The importance of women in management is increasing day by day. For this reason, it is necessary to evaluate the perspective to women managers. This study focused on female working in the civil aviation sector. Organizational climate is an important criterion affecting the employees of the enterprise. Organizational climate describes what the mood in organizations is. We think that when the organizational climate is positive, the commitment of the employees increases, and when it is negative, the commitment decreases. The aim of the study is to investigate the perspectives of people working in the civil aviation sector towards women managers and how these perspectives affect the climate in their organization. As a result of the statistical analysis: It is concluded that the civil aviation sector employees have an effect on the perception of women managers and the perception dimensions of women managers have a significant effect on the organizational climate.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

Although women have started to exist with an increasing trend in many areas, they still have not reached the desired levels in management levels. Men are more involved in managerial positions worldwide than women. there are various reasons for this situation, certainly.
These are stereotypes towards women, career barriers, women's insufficient support for education, even the attitudes of people who believe that women should only be mothers and do housework, thinking that women make decisions with their emotions, thinking that women cannot work under stress, gender equality etc.

According to Hefferman (2002), the future of the business world depends on women. Especially for contemporary organizations, stereotypically feminine qualities such as solidarity, guidance and cooperation are also important for leadership. According to Russel, Rush and Herd (1988), expect an effective female leader to exhibit a higher evaluation behavior than an effective male leader (Girdauskiene and Eyvazzade 2015, 12).

The point of view of female managers is important in the civil aviation sector as well as in every sector. Although the aim of aviation enterprises are to increase the number of female managers, it is still seen that they have not reached the desired level. For this reason, the evaluation of the perception towards female managers in the civil aviation sector has helped us to find the reasons why the female managers are not enough in this sector by reflecting the point of view of the employees in the civil aviation sector towards female managers. For all reasons, in this study, it has been investigated what the perspectives of people working in the civil aviation sector are towards female managers and how these perspectives are reflected in the climate in the organization they are in.

As in almost every sector, it is not easy for women to be senior managers in the civil aviation sector. The idea that women will be less successful than men in management still exists. Although there are many developments related to civil aviation, women are not sufficiently involved in the management levels.

In a study conducted with the data of 2019 on the female workforce in the aviation sector, the percentage distribution of women to the occupational groups in Table 1 is shown. An important point to note is the low number of maintenance technicians and airline managers. In addition, the rate of airport administrators is also quite insufficient. Numerical data show that women are not at the desired level as both senior managers and managers. Moreover, it is understood that women mostly work as travel agents and cabin attendants in aviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Female Employees</th>
<th>Professions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than %5</td>
<td>Maintenance Technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airline Managers (CEO, COO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%5-%10</td>
<td>Pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%11-%20</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering Dispatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airport Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Traffic Controllers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly Trained Aviation Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyber Security Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than %70</td>
<td>Travel Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabin Attendants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to TUIK's 2021 data, the rate of female managers in Turkey was 14.4% in 2012, while it was 19.3% in 2020. While there is a slight increase, the rate of female managers is still not at the desired level. (TÜİK, 2021)
When we examine the civil aviation sector, the first female CEO in Turkey works at Pegasus Airlines. However, when we look at IATA, which has around 400 members, there are only 24 female CEOs among the members (Dunya, 2022). This shows that male managers correspond to 94% and female managers to 6%. It means that there is a numerical gap between male and female managers in the aviation sector. Finally, although women are insufficient in many areas of the civil aviation sector, the areas where there is a female workforce gap are positions such as airport management and aviation leadership (Civelek and Yavuzyilmaz, 2019).

2. THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Although organizational climate has been defined as a concept closely related to the concept of organizational culture, especially in the 1960s, it is seen that the first research actually goes back to the 1930s. With the human relations movements that started with Hawthorne, researchers have evolved their perceptions from a "difficult" physical environment to a "soft" psychological environment. In this way, it can be said that the concept of organizational climate emerged. Although the first study in the field of organizational climate is based on group work, the founder of this group in 1939 was Kurt Lewin (Zhang and Liu, 2010, 189).

Considering the researchers, it is clear that there is no specific definition of “organizational climate”. The reason for this is that the concept of organizational climate is quite complex and has many variables.

The research, in which the concept of organizational climate first entered the literature, is Lewin's discovery of three different leadership styles, which we can consider as liberation, democracy and autocracy. However, it was not fully defined in the aforementioned study. In the 60s, Forehand mentioned three characteristics of organizational climate without making any definitions. First, the organizational climate can change as organizations change, secondly, the permanent organizational climate, and thirdly, organizational climate can affect the behavior of people in the organization (Gök, 2009, 590).

After all these issues, it is useful to define the organizational climate; Organizational climate includes the opinions of the employees about the environment in which they work, the current environment of the employees, the information they have obtained and learned from the organization, and the views they have obtained about the organization in more than one aspect. People may think of climate as business-oriented, innovation-oriented, or supportive. Of course, the ideas of the employees about the organizational climate may differ according to the variables in the organization (Çekmecelioğlu, 2006, 299).

2.1. Organizational Climate Dimensions

Although the sub-dimensions of organizational climate vary in different studies, the sub-dimensions in the scale we use are; organizational structure, responsibility, reward, risk, sincerity, organizational support, standards, conflict and belonging. For this reason, it is useful to define the dimensions mentioned.

2.1.1. Organizational Structure

Organizational structure deals with the situation in the environment in which individuals work. If there is any issue that will create a positive or negative perception within the organization, the dimension draws attention to this. In addition, the way the organization works is also evaluated.
2.1.2. Responsibility
Responsibility dimension has the characteristic of being individual. An organizational climate that values individual responsibility can increase the motivation to do work. The resulting situation may arise from the demands of individuals to control the means of influence. If employees do not control the means of influence, they can be controlled by the means of influence. Another motivation that the organizational climate attaches importance to is the achievement motive. If the organizational climate considers status differences other than strengthening independence and feedback, power motive may be affected by the dimension of responsibility (Öge, 2001, 135).

2.1.3. Prize
In the reward dimension, the situations such as rewarding, punishing and motivation of employees were emphasized. Certainly, while being rewarded and motivated increases the commitment of the employees, it will also positively affect the organizational climate. In an organizational climate where punishment is high for employees, it will not be possible for employees to be motivated successfully. The most important issue in this dimension is that the employee is rewarded rather than punished, that is, positively supported.

2.1.4. Risk
If it is necessary to take risks when necessary, risk should be taken, and when necessary, it should not be taken. In addition, employees who are generally successful do not want to take too much risk and can take firm steps and spread the work over time.

2.1.5. Sincerity
Sincerity is a dimension that increases commitment rather than power of success in employees. What is important in this dimension is whether the group or individual relations between employees are strong or not. It comes to the fore that they know each other well, care about each other and make their work easier.

2.1.6. Organizational Support
In organizational support, it is concerned with whether the employee receives or does not receive support from his managers or colleagues in the organization. Supporting the employee positively in terms of work and career also positively affects the organizational climate.

2.1.7. Standards
The performances of the employees are evaluated with the standards. Employees who show high performance according to the standards in the organization also feel both successful and high commitment if they are compatible with other employees, in this case, it will affect the organizational climate positively, and the opposite will affect the organizational climate negatively.

2.1.8. Conflict
In the conflict dimension, if individuals approach the conflict situation moderately, success will not increase; but it will increase the power of doing business. 
2.1.9. Belonging
According to the dimension of belonging, if the employees establish good and social relations with their other colleagues, they are both happy to be a member of that group and their sense of belonging to the organization will increase. In this case, the organizational climate will also be positively affected, and in the opposite case, both the commitment to the organization will decrease and the organizational climate will be negatively affected.

3. METHOD
3.1. Data Analysis
SPSS package program was used for the analysis of the data obtained in the study. The significance level in the analyzes was accepted as p=0.05 and p=0.01, and the reliability and validity of the scales used in the research were examined first. The reliability levels of the scales used in the research were calculated by the internal consistency method and the Cronbach Alpha reliability criterion was used. Afterward, total item’s correlation was determined and the change in Cronbach Alpha values in case of deletion of any scale item was examined. In order to test the validity of the scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyzes were performed. In the research, regression and correlation were used to examine the results of the research hypotheses. Normal distribution analyzes and central tendency measurements were used to examine the distribution of the data obtained within the scope of the research, and the levels of participation in each measurement were examined with the mean and standard deviation values.

4. RESULTS & DISCUSSION
4.1. Frequencies
In this part of the research, the findings and comments regarding the analysis of the data obtained as a result of the research are presented. Distribution of Participants by Demographic Characteristics are shown in Table 2.
When the distribution of the participants according to their demographic characteristics are analyzed, 35.83% of the participants are female, 64.17% are male, 51.67% are married, 48.33% are single, 48.33% are high school and it was determined that they graduated from equivalent schools, 36.67% of them graduated from undergraduate and 15% of them graduated from postgraduate. It was determined that 4.17% of the participants were 18-24 years old, 46.67% were 25-34 years old, 40% were 35-44 years old and 9.17% were over 45 years old.
Table 2: Distribution of Participants by Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>64.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Status</td>
<td>High School and Equivalent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 +</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Findings Regarding the Validity and Reliability of the Female as Managers Scale

The item analysis results, reliability levels and explanatory factor analysis results regarding the validity and reliability of the scale for women as administrators are given in Table 3. It is expected that the relationship between the items in the scale and the other items should not take a value below the value of 0.30 (Büyüköztürk, 2009).

In line with the data in Table 3, it was decided that there was no need to remove an item from the scale, since the correlation value of the items in the scale with the other items was less than 0.30. It was determined that the reliability level of the scale was high. (C.Alpha = 0.963).

Prerequisites for factor analysis were examined. The first of these conditions was Barlett Sphericity tests to examine the existence of the relationship between Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin test (KMO) and variables in order to decide whether the number in the data is sufficient for factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2014). In Table 3, the KMO value was found to be more than 0.60 and the Barlett sphericity test was significant (p<0.01). According to these results, it is proved that the sample data is suitable for factor analysis and that the data obtained comes from a multivariate normal distribution [10]. In order to decide whether to stop an item from the scale, the criterion of having a factor load value of more than 0.45 was used [9]. At the same time, the overlapping of the items was examined and loading on a factor was taken into account.

Since the factor load values of items 10 and 19 were below 0.45, they were excluded from the scale. As a result of factor analysis, the 17-item scale has a 3-factor structure and the total variance explained is 89.999%. Because the scale was more than a single factor, “varimax” vertical rotation was performed.

According to Table 4, when the items collected under factor 1, factor 2 and factor 3 are examined, the factors are named as “Employment Effect”, “Progress Expectation” and “Leadership Role”; respectively. When the reliability levels of the factors were examined, it was determined that the reliability level of each factor was above 0.70, therefore the reliability was high.
Table 3: Reliability, Explanatory Factor Analysis and Item Analysis Results of the Female as Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item-Scale Relationship</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>7.747</td>
<td>43.039</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Confidence: 0.918; Total Explained Variance: 89.999; KMO: 0.963; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = $X^2(153) = 3385.340; p=0.000$

Tablo 4: Item Numbers of Scale Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate Dimension</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>1_8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>9_15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prize</td>
<td>16_21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>22_26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>27_31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>32_36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>37_42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>43_46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>47_50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Findings Regarding the Validity and Reliability of the Organizational Climate Scale

Item numbers of scale factors are shown in Table 4. The item analysis results, reliability levels and explanatory factor analysis results regarding the validity and reliability of the organizational climate scale are given in Table 5. According to Table 5, it was decided that there was no need to remove an item from the scale, since the correlation value of the items in the scale with the other items was less than 0.30. It was determined that the reliability level of the scale was high. (C.Alpha = 0.971).
In Table 5, the KMO value was found to be more than 0.60 and the Barlett sphericity test was significant.

In order to decide whether to stop an item from the scale, the criterion of having a factor load value of more than 0.45 was used [9]. At the same time, the overlapping of the items was examined and loading on a factor was taken into account. Since there was no item in the scale with a factor load below 0.45, the item was removed from the scale. It has a 9-factor structure and the total variance explained is 83.229%. Because the scale was more than a single factor, “varimax” vertical rotation was performed. In addition, when the reliability levels of the factors were examined, it was determined that the reliability level of each factor was above 0.70, therefore the reliability of the factors was high. The naming of the factors according to Table 4 is given in the table below. (p<0.01). According to these results, it is proved that the sample data is suitable for factor analysis and that the data obtained comes from a multivariate normal distribution [(Kan and Akbaş, 2005)].
Table 5: Reliability, Explanatory Factor Analysis and Item Analysis Results of the Organizational Climate Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Item-Scale Relationship</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>6.241</td>
<td>12.482</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Findings Related to the Hypotheses of the Research

In this part of the study, the findings of the research hypotheses are included. Before examining the hypotheses of the research, the distribution of the data was examined in order to decide on the analysis techniques to be used, and the result of the normal distribution analysis is given in Table 6.

As a result of the normal distribution analysis, it was determined that the data obtained came from the normal distribution due to the closeness of the mean-median among the central tendency measurements examined, and the kurtosis and skewness between ±2 (George and Mallery 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Kewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Roles</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>-0,185</td>
<td>-1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Impact</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>-0,194</td>
<td>-1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Prospect</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>3,786</td>
<td>-0,013</td>
<td>-1,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Management Levels</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>-0,150</td>
<td>-1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-0,788</td>
<td>-0,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>-0,206</td>
<td>-1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prize</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>-0,400</td>
<td>-1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>-0,203</td>
<td>-1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>-0,375</td>
<td>-1,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>0,018</td>
<td>-1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>-0,302</td>
<td>-1,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>-0,509</td>
<td>-1,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>-0,324</td>
<td>-1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>-0,323</td>
<td>-0,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationships between the variables. According to the results of the correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a positive significant relationship of 0.777 ($r=0.777; p<0.01$) between the perceptions of the participants towards the female manager and the organizational climate. When the relationship between the sub-dimensions was examined, it was determined that the highest correlation was between the correlation coefficient of 0.807 and the employment effect and organizational structure dimensions ($r=0.807; p<0.01$).

### Table 7: Analysis of Findings of the Relationships of the Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
<th>(14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.735**</td>
<td>.838**</td>
<td>.804**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Effect (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>.942**</td>
<td>.807**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.370**</td>
<td>.514**</td>
<td>.691**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.911**</td>
<td>.761**</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.419**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>.415**</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Female Manager (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.859**</td>
<td>.560**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.513**</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>.488**</td>
<td>.520**</td>
<td>.490**</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.808**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.436**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.734**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>.450**</td>
<td>.511**</td>
<td>.336**</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.317**</td>
<td>.490**</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.439**</td>
<td>.689**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincerity (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.674**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.393**</td>
<td>.536**</td>
<td>.730**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.359**</td>
<td>.702**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.376**</td>
<td>.605**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.675**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Climate (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Findings Related to the Hypotheses of the Research

In this study, the hypotheses established in accordance with the purpose of the research are given below.

**H1:** Civil aviation sector employees' perceptions of female managers have a significant effect on organizational climate

**H2:** The perception dimensions of civil aviation sector employees towards female managers have a significant effect on the organizational climate.

Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses aimed in the research. Before performing the regression analysis, the assumptions of the regression analyzes that the distribution of the data is normal, there is a relationship between the variables, and the absence of autocorrelation and multiple correlation problems between the variables were examined. Table 6 shows that the distribution of the data included in the model within the scope of the research is the normal distribution. The result that the relationship between the variables included in the model is not significant is given in Table 7.
Durbin Watson value was examined to examine whether there was autocorrelation for the regression model for each path coefficient in the model, and it was decided that there was no autocorrelation for each established regression coefficient since this value was between 1-3 (Field, 2005). At the same time, in the second hypothesis of the research, because of the existence of more than one independent variable, a multiple linear regression model was used to examine the effects of perception dimensions, and the VIF value was examined while deciding whether there was a multiple correlation in the relevant model, and it was determined that there was no multicollinearity problem since the VIF value was not below 10 (Field, 2005).

In the light of all this information, it was determined that the assumptions of the regression analyzes established for the first and second hypotheses of the research were met. The results of the first hypothesis of study are given in Table 8.

Table 8: Standardized, T-Values and Explained Variance Levels of the Impact of Civil Aviation Industry Employees' Perceptions of Women Managers on Organizational Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>11.849</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception Towards Female Managers</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>13.391</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; R^2=0.600; Durbin Watson: 1.932; F:179,317; F(p):0.001<0.01
Independent: Perception of Female Managers
Dependent: Organizational Climate

When the values in Table 8 were examined, the first hypothesis of the study was accepted since it was determined that the effect of the perception of female manager on the organizational climate (β= 0.406; t= 13.391; p<0.01) was significant. It was determined that the perception towards the female manager alone explains 60% of the organizational climate (Adjusted R^2=0.600).

It was determined that the perceptions of the participants towards the female manager had an effect of 0.406 on the organizational climate. This result shows that when there is a one-unit increase in the perceptions of the participants towards the female manager, there will be an increase of 0.406 units on the organizational climate. The regression model of the research is given below.

Organizational Climate= 1.598+0.406*Perception towards female manager

The results of the second hypothesis of the research are given in Table 9.

When the values in Table 9 are examined, the effect of the perception of the leadership role towards the female manager on the organizational climate (β= 0.232; t= 2.460; p<0.05), the effect of the perception of the employment effect for the female manager on the organizational climate (β= 0.209; The second hypothesis of the study was accepted, since it was determined that the effect of t= 2.229; p<0.05) and the perception of progress expectation towards the female manager on the organizational climate (β= 0.423; t= 4.604; p<0.01) were significant. It was determined that the dimensions of perception towards the female manager explained the organizational climate by 61.2% (Adjusted R^2=0.612).

The regression model of the research is given below.

Organizational Climate= 1,579+0.232*Leadership Roles+0.209*employment, impact+0.423*prospectiveness.
Table 9: Standardized, T-Values and Explained Level of Variance on the Effect of Perception Dimensions of Civil Aviation Sector Employees towards Female Managers on Organizational Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>11.602</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Roles</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
<td>2.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Impact</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
<td>2.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Prospect</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>4.604</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>2.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<0.01; *p<0.05; R²:612; Durbin Watson: 2.146; F:63.606; F(p):0.001<0.01

Independent Variables: Leadership Roles, Employment Impact, Prospect Prospect
Dependent: Organizational Climate

When the regression model is examined, a one-unit increase in the leadership roles of female managers has a 0.232 effect on the organizational climate, a one-unit increase in the employment level of female managers has a 0.209 effect on the organizational climate, and a one-unit increase in the expectation of progress of female managers has a 0.423 effect on the organizational climate. It has been determined that it will increase with a significant effect. According to table 8, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationships between the variables. According to the results of the correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a positive significant relationship of 0.777 (r=0.777; p<0.01) between the perceptions of the participants towards the female manager and the organizational climate. When the relationship between the sub-dimensions was examined, it was determined that the highest correlation was between the correlation coefficient of 0.807 and the employment effect and organizational structure dimensions (r=0.807; p<0.01).

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Theoretical Implications

With this research, the effects of women's management perceptions of the employees in the civil aviation sector on the organizational climate is revealed. No studies have been found in the literature on the effects of women's management perceptions of those working in the civil aviation sector on the organizational climate. Therefore, this study has completed this missing area in the literature.

The research is of great importance in terms of revealing the mediating role of the standards dimension related to organizational climate and revealing the mediating role of the leadership role dimension of women as managers.

With this research, it will be possible to make the following theoretical suggestion: Although it is a very comprehensive study that can be studied with scales related to different organizations women as managers, there will be a situation to measure WARMS levels with different organizational scales.

In addition, this study can be done in different sectors. It will be beneficial especially in banking, tourism and academia sectors.

5.2. Findings & Comments

In this study, it is seen that the participants in the research are mostly men, they are almost equal in terms of marital status, and the majority of them are high school or equivalent, undergraduate graduates in terms of education level, and finally they are between the ages of 25-34 and 35-44.
In this study, when the values are examined, it is concluded that the effect of the perception towards female managers on the organizational climate is significant. Moreover, it is concluded that the effect of the perception of leadership role for female managers on the organizational climate, the effect of the perception of employment effect for female managers on the organizational climate, and thirdly, the effect of the perception of progress expectation towards woman as managers on the organizational climate.

5.3. Limitations
One of the important limitations of the research is that only civil aviation sector employees are included in the surveys. By measuring the perceptions of civil aviation senior managers towards female managers, more information can be obtained in terms of employment impact leadership roles, progress expectation.
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