was no statistically significant difference between cognitive identification perception levels, which is one of the organizational identification dimensions ($p > 0.05$). According to the findings, it was seen that as the income levels of employees increased, general organizational identification and affective identification perception levels increased.

However, no statistically significant differences were found between the perceived general organizational identification levels and the levels of organizational identification in terms of the educational levels of the employees ($p > 0.05$). This result is similar to the study conducted by Kaplan (2018) that the educational level of the employee does not affect organizational identification.

As a result of testing the main and sub-hypotheses of the study, the main hypothesis of the study which H_0 : There is no significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees was rejected. On the contrary, it is concluded that the hypothesis which H_1 : There is significant difference between the organizational identification levels in terms of socio-demographic characteristics of employees was widely accepted. In this context, the answer to the question of whether the organizational identification levels differ in terms of socio-demographic variables, which is the starting point of the study, and thus the aim of the study was reached.

As in all field studies, this study has some limitations. The main limitations of this research are limited to the enterprises and employees operating in TRC1 Organized Industrial Zone. Therefore, evaluations are limited to the scale of TRC1 Organized Industrial Zone. The validity of the findings in other regions should be determined by other studies. For this reason, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted in different regions and different sectors.

REFERENCES

- Balci A., Baltaci A., T., Cereci, C. and Acar, U. (2012). "The Relationship of Organizational Socialization with Organizational Identification and Organizational Citizenship: A Research on Primary School Administrators", *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 2 (2), pp. 47-74.
- Bartels, J. (2006). *Organizational Identification and Communication: Employees Evaluations of Internal Communication and Its Effect on Identification at Different Organizational Levels*. Doctora Thesis, University of Twente.
- Cheney, G., Tompkins, P. K. (1982). "Coming to Terms with Organizational Identification and Commitment", *Central States Speech Journal*, 38(1).

- Cakinberk, A., Derin, N. and Demirel, E. T., (2011). Formation of Public Identification with Public Commitment: The Case of Malatya and Tunceli Private Educational Institutions”, *Journal of Business Research*, 3, (1), pp. 89-121.
- Cirakoglu, H., (2010). “Organizational Identification and Job Satisfaction Relations”, *Institute of Social Sciences (Unpublished Master Thesis)*, Dokuz Eylul University, Izmir (Turkey).
- Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J. M. and Harquail, C.V., “Organizational Images and Member Identification”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1994, 39(2), pp. 239-263.
- Gunbek, K., (2007). *Organizational Identification and An Application on Public Personnel*, (Unpublished Master Thesis), Inonu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Malatya (Turkey).
- Hortacsu, N. (2007). *I, We, You All: Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Imge Bookstore, Ankara.
- Isik, M. (2016). *The Mediator Role of Organizational Identification in the Effect of Corporate Reputation Perception on Job Satisfaction and a Research*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis) Dicle University Institute of Social Sciences, Diyarbakir (Turkey).
- Kaplan, A. (2018). *The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Reputation Perceptions on Organizational Identification*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis), Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences, Konya (Turkey).
- Karabey, C. N. and Iscan, O. F. (2007). “Relationship between Organizational Identification, Organizational Image and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: An Application”, *Atatürk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 21(2), pp. 231-241.
- Kara, E. (2019). “Individual Belonging and Innovative Performance in Organizations”, *Research & Reviews in Social, Human And Administrative Sciences*, Chapter 18, pp: 249, Editors: Orhan Çoban, Ali Erbaşı, Enderhan Karakoç, Fehmi Karasioğlu, Gece Kitaplığı, Ankara.
- Karayigit, K. (2008). *A Research on the Relationships between Organizational Identification and Organizational Commitment*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Dokuz Eylul University, Institute of Social Sciences, Izmir (Turkey).
- Mael, F. and Ashforth, Blake, E. (1992). “Alumni and Their Alma Mater: A Partial Test of The Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification”, *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13(2), pp.103-123.
- Olkkonen, M.E. and Lipponen, J. (2006). Relationships Between Organizational Justice, Identification With Organization and Work Unit, And Group Related Outcomes. *Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes*. 100, pages 202 – 215.
- Polat, M. and Meydan, C.H. (2010). A Research on the Relationship between Organizational Identification and Cynicism and Intention to Leave. *The Journal of Turkish Military Academy Institute of Defense Sciences*, pages 145-172.
- Pratt, M.G. “To Be Or Not To Be? Central Questions in Organizational Identification” *Identity in Organizations: Developing Theory Through Conversations*, (Ed. D. Whetten & P.Godfrey), Thousand Oaks, USA.
- Schuman, H. and Scott, J., “Generations and Collective Memories”, *American Sociological Review*, 1989, 54(3), ss.359-381.
- Tavsancil, E., (2002), *Measurement of Attitudes and Data Analysis with SPSS*, Nobel Publications, Ankara.
- Topcu, M. K., (2015). *The Role of Psychological Contract Perception on the Effect of Employee Personality Characteristics on Organizational Identification and Intention to Leave*, (Unpublished PhD Thesis) Turkish Military Academy Institute of Defense Sciences, Ankara (Turkey).
- Turner, B. S., “Ageing and Generational Conflicts: A Reply to Sarah Irwin”, *British Journal Of Sociology*. 1982, 49(2), pages 299-304.

Tumer, E. (2010) *Organizational Justice and Organizational Identification in Enterprises: An Application at Esenboğa Airport*, (Unpublished Master's Thesis) Gazi University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara (Turkey).

Tuzun, I. K., Çağlar, I., "The Relationship between the Concept of Public Identification and Communication Efficiency", *Journal of Yasar University*, 2008, 3(9), ss.1011-1027 <http://journal.yasar.edu.tr/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/no9_vol3_03_tuzun_caglar.pdf>(21.04.2017).

Van Knippenberg, D., Van Dick, R. and Tavares, S. (2007). Social Identity And Social Exchange: Identification, Support And Withdrawal From The Job. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(3): 457- 477.

Linked Resources:

<<http://www.adiyaman.gov.tr/ekonomik-durumu>> (28.10.2017).

<<http://www.kilisosb.org.tr/bilgi.asp?aid=2>> (13.07.2015).

<<https://www.gaosb.org.tr>> (01.01.2015).