

Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns (JERP)

www.jerpatterns.com

Investigation of the Relationship Between Psychological Comfort Levels and Organizational Commitment Levels of Physical Education Teachers


Mustafa Kızılkoca¹

To cite this article:

Kızılkoca, M. (2022). Investigation of the Relationship Between Psychological Comfort Levels and Organizational Commitment Levels of Physical Education Teachers. *Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns (JERP)*, 3(2), 207-221. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53016/jerp.v3i2.71>

Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns (JERP) is an international scientific, high quality open access, peer viewed scholarly journal provides a comprehensive range of unique online-only journal submission services to academics, researchers, advanced doctoral students and other professionals in their field. This journal publishes original research papers, theory-based empirical papers, review papers, case studies, conference reports, book reviews, essay and relevant reports twice a year (June and December) in online versions.

¹ Mustafa Kızılkoca, Munzur University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, mkizilkoca@munzur.edu.tr,

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3636-6971>

Investigation of the Relationship Between Psychological Comfort Levels and Organizational Commitment Levels of Physical Education Teachers

Mustafa KIZILKOCA¹

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Received 09.11. 2022

Accepted 31.12. 2022

<https://jerpatterns.com>

December, 2022

Volume: 3, No: 2

Pages: 207-221

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine the relationship between psychological comfort levels and organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers. The universe of the research consisted of physical education teachers working in Elâzığ province. The study's sample group consisted of 211 people, 148 male, and 63 female, from physical education teachers working in Elâzığ. The "Psychological Comfort Scale" and "Organizational Commitment Scale" were used as data collection tools. Dependent-Sample T-test, One Way Anova, and Pearson Correlation Analysis were used in the analysis of the data. In terms of gender and educational status variables, there was no significant difference in the organizational commitment sub-dimensions and psychological commitment levels of physical education teachers. Regarding age, occupational year, and marital status variables, significant differences were found in organizational commitment sub-dimensions and psychological comfort levels. According to the findings obtained, as the age and occupational year increased, the organizational commitment and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers decreased. Single teachers were found to have higher levels of organizational commitment and psychological comfort than married teachers. A medium-level relationship was found between the levels of forced commitment, moral commitment, and self-interested commitment, which are the organizational commitment sub-dimensions of physical education teachers, and psychological comfort levels ($r = -0.39$, $r = 0.51$, $r = 0.43$). As the psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers increased, so did their level of organizational commitment. After all; A significant positive relationship was found between the organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers and their psychological comfort levels.

Keywords: Organizational Commitment, Physical Education Teacher, Psychological Comfort.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of psychological comfort is a concept that is frequently used recently. This concept is a form of expression first introduced by Edmondson (1999) (Koçak & Yener, 2019). The concept of psychological comfort can be explained as a person's well-being or feeling of psychologically safe (Yener, 2015). The level of psychological comfort is explained as the level of perceived interpersonal anxiety or psychological risk that people feel within the organization where they work (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). The perception of psychological comfort is a collection of perceptions formed by the combination of reactions shown by managers in the institutions where people are located, in expressing their suggestions and thoughts, taking responsibility, receiving help or support from other employees, and making mistakes (Edmondson, 1999). When people express their opinions, express situations they are unhappy with, ask questions and express the mistakes they see, the reactions shown by their friends or managers affect psychological comfort positively or negatively (Yener, 2015). Psychological comfort is the reflection of inner peace in the environments where people work the way they work (Edmondson, 2002). Therefore, rather than being an individual concept in reality, it is accepted as a common perception that all individuals in the working environment feel and share (Kahn, 1990). The confidence that people have in return for the responsibilities and risks they assume in the places where they work and the belief that they will not be punished or humiliated as a result of the mistakes and failures they have made are directly related to the psychological comfort level (Lee et al., 2004). It has been determined that people with high psychological comfort levels express themselves more comfortably in the places where they work, have high levels of job satisfaction, experience very little stress, and feel much more valuable (Liu et al., 2014; Yener, 2018). People working in institutions with a high level of psychological comfort can act comfortably in voicing and solving the identified problems, criticizing themselves and other friends easily, and easily expressing their suggestions and solutions (Kessel et al., 2012). In the institutions where they work, people have the belief that if they are in a psychologically comfortable environment, they will be accepted and respected not only by their managers or managers, but also by other colleagues, and this situation allows people to work away from stress, have high risk-taking levels, and seek solutions at the maximum level (Newman et al., 2017). Employees who are not afraid of making mistakes and who trust themselves are defined as people with a high level of psychological comfort (Tiwari & Lenka, 2016). In institutions where people work together, the most important factor that will ensure a high psychological comfort level sense of trust. The sense of trust that people feel toward those they work with increases the level of psychological comfort in the work environment (Guchait et al., 2014). Research shows that the concept of trust and the concept of psychological comfort are very much related to each other (Baer & Frese, 2003). Three main factors that affect the level of psychological comfort can be mentioned. These are stated as the characteristics of co-workers, the relationships established with the people with whom they work, and the relations established with the manager or administrators. The fact that one of these factors is problematic affects the level of psychological comfort. For this reason, it is desirable to carry out all of the mentioned factors in a healthy way (May et al., 2004). It can be said that it improves self-efficacy with the Transtheoretical Model (Pennington, 2021).

The way people behave toward a community or a particular person that prepares them for restricted thoughts is called commitment. Commitment is a form of behavior that exists in places where we live collectively and is instinctively reflected (Doğan & Demiral, 2009). Organizational commitment is seen as an important phenomenon that has been studied for many years. The concept of organizational commitment was first introduced by Whyte in 1956 and has been later defined by many (Bakan, 2011). Some of these definitions are; O'Reilly et

al. (1991) defined organizational commitment as the psychological commitment that realizes the assimilation and internalization of the characteristics and goals of the places to which people are affiliated or work. Becker et al. (1996) defined the labor and effort of people as the emergence of their labor and effort within the scope of the objectives of the places where they work and the willingness to participate voluntarily in the social activities of the places where they work. Organizational commitment directly affects the happiness and willingness of people working within the organization. For this reason, increasing organizational commitment is an extremely important situation for employers (Şenturan, 2014). In the research conducted, it has been revealed that people with high organizational commitments work more efficiently, behave honestly and selflessly, are happy with their work, and do not think about leaving (Bayram, 2005). However, it has been determined that the production and performance levels of people with high levels of organizational commitment increase in the institutions where they work (Karim & Rehman, 2012). One of the points to be considered is the confusion about the concepts of job dependence and organizational dependence. These two concepts have different meanings from each other. Organizational dependence is the loyalty of people to the institution or place where they work, and dependence on work is the type of commitment to the profession that people have made. People may not show the same degree of dependence on their jobs or places of work (Dollard et al., 2012). Factors affecting organizational commitment are examined under three headings. These are organizational factors, individual factors, and non-organizational factors. The organizational factors examined as the first of these factors include the values of the organization, attitudes, and behaviors towards employees, the objectives of the institution, their contributions to the communication established between employees, and their perspectives towards employees. Fulfilling the responsibilities of institutions to their employees, helping them to improve themselves, and giving them an adequate wage have an important place in increasing organizational commitment (Gündoğan, 2009). When individual factors affecting organizational commitment are examined, age, professional experience, education, and gender, (Sıgri, 2007). Thirdly, in the examination of the mentioned external factors, situations that develop outside of employees or institutions are addressed. These can be stated as problems such as the economic structure of the country and related unemployment, problems arising from the sector or higher authorities (Ince & Gül, 2005).

In line with the information provided, the aim of the study was determined as the examination of the relationship between the psychological comfort and organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers.

METHOD AND MATERIALS

Research Model

In this study, a quantitative research screening model was used to examine the relationship between psychological comfort and organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers working in Elazığ province (Yazıcıoğlu & Erdoğan, 2004).

Universe Sample

The universe of the research consisted of physical education teachers working in Elazığ province. The study's sample group consisted of a total of 211 people, 148 male, and 63 female, from physical education teachers working in Elazığ in the 2022-2023 academic year. Descriptive statistics about the teachers participating in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Table of Physical Education Teachers.

Variables	Group	n	%
Gender	Male	148	70,1
	Female	63	29,9
Age	21-30 old	29	13,7
	31-40 old	105	49,8
	41-50 old	77	36,5
Occupational year	1-10 year/s	44	20,9
	11-20 years	124	58,8
	21-30 years	43	20,4
Educational status	Undergraduate	176	83,4
	Graduate	35	16,6
Marital status	Married	161	76,3
	Single	50	23,7

The number and percentage frequencies of the physical education teachers participating in the study according to gender, age, occupational year, educational status, and marital status variables are given in the table.

Data Collection Tools

Psychological Comfort Scale

Edmondson (1999) developed the psychological comfort scale to determine the level of comfort and security in the institution where people work. Turkish adaptation was made by Yener in 2015. The scale consists of two sub-dimension scales "Initiative" and "Tolerance" and the evaluation is made on the based total score. The psychological comfort scale is a 5-point Likert-type scale. The scale scoring can obtain a maximum of 35 and a minimum of 7 points. The high score indicates that the institution's psychological comfort level is high. The reliability value of the developer scale was found to be Cronbach Alpha 0.82. The reliability coefficient of the psychological comfort scale was found to be Cronbach Alpha 0.81.

Organizational Commitment Scale

The scale was developed by Panley and Gould (1988) to measure people's loyalty to the institutions they work for. The Turkish version was made by Ergün and Celik in 2019. The scale is examined in three sub-dimensions as "Moral Commitment", "Self-interested Commitment, and "Forced Commitment". Questions 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13 measure the self-interested commitment dimension, questions 3, 6, 9, 12, and 15 measure the moral commitment dimension, and questions 2, 5, 8, 11, and 14 measure the forced commitment dimension. The scale is 5 points Likert type scale. Questions are evaluated between 1 point and 5 points. As a result of the scale, a minimum of 15 points and a maximum of 75 points can be obtained. In the evaluation of the sub-dimensions, the lowest 5 and the highest 25 points can be obtained. In the evaluation of the scores received, the high level of the points obtained in the forced commitment sub-dimension indicates a low level of commitment, and the high score obtained in the moral commitment and self-interested commitment sub-dimensions indicates a high level of commitment. Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found to be 0.94 for the moral commitment sub-dimension, 0.93 for the self-interested commitment sub-dimension, and 0.92 reliability coefficient for the forced commitment sub-dimension.

Analysis of Data

SPSS 22.0 program was used in the statistical analysis of the data. Skewness and Kurtosis values were examined for normal distribution values of the data. The value range is +1, and -1 is accepted as the value range (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Independent-Sample T-test was applied in terms of gender, education status, and marital status variables of the obtained data, One Way ANOVA tests were applied in terms of age and occupational year variables. Pearson Correlation Analysis was applied to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and psychological comfort levels. The significance level was determined as $p < 0.05$ in the study.

FINDINGS

In this section, statistical evaluation of the data was made and the results of the evaluation were shown in tables. The result of the statistical test to see whether the data was distributed normally in the research was given in the Table 2.

Table 2. Data Normality Analysis Table

Measured values	n	X	Standart D.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Forced commitment	211	3,04	0,34	0,00	-0,35
Self-interested commitment	211	3,84	0,03	0,04	-0,60
Moral commitment	211	3,35	0,03	0,12	-0,48
Psychological comfort	211	2,69	0,02	0,32	-0,34

Skewness and Kurtosis values were examined for normality analysis of the data. Skewness and Kurtosis values are considered to be -1 and +1 ranges. It was determined that the obtained data showed normal distribution when the table was examined.

Table 3. Comparison of Organizational Commitment and Psychological Comfort Levels According to Gender Variable.

Measured values	Variable	n	X	Sd	t	p
Forced commitment	Male	148	3,04	0,48	0,34	0,72
	Female	63	3,02	0,53		
Moral commitment	Male	148	3,33	0,51	-0,62	0,53
	Female	63	3,38	0,43		
Self-interested commitment	Male	148	3,82	0,45	-0,88	0,37
	Female	63	3,88	0,42		
Psychological comfort	Male	148	2,67	0,37	-1,18	0,23
	Female	63	2,74	0,38		

When Table 3 is examined, the comparison of organizational commitment and psychological commitment values in terms of gender variable was made with the Dependent-Sample T-test. When the data were examined, no significant differences were detected in terms of gender variables in the values of forced commitment, moral commitment, and self-interested commitment, which are the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment ($p=0,72$, $p=0,53$, $p=0,37$). There was no significant difference in terms of gender variable when the psychological comfort value was examined ($p=0,23$).d

Table 4. Comparison of Organizational Commitment and Psychological Comfort Levels in terms of Age Variable.

Measured values	Variable	n	X	Sd	F	p
Forced commitment	21-30 old	29	2,38	0,33	54,43	0,00*
	31-40 old	105	3,02	0,43		
	41-50 old	77	3,31	0,40		
Moral commitment	21-30 old	29	3,97	0,33	67,18	0,00*
	31-40 old	105	3,41	0,39		
	41-50 old	77	3,02	0,39		
Self-interested commitment	21-30 old	29	4,35	0,30	55,56	0,00*
	31-40 old	105	3,91	0,36		
	41-50 old	77	3,55	0,37		
Psychological comfort	21-30 old	29	3,21	0,29	110,85	0,00*
	31-40 old	105	2,77	0,27		
	41-50 old	77	2,39	0,24		

*p<.05

In Table 4, the analysis of organizational commitment and psychological comfort values in terms of age variable was performed with the One Way Anova test. When the table was examined, a significant difference was found between age groups in organizational commitment sub-dimensions and psychological comfort value according to p<0.05 significance level. Tukey test was performed to determine the differences between the groups and was tabulated (Table 5).

Table 5. Determination of Differences Between Groups in terms of Age Variable.

Measured values	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sd	p
Forced commitment	21-30	31-40	-0,63	0,08	0,00*
		41-50	-0,92	0,08	0,00*
	31-40	21-30	0,63	0,08	0,00*
		41-50	-0,29	0,06	0,00*
	41-50	21-30	0,92	0,08	0,00*
		31-40	0,29	0,06	0,00*
Moral Commitment	21-30	31-40	0,56	0,08	0,00*
		41-50	0,95	0,08	0,00*
	31-40	21-30	-0,56	0,08	0,00*
		41-50	0,39	0,05	0,00*
	41-50	21-30	-0,95	0,08	0,00*
		31-40	-0,39	0,05	0,00*
Self-interested Commitment	21-30	31-40	0,44	0,07	0,00*
		41-50	0,80	0,07	0,00*
	31-40	21-30	-0,44	0,07	0,00*
		41-50	0,36	0,05	0,00*
	41-50	21-30	-0,80	0,07	0,00*
		31-40	-0,36	0,05	0,00*
Psychological comfort	21-30	31-40	0,44	0,05	0,00*
		41-50	0,82	0,05	0,00*
	31-40	21-30	-0,44	0,05	0,00*
		41-50	0,37	0,03	0,00*
	41-50	21-30	-0,82	0,05	0,00*
		31-40	-0,37	0,03	0,00*

*p<.05

Tukey test was applied to determine the differences between the groups in terms of age variable. When the table is examined, it is seen that in the forced commitment sub-dimension, the 21-30 age group has a significantly lower level of commitment compared to the 31-40 age group and 41-50 age group, and the 31-40 age group has a significantly lower level of commitment than the 41-50 age group. It was observed that he had a low level of forced commitment ($p < 0.05$). In the sub-dimensions of moral commitment and self-interested commitment, the 41-50 age group has a significantly lower level of commitment compared to the 31-40 and 21-30 age groups, and the 31-40 age group has a significantly lower commitment level than the 21-30 age group. observed ($p < 0.05$). When the differences between the groups in the measurement of psychological comfort were examined, it was determined that the 21-30 age group had a significantly higher comfort level than the 31-40 age group and the 41-50 age group. It was determined that the 31-40 age group had a significantly higher psychological comfort level than the 41-50 age group ($p < 0.05$). It was determined that organizational commitment and psychological comfort decreased significantly as the age level increased when the findings were examined.

Table 6. Comparison of Organizational Commitment and Psychological Comfort Levels in terms of the Occupational Year Variable

Measured values	Variable	n	X	Sd	F	p
Forced commitment	1-10 years	44	2,62	0,50	26,50	0,00*
	11-20 years	124	3,09	0,44		
	21-30 years	43	3,29	0,42		
Moral Commitment	1-10 years	44	3,80	0,41	33,80	0,00*
	11-20 years	124	3,28	0,43		
	21-30 years	43	3,09	0,43		
Self-interested Commitment	1-10 years	44	4,19	0,39	28,12	0,00*
	11-20 years	124	3,82	0,41		
	21-30 years	43	3,55	0,37		
Psychological comfort	1-10 years	44	3,04	0,37	46,77	0,00*
	11-20 years	124	2,67	0,31		
	21-30 years	43	2,38	0,22		

* $p < .05$

The analysis of organizational commitment and psychological comfort values in terms of occupational year variable was performed with the One Way Anova test. When the table 6 was examined, a significant difference was found between age groups in organizational commitment sub-dimensions and psychological comfort value according to $p < 0.05$ significance level. Tukey test was performed to determine the differences between the groups and was tabulated (Table 7).

Table 7. Determination of Differences Between Groups in terms of Occupational Year Variable.

Measured values	Occupational year (I)	Occupational year (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sd	p
Forced commitment	1-10	11-20	-0,47	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	-0,67	0,09	0,00*
	11-20	1-10	0,47	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	-0,1	0,07	0,03*
	21-30	1-10	0,67	0,09	0,00*
		11-20	0,19	0,07	0,03*

Moral commitment	1-10	11-20	0,52	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	0,71	0,09	0,00*
	11-20	1-10	-0,52	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	0,18	0,07	0,03*
	21-30	1-10	-0,71	0,09	0,00*
		11-20	-0,18	0,07	0,03*
Self-interested commitment	1-10	11-20	0,36	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	0,63	0,08	0,00*
	11-20	1-10	-0,36	0,07	0,00*
		21-30	0,26	0,07	0,00*
	21-30	1-10	-0,63	0,08	0,00*
		11-20	-0,26	0,07	0,00*
Psychological comfort	1-10	11-20	0,36	0,05	0,00*
		21-30	0,65	0,06	0,00*
	11-20	1-10	-0,36	0,05	0,00*
		21-30	0,28	0,05	0,00*
	21-30	1-10	-0,65	0,06	0,00*
		11-20	-0,28	0,05	0,00*

*p<.05

Tukey test was applied to determine the differences between the groups in terms of the occupational year variable. When the table is examined, it is seen that in the forced commitment sub-dimension, the 1-10 year group has a significantly lower level of commitment than the 11-20 year and 21-30 year group, and the 11-20 year group has a significantly lower level of commitment than the 21-30 year group. It was observed that he had a low level of forced commitment ($p < 0.05$). In the sub-dimensions of moral commitment and self-interested commitment, the 21-30 year group has a significantly lower level of commitment compared to the 11-20 year and 1-10 year groups, while the 11-20 year group has a significantly lower level of commitment compared to the 1-10 year group. ($p < 0.05$). When the differences between the groups in the measurement of psychological comfort were examined, it was determined that the 1-10 year group had a significantly higher comfort level than the 11-20 year group and the 21-30 year group. It was determined that the 11-20 year group had a significantly higher psychological comfort level than the 21-30 year group ($p < 0.05$). It was determined that organizational commitment and psychological comfort decreased significantly as the level of the occupational year increased when the findings were examined.

Table 8. Comparison of Organizational Commitment and Psychological Comfort Levels According to the Educational Status Variable.

Measured values	Variable	n	X	Sd	t	p
Forced commitment	Undergraduate	176	3,02	0,49	-0,80	0,42
	Graduate	35	3,10	0,52		
Moral commitment	Undergraduate	176	3,36	0,50	0,56	0,57
	Graduate	35	3,30	0,45		
Self-interested commitment	Undergraduate	176	3,84	0,45	0,21	0,82
	Graduate	35	3,82	0,41		
Psychological comfort	Undergraduate	176	2,69	0,38	0,00	0,99
	Graduate	35	2,69	0,37		

The comparison of organizational commitment and psychological commitment values in terms of the educational status variable was made with the Dependent-Sample T-test. When the data were examined, no significant difference was found in terms of educational status

variables in the values of forced commitment, moral commitment, and self-interested commitment, which are the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment ($p=0,42$, $p=0,57$, $p=0,82$). When the psychological comfort value was examined, no significant difference was found in terms of the educational status variable ($p=0,99$).

Table 9. Comparison of Organizational Commitment and Psychological Comfort Levels According to the Marital Status Variable.

Measured values	Variable	n	X	Sd	t	p
Forced commitment	Married	161	3,07	0,44	1,95	0,05*
	Single	50	2,92	0,63		
Moral commitment	Married	161	3,29	0,46	-3,22	0,00*
	Single	50	3,54	0,53		
Self-interested commitment	Married	161	3,77	0,41	-4,04	0,00*
	Single	50	4,06	0,48		
Psychological comfort	Married	161	2,63	0,35	-4,53	0,00*
	Single	50	2,89	0,39		

* $p<.05$

The comparison of organizational commitment and psychological commitment values in terms of the marital status variable was made with the Dependent-Sample T-test. In the forced commitment sub-dimension, it was determined that married teachers had a significantly higher commitment level than single teachers ($p=0.05$). In the sub-dimensions of moral commitment and self-interested commitment, single teachers were found to have a significantly higher level of commitment than married teachers ($p=0.00$). In the measure of psychological comfort, it was determined that the psychological comfort level of married teachers was significantly lower than that of single teachers ($p=0.00$). When the psychological comfort value was examined, a significant difference was found in terms of the marital status variable ($p=0.00$). It was determined that the organizational commitment sub-dimensions and psychological comfort values of single teachers were higher than married teachers when the findings were examined.

Table 10. Examination of the Relationship Between Organizational Commitment Sub-Dimensions and Psychological Comfort

Correlation	Psychological comfort	
Forced commitment	Pearson r	-0,39**
	p	0,00
	n	211
Moral commitment	Pearson r	0,51**
	p	0,00
	n	211
Self-interested commitment	Pearson r	0,43**
	p	0,00
	n	211

Pearson Correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationship between organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers. When the data were examined, a medium-level relationship was found between the psychological comfort levels of the teachers and the organizational commitment sub-dimensions. A negative relationship was determined between psychological comfort and forced commitment level ($r=-0.39$). As the forced dependencies of physical education teachers

decreased, their level of psychological comfort increased. A positive relationship was determined between psychological comfort and the sub-dimensions of moral commitment and self-interested commitment ($r=0.51$, $r=0.43$). As physical education teachers' levels of moral commitment and self-interested commitment increased, so did their psychological comfort levels.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the research conducted to examine the relationship between the organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers, the organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers were examined in terms of sub-dimensions and psychological comfort levels, gender, age, occupational year, educational status, and marital status variables. The relationship between teachers' organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels was also statistically examined and discussed within the framework of the literature.

In the examination of physical education teachers' organizational commitment and psychological comfort levels in terms of gender variable, no statistically significant difference was found between male teachers and female teachers in the values of forced commitment, moral commitment, self-interested commitment values and psychological comfort levels from the organizational commitment sub-dimensions. Some studies are parallel to the research, as well as studies with conflicting results with the results of the research in the literature review on the subject. Demirtaş (2010) has not found a significant difference between the organizational commitment levels of male teachers and female teachers in his research examining the organizational commitment of private teaching institution teachers. In the research conducted by Yakut (2015) on the organizational commitment levels of vocational high school teachers, it was found that male teachers had a higher level of organizational commitment than female teachers. Yalçın & İplik (2005) have not found a significant difference between the organizational commitment levels of male and female employees in their research on hotel employees. Studies in which women have a higher level of organizational commitment than men are also found in the literature (Durna & Eren, 2005; Albayrak, 2007).

It was found that the organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers decreased significantly as their age and occupational years increased in examining the organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers according to age and occupational year variables. Topaloğlu, Koç & Yavuz (2008) found that teachers who are new to the occupation have more organizational commitment than senior teachers in their studies examining the organizational dependencies of teachers in the literature review on the subject. Özcan (2008) found that the occupational seniority year did not make a significant difference in organizational dependency levels in his research. In his research on vocational high school teachers, Yakut (2015) found that as the age of teachers increased, their organizational commitment increased. The research contradicts the findings obtained. Yener (2016) determined that psychological comfort level increase as age and occupational year increase in the examination of psychological comfort levels according to the age and occupational year variable and predicted that this result may be because people turn into a more contented structure due to the increase in experience with age. It is seen that there are studies that are parallel and contradictory with the research in the literature review. It is thought that the decrease in organizational commitment and psychological comfort as the age and occupational year increase is due to the economic difficulties encountered by teachers and the occupational attrition experienced by physical education teachers when the findings obtained in the study are evaluated.

In examining organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers regarding educational status variables, there was no significant difference between organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels between undergraduate and graduate teachers. Yener (2016) has not found a difference between education and psychological comfort levels. Güzelbayram (2013) has not found a significant difference in the examination of the organizational commitment of the instructors in terms of educational status variable in her research on lecturers. Other studies have been found that are parallel to the research (Memişoğlu & Kalay, 2017; Uğraşoğlu & Çağanağa, 2017).

In the study, in the examination of the organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers according to the marital status variable, it was found that single teachers had higher organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels than married teachers. In the literature, it has been found that married teachers have more organizational commitment than single teachers (Al-Fadli, 1997; Coral, 2006; Özkaya et al., 2006; Sürgevil, 2007). Nartgün and Menep (2010) found that marital status did not affect organizational commitment in their research. The findings obtained by the literature review do not show parallels. It is thought that the reason for this is due to the economic problems and livelihood problems experienced today.

A medium-level relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment and the level of psychological comfort in the study. As the organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers increased, their psychological comfort levels also increased. A sufficient number of studies have not been found in the literature review on the subject. Bilgin (2018) has not found a significant relationship between psychological well-being and organizational commitment levels in his research on teachers working in private schools. When the findings are evaluated, it is predicted that the relationship between the level of organizational commitment and psychological comfort levels is more connected to the institutions where physical education teachers work in situations where they are psychologically comfortable.

After all; There was no significant difference in the organizational commitment levels and psychological comfort levels of physical education teachers in terms of gender and educational status variables. Significant differences were found in age, occupational year, and marital status variables. It was found that teachers with young ages and fewer occupational years had higher levels of organizational commitment and psychological comfort. It was found that single teachers had higher levels of organizational commitment and psychological comfort levels than married teachers. A medium-level relationship was found between the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment and the level of psychological comfort. As the organizational commitment levels of physical education teachers increased, their psychological comfort levels also increased.

Suggestions;

- Application of research to teachers of other branches,
- Examining the relationship between the economic difficulties experienced by teachers and the findings of the research,
- The application of the research to teachers living in metropolitan and the comparison of the findings are suggestions that can be made as a result of the study.

REFERENCES

- Albayrak, E. G. (2007). *Impact on career management and organizational commitment. Master's Thesis, University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul.*
- Al-Fadli, F. (1997). The relationship between organizational commitment, leadership subordinates' work relationships, and demographic variables. *Public Administration*, 37(1), 75-120.
- Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(1), 45-68.
- Bakan, İ. (2011). *The Basis of Organizational Strategies Organizational Commitment Concept, Theory, Cause, and Effect. Gazi Bookstore, Ankara.*
- Bayram, L. (2005). A new paradigm in management: Organizational commitment. *Journal of the Court of Accounts*, (59), 125-139.
- Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D. M., & Gilbert, N. L. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 39(2), 464-482.
- Bilgin, Y. (2018). *Examination of the relationship between the quality of working life, psychological well-being, and organizational commitment levels of teachers working in special education schools. Master's Thesis. Necmettin Erbakan University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Special Education, Konya.*
- Demirtaş, H. (2010). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction in private teaching institution' teachers. *İnönü University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 11 (2), 177-206.
- Doğan, S., & Demiral, Ö. (2009). An Investigation into the Effect of Personnel Empowerment and Psychological Contract in Ensuring Organizational Commitment. *Erciyes University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, (32), 47-80.
- Dollard, M. F., Tuckey, M. R., & Dormann, C. (2012). Psychosocial safety climate moderates the job demand–resource interaction in predicting workgroup distress. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 45, 694-704.
- Durna, U., & Eren, V. (2005). Organizational commitment is on the axis of three elements of commitment. *Journal of Doğuş University*, 6 (2), 210-219.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative science quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2002). Managing the risk of learning: Psychological safety in work teams. *Cambridge, MA: Division of Research, Harvard Business School*. 255-275.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 1(1), 23-43.
- Ergün, H., & Çelik, K. (2019). Turkish adaptation of organizational commitment scale. *Pamukkale University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, (34), 113-121.
- Guchait, P., Ruetzler, T., Taylor, J., & Toldi, N. (2014). Video interviewing: A potential selection tool for hospitality managers—A study to understand applicant perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 36, 90-100.
- Gündoğan, T., & Müdürlüğü, İ.K.G. (2009). Organizational Commitment: Implementation Of The Central Bank Of The Republic Of Turkey. *General Directorate of Human Resources of the Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey*, 31-61.
- Güzelbayram, Ş. (2013). Determination of organizational commitment levels of lecturers working in foundation universities. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, (1), 57-64.

- Ince, M., & Gül, H. (2005). A new paradigm in management: Organizational commitment. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi, 77.
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Karim, F., & Rehman, O. (2012). Impact of job satisfaction, perceived organizational justice and employee empowerment on organizational commitment in semi-government organizations of Pakistan. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 3(4), 92.
- Kessel, M., Kratzer, J., & Schultz, C. (2012). Psychological safety, knowledge sharing, and creative performance in healthcare teams. *Creativity and innovation management*, 21(2), 147-157.
- Koçak, Ö. E., & Yener, S. (2019). The mediating role of psychological comfort perception in the effect of trust perception in the leader on workplace loneliness. *Journal of Management and Economics*, 26(3), 937-954.
- Lee, F., Edmondson, A. C., Thomke, S., & Worline, M. (2004). The mixed effects of inconsistency on experimentation in organizations. *Organization Science*, 15(3), 310-326.
- Liu, S., Hu, J., Li, Y., Wang, Z., & Lin, X. (2014). Examining the cross-level relationship between shared leadership and learning in teams: Evidence from China. *The leadership quarterly*, 25(2), 282-295.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability, and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- Memişoğlu, S. P. & Kalay, M. (2017). The relationship between the organizational commitment and motivation of teachers working in primary and secondary schools (Bolu provincial example). *Turkish Studies*, 12(4), 367-392.
- Mercan, M. (2006). *Organizational commitment in teachers is characterized by organizational alienation and organizational citizenship. Master's Thesis, Afyonkarahisar Kocatepe University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Primary Education, Department of Classroom Teaching, Afyon.*
- Nartgün, Ş. S., & Menep, İ. (2010). Examination of the perception levels of teachers working in primary schools regarding organizational commitment: The case of Şırnak/İdil. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(1), 288-316.
- Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human resource management review*, 27(3), 521-535.
- O'Reilly III, C. A., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of management journal*, 34(3), 487-516.
- Özcan, E.B. (2008). *The relationship between organizational commitment and business values: A study in Adana province. Master's Thesis. Cukurova University, Adana.*
- Özkaya, M. O., Kocakoç, İ. D., & Karaa, E. (2006). Fieldwork to examine the relationships between managers' organizational loyalties and demographics. *Management and Economics: Celal Bayar University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty*, 13(2), 77-96.
- Pennington, C. G. (2021). Applying the transtheoretical model of behavioral change to establish physical activity habits. *Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns, (JERP)*, 2(1), 1-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53016/jerp.v2i1.6>
- Sığrı, Ü. (2007). Analysis of employees' organizational commitment with Meyer and Allen typology: A comparative study in the public and private sectors.
- Sürgevil, O. (2007). *Organizational commitment in working life. Master's Thesis. Ege University Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, Izmir.*
- Şenturan, Ş. (2014). *Organizational behavior with case studies. Beta Publishing House.*

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics (6th ed.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tiwari, B., & Lenka, U. (2016). Building psychological safety for employee engagement in post-recession. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*.
- Topalođlu, M., Koç, H., & Yavuz, E. (2008). Analysis of teachers' organizational commitment in terms of some key factors. *Kamu-İş Journal*, 9(4), 201-218.
- Uğraşođlu, İ. K. & Çađanađa, Ç. K. (2017). Examination of teachers' organizational commitment levels in terms of different variables. *International Journal of News Trends in Arts Sports & Science Education*, 6(4), 10-38.
- Yakut, S. (2015). *Job satisfaction and organizational commitment and practice in vocational high schools. Ph.D. Thesis. Istanbul Kùltür University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul.*
- Yalçın, A., & İplik, N. F. (2005). A study to determine the relationship between the demographic characteristics of employees in five-star hotels and their organizational commitment: The case of Adana. *Çukurova University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 14(1), 395-412.
- Yazıcıođlu, Y. & Erdođan, S. (2004). *SPSS Applied scientific research methods. Ankara: Detay Publishing.*
- Yener, S. (2015). *Investigation of the mediating variable relationship of psychological security perception in the relationship between shared leadership behavior and intention to leave the job. Ph.D. Thesis. Haliç University Institute of Social Sciences, Istanbul.*
- Yener, S. (2016). Psychological comfort as the determinant of the intention to leave the job. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(3), 169-192.