



## INVESTIGATING THE WORKING LIFE QUALITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT BEHAVIORS OF ACADEMICIANS CARRYING ON DUTIES IN FACULTIES OF SPORTS SCIENCES

**Kürşat Yusuf Aytaç<sup>1</sup>**

Adiyaman University,  
School of Physical Education and Sport,  
Turkey

### **Abstract:**

Within the scope of this research, the relationships between work life quality levels and organizational commitment of the academicians carrying on their duties in faculties of sports sciences was aimed to be investigated. In the research on relational screening model, Work Life Quality Scale developed by Sirgy et al. (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Afşar (2011), and Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Varol (2010) were performed to 325 volunteer participants. In the research, descriptive statistics (number of persons, minimum, maximum, average, standard deviation) related to the work life quality and organizational commitments of the academicians were calculated. Multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA) was calculated for determining whether work life quality of the participants differed significantly according to their demographical properties. Pearson correlation coefficient was also calculated for determining the relationship level between work life quality levels and organizational commitments of the participants. In tests of difference, p level of significance was accepted to be 0.05. At the end of the research, it was determined that work life quality of academicians was slightly over medium level, and their organizational commitment was at a medium level. When analyzed in terms of the demographical variables, as the level of age and period for working in the institution increased, work life quality was noticed to increase, as well. Furthermore, as the work life quality of the participants increased, their organizational commitment was specified to increase positively.

---

<sup>1</sup> Correspondence: email [kyaytac@adiyaman.edu.tr](mailto:kyaytac@adiyaman.edu.tr)

**Keywords:** quality of work life, organizational commitment, sport

## 1. Introduction

In competition environment of our age, success of organizations varies according to attitudes, behaviors and conditions of the staff that carry on duties within their own bodies. These attitudes and behaviors of the staff working in both public and private institutions and organizations are considered as an important factor for organizations' fulfilling their duties, powers and responsibilities.

Managers' knowing the attitudes of employees is remarkable in terms of understanding the attitudes towards organization and predicting positive or negative factors that are possible to appear (Özkalp and Kirel, 1999: 61-62).

Because the factors such as employees' being happy in their job, quality of the task they carry on, their commitment with the organization, and appropriateness of the working environment affect productivity of the organization and employees. Like all other organizations, educational organizations are under the effect of these developments and changes in human factor in terms of their performances.

Several models have been offered and implemented for development of the educational organizations. These model changes in education have failed because these have not been supported with the development of human factor (Bursalıoğlu, 1994:23). For that reason, the relationship between organizational commitment levels and work life quality of the academicians carrying on duties in Faculties of Sports Sciences or Vocational Schools of Physical Education and Sports, and some demographical variables related to these were investigated in this research.

### 1.1 Quality of Work Life

In general sense, work life quality that has appeared in stage of history as a chain of precautions to be taken on how productivity of employees is possible to be improved is defined within the framework of meeting the needs of employees dealing with their job satisfaction and happiness (Afşar, 2015:3, Çinar et al 2016:120).

Work life quality means improving the working conditions considering mental, psychological and social conditions as well as physical needs of employees, namely humanizing the work with all its aspects, to be brief (Beh and Rose, 2007:30-31).

Humanizing the working life includes efforts related to the purpose of integrating employees with what they carry on, and it aims to reach position of employee in working life up to a level appropriate to the structure, abilities and

expectations of the employee (Tınar, 1996:127). Sport is one of the most comprehensive, diverse and interesting areas of recreation. (Kırtepe and Karaman, 2017:37)

Özkalp and Kirel (2001:14) mentioned work life quality as meeting the needs of people, getting them feel appreciated in organization, and creating an environment providing opportunities for them to develop and be aware of their abilities for maintaining their lives in a safe environment.

The basic purpose for the work life quality is to develop appropriate working conditions for the employees while achieving the organizational success. Enhancing work life quality is considered as one of the fundamental factors of today's firms for achieving the organizational efficiency (Demir, 2011:454).

In the researches, it has been reported that work life quality had a multi-dimensional structure including a series of interrelated factors. Bolhari et al. (2011:374) listed the factors of work life quality as higher payments, occupational safety, better reward system, opportunity for growth and participative groups. Dikmetaş (2006:170) revealed other dimensions of work life quality, and expressed it as a concept integrating the concepts such as quality of work, salaries, profits, working environment and conditions, management and organization of works, the technology used in work, employee satisfaction and motivation, industrial relationships, attendance, employment security, social justice, and social security, demographical structure and continuous education that directly or indirectly affect working.

Accordingly, work life quality is a significant indicator for individuals' taking pleasure from life providing expected psychological satisfaction and meeting their expectations from their workplace and occupation. Depending upon being an indicator for the psychological and intellectual satisfaction of employees, this should also be considered as a factor playing role in productivity, innovativeness and strategic participation of the employer (Türkay, 2015:240).

## **1.2 Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment that is one of the attitudes of employees towards job is defined as the strong desire employees feel for being in the organization and maintaining the membership of organization, their desire for making efforts for organizational targets, and their believing and accepting organizational targets and values at a high level (Mowday et al., 1979:311).

Organizational commitment can be, in general, expressed as employees' considering the benefits of organization more superior than their benefits. Furthermore, organizational commitment can also be defined as employees' desire for making efforts

for the organization and adapting the targets and values of the organization (Turan, 2006:35, Yalçın and İplik, 2005:397).

The effects of organizational commitment as an occupational attitude upon the organization and employees has been revealed in various researches; and these researches have generally concluded that the employees with high organizational commitment have more contributions upon the institution (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990:171, Özdevecioğlu, 2003:92, Yalçın and İplik, 2005:397). The increase at productivity of employees and their working willingly are significantly related with their commitment to their organizations (Ağca and Ertan, 2008:391).

In reference to this, it has been suggested that the individuals with high organizational commitment need less supervision and discipline, have higher performance, evaluate the choices related to the positions in organizations as an instrument that will provide the highest contribution for the organization, and have more reliable and sincere behaviors (Uygur, 2007:73).

In general sense, commitment to organization is expressed in three different dimensions as emotional, continuance and normative. Emotional commitment indicates an emotional commitment towards organization. Continuance commitment refers the commitment employees build upon release expenses. And normative commitment expresses employees' continuing to work as a moral responsibility. This is arisen from employees' considering the organization to behave them well and feeling responsibility for rendering service for a specific period, in return (Ölçüm, 2004:55).

Organizational commitment has become remarkable for the organizations due to ending of employment, discontinuance, withdrawal, and job-search activities; attitudinal, emotional and cognitive structures such as job satisfaction, morale and performance; properties related to work and role of the employee such as autonomy, responsibility, attendance and sense of duty; personal properties of employees such as age, gender, period of service and education; and knowing the predictors of organizational commitment for individuals (Balay, 2000:20).

## **2. Method**

In this section, the information related to model, population, sample of the research, data collection tools and data analysis were presented.

### **2.1 Research Model**

In this research, the relationships between organizational commitment and work life qualities of the lecturers carrying on their duties in faculties of sports sciences or

vocational schools of physical education and sport in state universities in Turkey were aimed to be investigated. Within the scope of the research, whether organizational commitment and work life qualities of the lecturers had a significant relationship according to their genders, ages, marital status, the period for their working in the institution, their status of being a manager or not, and their titles were also investigated.

## 2.2 Population and Sample

The research population included totally 1625 lecturers carrying on their duties in sports sciences departments or physical education and sports departments in universities in Turkey in 2015-2016 academic year. The equation below was benefited to determine the number of lecturers to be selected for the sample.

$$n = \frac{n_0}{1 + \frac{n_0}{N}}$$

Equation= the prediction of sample size in continuous variables

In the equation n was calculated with  $n_0 = (t^2PQ)/d^2$  and because p level of significance was accepted to be 0.05, and t value in the table was 1.96,  $n_0=384.16$  was calculated at 0.05 level of significance. When 1625 (N) indicating the number of population was put in the equation, it was concluded that;

$$n = \frac{384,16}{1 + \frac{384,16}{1625}}$$

at least 311 lecturers represented the population. Within the scope of the study, views of totally 325 lecturers were obtained; however, because some data had extreme values, they were excluded from the data set, and the process was maintained with 314 data. It was determined that 314 participants in the sample represented the population.

Distributions of the lecturers who participated into the research according to their some properties were presented in the Table.

## 2.3 Data Collection Tools

Within the scope of this study, the data were collected using

- Personal Information Form;
- Quality of Work Life Scale;
- Organizational Commitment Scale.

General information related to data collection tools was expressed under titles.

### **2.3.1 Personal Information Form**

Personal information form was created for determining the information related to genders, ages, marital status, the period for working in the institution, status of being a manager or not, and titles of the lecturers carrying on their duties in one of sports sciences faculties departments or vocational schools of physical education and sports departments.

### **2.3.2 Quality of Work Life Scale**

Work Life Quality Scale developed by Sirgy et al. (2001) was used in order to determine work life qualities of the lecturers. Confirmatory factor analysis was calculated for determining the content validity of the scale that was adapted into Turkish by Afşar (2011). At the end of the calculation, it was found that the items in the scale were grouped under seven factors, and total score could be taken for all items. For determining the reliability of the scale items, Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated, and it was found to be 0.78.

There were totally 16 items in the scale. All items in the scale aimed to measure work life quality in the workplace. The items in the scale were scored on 7-point Likert type from “definitely wrong” to “definitely true.”

Within the scope of this research, work life qualities of 314 lecturers were determined. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient calculated for determining the reliability of the answers given by the lecturers for the scale items was found to be 0.689. In other words, the lecturers were determined to answer reliably for the items in the scale.

### **2.3.3 Organizational Commitment Scale**

Organizational Commitment Scale that was developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) was used for determining the organizational commitment levels of the lecturers. There were totally 18 items grouped under three dimensions in the scale that was adapted into Turkish by Varol (2010). The items were scored in 5-point Likert type. The scale included three dimensions as emotional commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for determining the reliability of the answers given by the lecturers for the scale of organizational commitment. The value of 0.680 that was obtained at the end of the calculation proved that the lecturers answered the scale items reliably.

## **2.4 Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics (number of persons, minimum, maximum, average, standard deviation) of the data obtained in the research were primarily calculated. Subsequently, the data were analyzed in accordance with the research problems.

Multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA) was calculated for determining whether work life qualities of the lecturers differed significantly according to their gender, age, marital status, the period for their working in the institution, their status of being a manager or not, and their titles.

### 3. Findings

**Table 1:** Distribution of lecturers according to some properties  
(distribution of frequency and percentage)

Variables	Categories	f	%
Gender	Female	71	22,6
	Male	243	77,4
Age	21-25 years old	40	12,7
	26-35 years old	126	40,1
	36-45 years old	105	33,4
	46 years old and above	43	13,7
Marital status	Married	197	62,7
	Single	117	37,3
The period for working in the institution	1-2 years	75	23,9
	3-8 years	130	41,4
	9 years and above	109	34,7
Status of being a manager	Yes	63	20,1
	No	251	79,9
Academic title	Lecturer	151	48,1
	Academician	89	28,3
	Teaching Assistant	74	23,6

When the information in the Table 1 was analyzed, 22.6% (n=71) of the lecturers who participated into the research were male, and 77.4% (n=243) were female. It was determined that 12.7% (n=40) of the lecturers were 21-25 years old, 33.4% (n=105) were 36-45 years old, 13.7% (n=43) were 46 years old and above. In terms of the marital status, 62.7% (n=197) of the lecturers who participated into the research were married, and 37.3% (n=117) were single. It was also specified that 23.9% (n=75) of the participants worked in the institution for 1-2 years, 41.4% (n=130) worked for 3-8 years, 34.7% (n=109) worked for 9 years and above. It was noticed that 20.1% (n=63) of the lecturers had a status of being a manager, and 79.9% (n=251) had no manager status. Among the participants, 48.1% (n=151) had carried on their duties as professor doctor, associate professor doctor, assistant professor doctor, and 28.3% (n=89) worked as academician, and 23.6% (n=74) worked with titles such as teaching assistant research assistant, and expert.

**Table 2:** Descriptive statistics calculated for work life quality levels of lecturers

Scale	Number of items	N	Lowest	Highest	$\bar{X}$	SD	Item Average
Health and safety	3	314	8,00	21,00	16,11	3,19	5,4
Family and economic	3	314	7,00	21,00	14,74	3,12	4,9
Social	2	314	2,00	14,00	9,86	2,51	4,9
Respect	2	314	4,00	14,00	9,94	2,19	5,0
Self-realization	2	314	4,00	14,00	10,01	2,41	5,0
Knowledge	2	314	3,00	14,00	10,13	2,49	5,1
Esthetics	2	314	4,00	14,00	10,10	2,35	5,1
<b>WLQ Total</b>	16	314	56,00	111,00	80,89	10,78	5,1

When the Table 2 was analyzed, it was noticed that health and security scores of the lecturers varied between 8.00 and 21.00, and the average was calculated to be  $16.11 \pm 3.19$ . The average of the scores taken from family and economics sub-dimension was  $14.74 \pm 3.12$ ; the average of social scores was  $9.86 \pm 2.51$ ; the average for respect scores was  $9.94 \pm 2.19$ ; the average for self-realization scores was  $10.01 \pm 2.41$ ; the average for knowledge scores was  $10.13 \pm 2.49$ ; the average for esthetics score was  $10.10 \pm 2.35$ ; and the average for work life quality total scores was calculated to be  $80.89 \pm 10.78$ .

**Table 3:** Descriptive statistics calculated for organizational commitment levels of lecturers

Scale	Number of items	N	Lowest	Highest	$\bar{X}$	SD	Item average
Emotional commitment	6	314	11,00	30,00	22,29	4,44	3,7
Continuance commitment	6	314	8,00	26,00	17,64	3,74	2,9
Normative commitment	6	314	10,00	29,00	20,19	3,89	3,4
<b>Organizational commitment</b>	18	314	33,00	81,00	60,12	8,99	3,3

When the data in the Table 3 were analyzed, it was determined that emotional commitment scores of the lecturers varied between 11.00 and 30.00, and the average was calculated to be  $22.29 \pm 4.44$ . Continuance commitment average score of the lecturers who participated into the research was calculated to be  $17.64 \pm 3.74$ ; and normative commitment average score was  $20.19 \pm 3.89$ ; and average of organizational commitment total scores was calculated to be  $60.12 \pm 8.99$ .



**Table 4:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their genders

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Gender	Health and safety	72,038	1	72,038	7,206	,008	,023
	Family and economic	5,405	1	5,405	,554	,457	---
	Social	,010	1	,010	,002	,969	---
	Respect	1,714	1	1,714	,357	,550	---
	Self-realization	50,254	1	50,254	8,900	,003	,028
	Knowledge	,332	1	,332	,053	,817	---
	Esthetics	5,254	1	5,254	,952	,330	---
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	10,361	1	10,361	,089	,766	---

The health and safety ( $F_{(1,314)}=7.206$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.023$ ) and self-realization ( $F_{(1,314)}=8.900$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.028$ ) scores of the lecturers were determined to vary significantly according to their genders. However; when partial eta squared values were analyzed, the difference was noticed not to be much significant ( $\eta^2\leq 0.20$ ). Average scores of the lecturers in terms of genders were analyzed, and it was found that health and safety scores of the female lecturers were lower than the scores of male lecturers. Moreover, self-realization scores of the female lecturers were determined to be higher rather than the scores of male lecturers.

**Table 5:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their ages

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Age	Health and safety	297,771	3	99,257	10,635	,000	,093
	Family and economics	133,424	3	44,475	4,725	,003	,044
	Social	101,027	3	33,676	5,588	,001	,051
	Respect	74,053	3	24,684	5,374	,001	,049
	Self-realization	206,917	3	68,972	13,321	,000	,114
	Knowledge	208,789	3	69,596	12,450	,000	,108
	Esthetics	154,819	3	51,606	10,170	,000	,090
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	6944,074	3	2314,691	24,389	,000	,191

When the Table 5. was analyzed, health and safety ( $F_{(3,314)}=10.635$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.093$ ), family and economics ( $F_{(3,314)}=4.725$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.044$ ), social ( $F_{(3,314)}=5.588$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.051$ ), respect ( $F_{(3,314)}=5.374$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.049$ ), self-realization ( $F_{(3,314)}=13.321$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;

$\eta^2=0.114$ ), knowledge ( $F_{(3,314)}=12.450$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.108$ ), esthetics ( $F_{(3,314)}=10.170$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.090$ ), and work life quality total scores ( $F_{(3,314)}=24.389$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.191$ ) of the lecturers differed significantly in terms of their ages. When partial eta squared values were analyzed, ages of the lecturers was noticed to be efficient most on work life quality total scores, self-realization and knowledge scores; however, the effect was low ( $\eta^2\leq 0.20$ ).

**Table 6:** The calculated LSD test results for the study quality of life sub-scales, which differ significantly according to the age of the lecturers

Source of variance	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean (I-J)	SE	P	
Family and economics	26-35 age	36-45 age	,070	,568	,902	
		46-and above	-2,197*	,671	,001	
	36-45 age	26-35 age	-,779	,404	,054	
		46-and above	-3,047*	,540	,000	
	Social	21-25 age	26-35 age	-,574	,557	,304
			36-45 age	-,707	,570	,216
		26-35 age	46-and above	-2,329*	,674	,001
			36-45 age	-,133	,405	,742
		36-45 age	46-and above	-1,755*	,542	,001
			46-and above	-1,622*	,555	,004
	Respect	21-25 age	26-35 age	-,836	,446	,061
			36-45 age	-1,454*	,456	,002
26-35 age		46-and above	-1,946*	,539	,000	
		36-45 age	-,617	,324	,058	
36-45 age		46-and above	-1,110*	,434	,011	
		46-and above	-1,092*	,444	,019	
Self-realization	21-25 age	26-35 age	,358	,389	,358	
		36-45 age	-,236	,398	,554	
	26-35 age	46-and above	-1,127*	,471	,017	
		36-45 age	-,594*	,283	,037	
	36-45 age	46-and above	-1,485*	,379	,000	
		46-and above	-,891*	,388	,022	
Knowledge	21-25 age	26-35 age	1,083*	,413	,009	
		36-45 age	,457	,423	,280	
	26-35 age	46-and above	-1,414*	,500	,005	
		36-45 age	-,625*	,301	,038	
	36-45 age	46-and above	-2,496*	,402	,000	
		46-and above	-1,871*	,412	,000	
Knowledge	21-25 age	26-35 age	,287	,429	,504	
		36-45 age	-,757	,439	,086	
		46-and above	-2,137*	,519	,000	

Kürşat Yusuf Aytaç  
 INVESTIGATING THE WORKING LIFE QUALITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT BEHAVIORS OF  
 ACADEMICIANS CARRYING ON DUTIES IN FACULTIES OF SPORTS SCIENCES

	26-35 age	36-45 age	-1,044*	,312	,001
		46-and above	-2,425*	,418	,000
	36-45 age	46-and above	-1,380*	,428	,001
Esthetics		26-35 age	,174	,409	,671
	21-25 age	36-45 age	-,788	,419	,061
		46-and above	-1,862*	,495	,000
	26-35 age	36-45 age	-,962*	,298	,001
		46-and above	-2,035*	,398	,000
	36-45 age	46-and above	-1,074*	,408	,009
Total		26-35 age	1,341	1,768	,449
	21-25 age	36-45 age	-3,414	1,810	,060
		46-and above	-13,012*	2,140	,000
	26-35 age	36-45 age	-4,756*	1,287	,000
		46-and above	-14,353*	1,721	,000
	36-45 age	46-and above	-9,597*	1,764	,000

Multiple comparison LSD test was performed to determine the difference. At the end of the calculation, health and safety, family and economics, social, respect, self-realization, knowledge, esthetics, and work life quality total scores of the lecturers at the age of 46 and above were determined to be higher rather than the scores of lecturers at the age of 21-25, 26-35, and 36-45. Moreover, respect, self-realization, knowledge, esthetics, work life quality total scores of the lecturers at the age of 36-45 was found to be higher rather than the scores of the lecturers at the age of 26-35.

**Table 7:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their marital status

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Marital Status	Health and safety	55,873	1	55,873	5,560	,019	,018
	Family and economics	18,724	1	18,724	1,927	,166	---
	Social	61,114	1	61,114	9,993	,002	,031
	Respect	1,341	1	1,341	,280	,597	---
	Self-realization	3,377	1	3,377	,583	,446	---
	Knowledge	21,016	1	21,016	3,414	,066	---
	Esthetics	10,341	1	10,341	1,878	,172	---
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	925,081	1	925,081	8,144	,005	,025

In accordance with the information in Table 7, family and economics ( $F_{(1,314)}=1.927$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), respect ( $F_{(1,314)}=0.280$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), self-realization ( $F_{(1,314)}=0.583$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), knowledge

( $F_{(1,314)}=3.414$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), esthetics ( $F_{(1,314)}=1.878$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the lecturers were determined to have no significant difference according to their marital status.

It was also determined that health and safety ( $F_{(1,314)}=5.560$ ;  $p<0,05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.018$ ), social ( $F_{(1,314)}=9.993$ ;  $p<0,05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.031$ ) and work life quality ( $F_{(1,314)}=8.144$ ;  $p<0,05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.025$ ) total scores of the lecturers differed significantly according to their marital status; however, when partial eta squared values were analyzed, the difference was noticed not to be too much significant ( $\eta^2\leq 0.20$ ). Average scores were analyzed for determining the difference, and it was found that health and safety, social and work life quality scores of the married lecturers were higher rather than the single lecturers.

**Table 8:** The calculated LSD test results for the study quality of life sub-scales of instructors that differ significantly according to marital status

Source of variance	(I) Marital status	(J) Marital status	mean (I-J)	SE	p
Health and safety	married	single	,872*	,370	,019
Social	married	Single	,912*	,289	,002
Total	married	Single	3,550*	1,244	,005

\* $p<0,05$

The differences between the mean scores in the table were examined and the health and safety, social and working life quality scores of the married lecturers were found to be higher than the single lecturers.

**Table 9:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their period for working in the institution

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Period for working in the institution	Health and safety	379,017	2	189,509	20,959	,000	,119
	Family and economics	98,604	2	49,302	5,193	,006	,032
	Social	1,673	2	,837	,132	,876	---
	Respect	30,440	2	15,220	3,226	,041	,020
	Self-realization	83,207	2	41,603	7,484	,001	,046
	Knowledge	158,590	2	79,295	13,831	,000	,082
	Esthetics	69,501	2	34,750	6,517	,002	,040
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	<b>2529,058</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1264,529</b>	<b>11,623</b>	<b>,000</b>	<b>,070</b>

When the Table 9 was analyzed, it was noticed that social ( $F_{(2,314)}=0.132$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the lecturers did not vary significantly according to their period for working in the institution. Health and safety ( $F_{(2,314)}=20.959$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.119$ ), family and economics ( $F_{(2,314)}=5.193$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.032$ ), respect ( $F_{(2,314)}=3.226$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.020$ ), self-realization

( $F_{(2,314)}=7.484$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.046$ ), knowledge ( $F_{(2,314)}=13.831$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.082$ ), esthetics ( $F_{(2,314)}=6.517$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.040$ ) and work life quality total ( $F_{(2,314)}=11.623$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.070$ ) scores of the lecturers differed significantly according to the period they worked in the institution; however, this difference was determined to be not too much when partial eta squared values were analyzed ( $\eta^2\leq 0.20$ ).

**Table 10:** The calculated LSD test results for the study quality of life sub-scales of the lecturers, which differ significantly from the work period of the institution

Source of variance	(I) Period for working in the institution	(J) Period for working in the institution	Mean (I-J)	SE	P
Health and safety	1-2 years	3-8 years	-,890	,436	,052
		9 years and above	-2,755*	,451	,000
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-1,864*	,391	,000
Family and economics	1-2 years	3-8 years	-,464	,462	,317
		9 years and above	-1,356*	,447	,003
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-,892*	,400	,026
Respect	1-2 years	3-8 years	-,391	,315	,215
		9 years and above	-,819*	,326	,013
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-,427	,282	,131
Self-realization	1-2 years	3-8 years	-,602	,342	,059
		9 years and above	-1,363*	,354	,000
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-,461	,306	,133
Knowledge	1-2 years	3-8 years	,714*	,347	,040
		9 years and above	-,921*	,359	,011
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-1,635*	,311	,000
Esthetics	1-2 years	3-8 years	-,212	,335	,528
		9 years and above	-1,107*	,346	,002
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-,895*	,300	,003
Total	1-2 years	3-8 years	-2,850	1,512	,060
		9 years and above	-7,295*	1,565	,000
	3-8 years	9 years and above	-4,445*	1,355	,001

\* $p<0,05$

As result of the multiple-comparison LSD test performed for the difference, health and safety, family and economics, knowledge, esthetics and work life quality total scores of the lecturers working in the institution for 9 years and above were found to be higher rather than the lecturers who worked in the institution for 1-2 years and 3-8 years. Respect and self-realization scores of the lecturers who worked in the institution for 9 years and above were determined to be higher rather than the lecturers who worked in the institution for 3-8 years.

**Table 11:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their status of being a manager

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Status of being a manager	Health and safety	57,855	1	57,855	5,761	,017	,018
	Family and economics	41,386	1	41,386	4,290	,039	,014
	Social	29,628	1	29,628	4,766	,030	,015
	Respect	59,658	1	59,658	12,942	,000	,040
	Self-realization	19,827	1	19,827	3,452	,064	---
	Knowledge	2,305	1	2,305	,371	,543	---
	Esthetics	13,197	1	13,197	2,401	,122	---
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	1354,996	1	1354,996	12,075	,001	,037

When the data in the Table 11 were analyzed, it was determined that self-realization ( $F_{(1,314)}=3.452$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), knowledge ( $F_{(1,314)}=0.371$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), and esthetics ( $F_{(1,314)}=2.401$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the lecturers did not vary significantly according to their status of being a manager.

According to the participants' status of being a manager, it was noticed that health and safety ( $F_{(1,314)}=5.761$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.018$ ), family and economics ( $F_{(1,314)}=4.290$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.014$ ), social ( $F_{(1,314)}=4.766$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.015$ ), respect ( $F_{(1,314)}=12.942$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.040$ ) and work life quality total ( $F_{(1,314)}=12.075$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.037$ ) scores had a significant difference; however, the difference was determined not to be too significant when partial eta squared values were analyzed ( $\eta^2\leq,20$ ). Average scores were analyzed for determining the difference, and it was specified that health and safety, family and economics, social, respect and work life quality total scores of the participants with the status of being a manager were higher rather than the ones who had no status of being a manager.

**Table 12:** The calculated LSD test results for the study quality of life sub-scales which differ significantly according to the managerial status of the lecturers

Source of variance	(I) Managerial	(J) Managerial	Mean (I-J)	SE	p
Health and safety	Yes	No	1,072*	,447	,017
Family and economics	Yes	No	,907*	,438	,039
Social	Yes	No	,767*	,351	,030
Respect	Yes	No	1,088*	,303	,000
Total	Yes	No	5,187*	1,493	,001

According to the information in the table, it was determined that the total scores of health and safety, family and economic, social, respect and working quality of life of the

teaching staff, who are the managerial task, are higher than those who do not have managerial duty.

**Table 13:** MANOVA results calculated for work life quality sub-scale average scores of lecturers according to their titles

Source of variance	Dependent variables	Sum of squares	SD	Average of squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
Title	Health and safety	19,453	2	9,727	,954	,386	---
	Family and economics	178,388	2	89,194	9,656	,000	,058
	Social	103,757	2	51,878	8,649	,000	,053
	Respect	,482	2	,241	,050	,951	---
	Self-realization	11,512	2	5,756	,994	,371	---
	Knowledge	25,518	2	12,759	2,071	,128	---
	Esthetics	18,511	2	9,256	1,684	,187	---
	<b>WLQ Total</b>	1207,368	2	603,684	5,340	,005	,033

When the data in the Table 13. were analyzed, it was determined that health and safety ( $F_{(2,314)}=0.954$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), respect ( $F_{(2,314)}=0.050$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), self-realization ( $F_{(2,314)}=0.994$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), knowledge ( $F_{(2,314)}=2.071$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) and esthetics ( $F_{(2,314)}=1.684$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the lecturers did not differ significantly according to their titles.

Moreover, it was also specified that family and economics ( $F_{(2,314)}=9.656$ ;  $p<0,05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.058$ ), social ( $F_{(2,314)}=8.649$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.053$ ) and work life quality total ( $F_{(2,314)}=5.340$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.033$ ) scores of the lecturers were determined to differ significantly according to their titles. When partial eta squared values were analyzed, the difference between the groups was noticed not to be too significant ( $\eta^2\leq 0.20$ ).

**Table 14:** The calculated LSD test results for the study quality of life sub-scales differ significantly according to the titles of the lecturers

Source of variance	(I) Title	(J) Title	Mean (I-J)	SE	p
Family and economics	Lecturer	Expert	-,023	,406	,955
		Assistant	1,767*	,431	,000
	Expert	Assistant	1,790*	,478	,000
Social	Lecturer	Expert	,361	,327	,271
		Assistant	1,440*	,348	,000
	Expert	Assistant	1,079*	,385	,005
Total	Lecturer	Expert	2,376	1,421	,095
		Assistant	4,851*	1,509	,001

Expert	Assistant <sub>2,474</sub> 1,673,140
--------	--------------------------------------

\*p<0,05

Multivariate LSD test was performed to determine the difference. At the end of the test calculation, assistants (research assistant, lecturer, and expert) were noticed to have lower family and economics scores rather than the lecturers and academicians (assistant professor, associate professor, professor). Furthermore, social and work life quality total scores of the assistants were noticed to be lower rather than the academicians.

**Table 15:** MANOVA results calculated according to the average scores of organizational commitment subscales according to age of lecturers

Source of Variance	Dependent variables	Ss	sd	sq	F	p	η <sup>2</sup>
Age	Emotional commitment	505,666	3	168,555	9,210	,000	,082
	Continued commitment	10,881	3	3,627	,257	,856	---
	Normative commitment	44,538	3	14,846	,981	,402	---
	Organizational commitment	859,455	3	286,485	3,635	,013	,034

According to the information in the table, it was determined that the attendance of the instructors did not show a significant difference according to the age of the teachers ( $F(3,314) = 0,257$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ) and normative commitment ( $F(3,314) = 0,981$ ;  $p > 0,05$ ) The emotional commitment according to the ages of the instructors ( $F(3,314) = 9,210$ ,  $p < 0,05$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0,082$ ) and organizational commitment ( $F(3,314) = 3,635$ ;  $p < 0,05$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0,034$ ) It has been identified. Multiple comparison LSD tests were calculated to determine which age groups the difference is between and the results are shown in the Table.

**Table 16:** The calculated LSD test results for the organizational commitment subscales differ significantly according to the age of the lecturers

Dependent variables	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean (I-J)	SE	p	
Organizational commitment		36-45 age	-2,248*	,795	,005	
		46-and above	-4,777*	,940	,000	
	26-35 age	36-45 age	-,535	,565	,345	
		46-and above	-3,064*	,756	,000	
	36-45 age	46-and above	-2,529*	,775	,001	
		26-35 age	-3,059	1,611	,059	
	21-25 age	36-45 age	-2,265	1,649	,051	
		46-and above	-6,424*	1,950	,001	
		26-35 age	36-45 age	-,206	1,173	,860
			46-and above	-3,365*	1,568	,033
	36-45 age	46-and above	-3,158	1,607	,052	

\*p<0,05



As you can see in the table, 21-25 year old teaching staff; it was found that the emotional loyalty of the other lecturers was lower and the lecturers at the age of 46 and above were higher. Similarly, it was determined that the organizational loyalty of the lecturers at age 46 and above was 21-25 years old and higher than the lecturers 26-35 years old.

**Table 17:** The relationships between work life quality and organizational commitment of lecturers

	Values	Health and safety	Family and economic	Social	Respect	Self-realization	Knowledge	Esthetics	WLQ
<b>Organizational Commitment</b>	r	,085	,172**	,244**	,114*	,087	,032	,220**	,230**
	p	,133	,002	,000	,043	,125	,576	,000	,000
	N	314	314	314	314	314	314	314	314

p\* $<$ 0.05; p\*\* $<$ 0.01

When the data in the Table 17 were analyzed, it was determined that there was no significant relationship between health and safety ( $r=0.085$ ;  $p>0.05$ ), self-realization ( $r=0.087$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) and the need for knowledge ( $r=0.032$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) scores of the lecturers who participated into the research and their organizational commitment levels. It was also noticed that there were positive but low level significant relationships between family and economics ( $r=0.172$ ;  $p<0.01$ ), social ( $r=0.244$ ;  $p<0.01$ ), respect ( $r=0.114$ ;  $p<0.05$ ), esthetics ( $r=0.220$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) and work life quality ( $r=0.230$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) total scores.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

In the light of the data obtained from the research, it was determined that work life quality levels of the academicians, in general, were slightly above the medium level ( $\bar{X}=5.1$ ) according to the average scores related to the sub-dimensions and general of the work life quality scale performed to the academicians carrying on their duties in faculties of sports sciences. When average scores related to the sub-dimensions were analyzed, whereas "Health and Safety" ( $\bar{X}=5.4$ ) sub-dimension ranked the first, "Social" ( $\bar{X}=4.9$ ) sub-dimension ranked the last. Similarly, in their study upon health employees, Saygılı et al. (2016) reported that the employees regarded the dimensions of Occupational Accident, Occupational Diseases Risk, and Physical Working Conditions in the Workplace much in terms of work life quality dimensions. When the literature

was reviewed, it was noticed to be mentioned that safe and healthy working conditions had important effects upon work life quality (Orpen, 1981:18, Stein, 1983:74, Bertrand, 1992:63, Harrison, 2000:25). In fact, health and safety is the leading for the human needs; maintenance of a productive and healthy life can be provided through administering health rights in the workplace, providing safety in the workplace and protection against diseases and injuries in the workplace.

According to the descriptive statistics calculated in accordance with the answers given by the lecturers for the scale items in order to determine organizational commitment levels, it was determined that organizational commitment levels of the lecturers was at a medium level ( $\bar{X}=3.3$ ), and they participated much in the dimension of emotional commitment ( $\bar{X}=3.7$ ). In terms of the importance of these dimensions, the most intended ranking for the employees to have emotional commitment, as the last (Brown, 2003:84). These results can be arisen from academicians being consistent with the individual and organizational targets and values and their considering their work not just a profession but also a life style. In his study upon the academicians, Koç (2017) determined that organizational commitments of the academicians were at a high level. When the average values were analyzed, it was determined that emotional commitment was the leading, and normative and continuance commitments were the subsequent. These results were parallel with the results of our study. (Koç, 2017:169). In the research carried out by Boylu et al. (2007:65) upon organizational commitment levels of the academicians, the expressions academicians agreed the most were the ones related to the emotional commitment; and the expressions related to normative and continuance commitment were the subsequent. Organizational commitment had an effect increasing job satisfaction and decreasing the absence of employees (Valentine et al., 2002:352). Due to these effects, organizational commitment is a factor providing contributions for the organization providing employees to adopt the profits of the organization (Çap, 2016:19).

According to the analysis results performed for the gender as one of the demographical variables for the academicians included within the scope of the research, no significant difference was found, in general, in work life quality levels of female and male academicians; however, significant difference was determined in health and safety sub-dimension in favor of male academicians, and in self-realization sub-dimension in favor of female academicians. These significant differences could be expressed to be arisen from the social roles of especially females and personality traits of males and females. In reference to this, females could be mentioned to need self-realization due to their social positions and the problems they encountered in keeping their position at work and promoting.

In terms of the age of the participants, the variable was noticed to differ significantly in general and all sub-dimensions of the work life quality scale. In calculation for determining the difference, it was determined that health and safety, family and economics, social, respect, self-realization, knowledge, esthetics and work life quality total scores of the academicians at the age of 46 and above were determined to be higher rather than the ones at the age of 21-25, 26-35, and 36-45; and furthermore, respect, self-realization, knowledge, esthetics and work life quality total scores of the academicians at the age of 36-45 were higher rather than the ones at the age of 26-35. This determined result (Ssesanga and Garrett, 2005:49, Rose et al., 2006:64, Koonmee and Virakul, 2012:41, Erdem and Kaya, 2015:144) was parallel with the results in the literature. In the light of these data, it was possible to mention that age of the academicians directly affected their work life quality levels, and as the age increased, their work life quality increased in parallel. High work life quality of the academicians with high age level could be mentioned to be arisen from the self-confidence and experience due to their increased age. In his study, Balay (2000:20) expressed that old individuals felt more satisfaction while carrying on their duties rather than the younger ones because they trusted their own and own experiences more.

When the results calculated according to the work life quality of the academicians in terms of their marital status were analyzed, it was determined that difference, though not too much significant, was determined in favor of married academicians in health and safety and satisfaction of social needs sub-dimensions, and work life quality total scores. Familial responsibilities of the academicians and their sensitivity towards taking time for their life out of work could be related to these results. These results were similar with the findings obtained in the study carried out by Rose et al. (2006:64) indicating that work life quality of the married employees was higher rather than the work life qualities of single employees.

As result of the calculation of participants' period for working in the institution, no significant difference was obtained in only the sub-dimension of satisfaction of social needs ( $F(2.314)=0.132$ ;  $p>0.05$ ); however, significant differences were found in other sub-dimensions and general work life quality scores. As result of the multivariate LSD test performed for the difference, it was determined that health and safety, family and economics, knowledge, esthetic needs and work life quality total scores of the academicians working in the institutions for 9 years and above were higher rather than the ones working for 1-2 years and 3-8 years. Respect and self-realization needs scores of the academicians carrying on their duties in the institution for 9 years and above was found to be higher rather than the ones working for 3-8 years. In other words, as the period for working in the institution increased, work life qualities of the academicians

were noticed to increase, as well. This difference could be associated with academicians considering themselves as a part of the institution due to their getting accustomed to their institutions, their feeling positive towards their institution and their having the possibility of promotion. To sum up, as the period for working increased, profits obtained from the organization increased, as well (Cohen, 1993:144), and the longer employees worked in the organization, the more possibility they had to be promoted (Balay, 2000:20). As similar to the literature, satisfaction of the individuals towards their organization became higher as the period for working there became longer. Namely, employees' working in an organization for a long time provided them to have higher work life quality (Judge and Bretz, 1994:43, Gürsel et al., 2003:8, Rose et al., 2006:61).

As result of the analysis performed for the general scale and work life quality sub-scale average scores of the academicians according to their status of being a manager, it was determined that there was only significant difference in terms of health and safety, family and economics, social need, respect need and work life quality total ( $F(1.314)=12.075$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.037$ ) scores; however, the difference between the groups was not too significant (Table). It was noticed in analyzed differences that health and safety, family and economics, social, respect, and work life quality total scores of the academicians with the status of being a manager were higher rather than the ones who had no status of being a manager. This differences could be considered to be arisen from manager academicians' meeting their moral and material needs more easily due to the status managing as a decision-making organ provided for them. The findings of the research carried out by Erbil (2016:97) upon the working individuals were partly similar with the findings of our research; the researcher reported that work life quality scores of the employees assigned in managing and educational services were more positive rather than the other employees.

Work life quality sub-scale average scores were analyzed according to the titles of the academicians; and it was determined that family and economics ( $F(2.314)=9.656$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.058$ ), social need ( $F(2.314)=8.649$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.053$ ) and work life quality total ( $F(2.314)=5.340$ ;  $p<0.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.033$ ) scores of the academicians differed significantly according to titles. It was found that family and economics scores of the assistants (research assistant, teaching assistant, expert) were lower than the scores of lecturers and academicians (assistant professor, associate professor, professor). Furthermore, social and work life quality total scores of the assistants were determined to be at a lower level rather than the academicians. This could be considered to be arisen from assistants' having lower occupational security, having more working tempo, and taking dissatisfactory lower salaries. When the relevant literature was reviewed, the variable of title was revealed to be an important variable related to various attitudes towards the

institution and organizational behaviors. For example, in their research, Ermiş et al. (2015:530) determined that organizational commitments of the academicians were significantly higher rather than the lecturers.

Yılmaz (1990:17) reported that job security fairly affected the productivity of employees, and looking to the future with confidence at a workplace affected the productivity of employees, and increased their work life quality. Similarly, Afşar (2011:248) concluded in his study that as the academic title of the academicians increased, their work life quality, increased, as well.

The relationships between work life qualities and organizational commitments of the academicians were analyzed, and it was determined that there was no significant relationship between organizational commitment levels in health and safety, self-realization and knowledge need sub-dimensions. There was a positive but low level relationship between family and economics, social need, respect need, esthetic need dimensions and general work life quality total scores and organizational commitment. In other words, as the family and economics, social, respect, esthetic satisfaction levels and work life quality level of the academicians increased, their organizational commitment increased, as well. The result indicating that there was a positive relationship between work life quality and organizational commitment was supported by the relevant literature (Camarata, 1997: 108, Gnanayudam and Dharmasiri, 2007:136, Normala, 2010:79, Farjad and Varnous, 2013:455, Gül et al., 2014:29, Yalçın et al., 2016:410). In reference to this, as the work life qualities of the individuals increased, their commitment to their organization increased, and they felt more belonging to their organization. Meeting the needs of employees as a factor of work life quality causes employees' developing a strong feeling of belonging towards their organization (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002:712).

In conclusion, it was determined that work life quality levels of the academicians included within the scope of the research were slightly above the medium level, and they presented organizational commitment levels at a medium level. Furthermore, it was also specified that as the age levels and the period for working in the institution as the demographical variables increased, the work life quality increased, as well; and social and work life quality total scores of the assistants were lower rather than the academicians. Besides, as the work life quality of the participants increased, their organizational commitment increased positively. For that reason, the academicians with the status of being a manager have been suggested to carry out activities for increasing the work life qualities considering the negative factors affecting assistants. In fact, educationalists' being a successful and efficient employee has been one of the most important indicators for achieving success in their educational organizations.

Educational environments where work life quality is not adequate affect the works of educationalists, and also affect their relationships, motivations, job satisfaction, commitment towards the organization and work life balance (Bolduc, 2002:137).

## References

1. Afşar, S.T. (2011). Çalışma yaşam kalitesinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyi üzerindeki etkisi: Devlet ve vakıf üniversitelerinde çalışan akademisyenler üzerine nicel bir araştırma. Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.
2. Afşar, S.T. (2015). Akademisyenlerin çalışma yaşam kalitesini Hacettepe Üniversitesi üzerinden okumak. Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi, 13(50), 134-173.
3. Ağca, V. ve Ertan, H. (2008). Çalışanların Örgütsel Bağlılıklarının Demografik Özelliklerine Bağlı Olarak Değişmesi: Antalya'da Beş Yıldızlı Otellerde Bir İnceleme. Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 22, 389-408.
4. Balay, R. (2000). Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerde Örgütsel Bağlılık. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
5. Beh, L. ve Rose, R.C. (2007). Linking QWL and Job Performance: Implications for Organizations. Performance Improvement, 46(6), 30-35.
6. Bertrand, J. (1992). Designing quality into work life. Quality Progress, 25(6), 29-33.
7. Bolduc, R.R. (2002). An Analysis of the Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Motivation for Correctional Services Officers In The Montreal Area. Ph.D. Thesis. McGill University Canada.
8. Bolhari, A., Rezaeean, A., Bolhari, J., Bairamzadeh, S. ve Soltan, A.A. (2011). The Relationship between Quality of Work Life and Demographic Characteristics of Information Technology Staffs. International Conference on Computer Communication and Management, IACSIT Press, Vol. 5, Singapore: 374-378.
9. Boylu, Y., Pelit, E. ve Güçer, E. (2007). Akademisyenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma. Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar, 44(511), 55-74.
10. Brown, B.B. (2003), Employees' Organizational Commitment and Their Perception of Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behaviors, Ph.D. Thesis, Unpublished Dissertation, Falls Church, Virginia.
11. Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1994). Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış. (9. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

12. Camarata, M.R.M. (1997). An Empirical Investigation of The Effects Of Quality Of Work Life (QWL) And Organizational Citizen Behavior (OCB) On Service Quality (SERVQUAL). Ph.D. Thesis. Virginia Commonwealth University.
13. Çınar V, Akbulut T, Öner S, Pancar Z, Karaman M.E(2016) An Investigation Of Healty Life Style Behaviors Of Turkish Wrestling Federation Coaches. International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21
14. Cohen, A. (1993). Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 14(2), 143-159.
15. Çap, H. (2016). Takım Spor Antrenörleri Ve Gemi Adamlarının İş Tatmin ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeylerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
16. Demir, M. (2011). İş görenlerin Çalışma Yaşamı Kalitesi Algılamalarının İşte Kalma Niyeti ve İşe Devamsızlık ile İlişkisi. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 11(3), 453-464.
17. Dikmetaş, E. (2006). Hastane Personelinin Çalışma / İş Yaşam Kalitesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(2), 169-182.
18. Erbil, D.D. (2016). Evli ve Çalışan Bireylerin Çalışma Yaşam Kalitesinin Evlilik Uyumuna Etkisi. Yüksek lisans tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
19. Erdem, B. ve Kaya, İ. (2015). Çalışma Yaşamı Kalitesini Etkileyen Faktörlerin İşgörenler Tarafından Algılanması: Otel Çalışanları Üzerinde Bir Araştırma. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 35(35),135-150.
20. Ermiş S.A, Gökyürek B, Yenel F, M.Y.Şahin. (2015) The Examining Of the Academics 'S Level on the Different Variables of Organizational Commitment: Sample of Physical Education, Science, Movement and Health, 15 (2): 528-533
21. Farjad, H.R. ve Varnous, S. (2013). Study of relationship of quality of work life (QWL) and organizational commitment. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(9), 449-456.
22. Gnanayudam, J. ve Dharmasiri, A. (2007). The influence of quality of work-life on organizational commitment: a study of the apparel industry. *Sri Lankan Journal of Management*, 12 (3,4).
23. Gül, G., Bol, P., Selçuk, N. ve Erbaycu, A.E. (2014). Çalışma Yaşam Kalitesinin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyi Üzerine Etkisi: Bir Eğitim Araştırma Hastanesi Örneği. *Is, Güç: The Journal Of Industrial Relations & Human Resources*, 16(4), 17-30.

24. Gürsel, M., İzgar, H., Altınok, V. ve Kesici, Ş. (2003). Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi İş Doyumu, Star Ofset Basım: Konya.
25. Harrison, G. (2000). The measurement of quality of work life in SA companies. *People Dynamics*, 18, 23-25.
26. Judge, T.A. ve Bretz, R.D. (1994). Political influence behavior and career success. *Journal of Management*, 20(1), 43-65.
27. Kırtepe A, Karaman M.E. (2017) Investigation of Health Life Style Behaviors of Women Who Are In Gym for Recreational Purpose. *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport – July 2017 Volume 6, Issue 3*
28. Koç, M. (2017). Research on Correlations between Academicians' Levels of Organisational Commitment and Their Intention to Quit Their Job: A Comparison of State and Foundation Universities. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 7(1): 163-173. doi:10.5539/jel.v7n1p163
29. Koonmee, K., ve Virakul, B. (2012). Ethics, Quality of Work life, and Employee job-related outcomes: A survey of HR and Marketing Managers in Thai Businesses. *NIDA Development Journal*, 47(4), 67-97.
30. Mathieu, J.E. ve Zajac, D.M. (1990). A Review and Meta-Analysis Of The Antecedents, Correlates, And Consequences Of Organizational Commitment, *Psychological Bulletin*. 108(2), 171-194.
31. Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace, theory research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
32. Mowday, R., Steers, R. ve Porter, L. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
33. Normala, D. (2010). Investigating the relationship between quality of work life and organizational commitment amongst employees in Malaysian firms. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(10), 75-82.
34. Orpen, C. (1981). The conceptualization of quality of working life. *Perspectives in Industrial Psychology*, 7, 36- 69.
35. Ölçüm, Ç.M. (2004). *Örgüt kültürü ve örgütsel bağlılık*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
36. Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). Algılanan Örgütsel Destek ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi* 18(2), 113-130.
37. Özkalp, E. ve Kirel, Ç. (1999). *Örgütsel Davranış*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
38. Özkalp, E. ve Kirel, Ç. (2001). *Örgütsel Davranış*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.



39. Rhoades, L. ve Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
40. Rose, R. C., Beh, L. Uli J. ve Idris. K. (2006). Quality of Work Life: Implications of Career Dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 61-67.
41. Saygılı, M., Avcı, K. ve Sönmez, S. (2016). Sağlık Çalışanlarının Çalışma Yaşam Kalitesine İlişkin Bir Değerlendirme: Bir Kamu Hastanesi Örneği. *International Journal of Social Science*, 52, 437-451.
42. Sirgy, M.J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., ve Lee, D.J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social indicators research*, 55(3), 241-302.
43. Ssesanga, K. ve Garrett, R.M. (2005). Job Satisfaction of University Academics: Perspectives from Uganda. *Higher Education*, 50(1), 33-56.
44. Stein, B.A. (1983). *Quality of work life in action: managing for effectiveness*. New York: American Management Association.
45. Tınar, M.Y. (1996). *Çalışma Psikolojisi*. Birinci Baskı, İzmir.
46. Turan, F. (2006). *İşyerlerinde Psikolojik Yıldırma Olgusu Ve Konuya İlişkin Bir Araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
47. Türkay, O. (2015). *Çalışma Yaşamı Kalitesinin İş Memnuniyeti ve Bağlılık Üzerine Etkileri: Seyahat Acentaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. *Yönetim Ve Ekonomi Dergisi*, 22(1), 239-256.
48. Uygur, A. (2007). *Örgütsel Bağlılık ile İş gören Performansı İlişkinin İncelemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Araştırması*. *Ticaret Ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 71-85.
49. Valentine, S., Godkin, L. ve Lucero, M. (2002). Ethical Context, Organizational Commitment, and Person-Organization Fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41(4), 349-360.
50. Yalçın, A. ve İplik, F.N. (2005). Beş Yıldızlı Otellerde Çalışanların Demografik Özellikleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkiyi Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(1), 395-412.
51. Yalçın, S., Yıldırım, İ. ve Akan, D. (2016). Öğretmenlerin İş Yaşam Kaliteleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Journal of Education Faculty*, 18(1), 205-224.
52. Yılmaz, S. (1990). Türkiye’de Verimlilik Sorunları ve MPM’nin Verimliliğe Katkıları. *Verimlilik Dergisi*. 10(48), 27-35.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).