MJSS

Akdeniz Spor Bilimleri Dergisi

Mediterranean Journal of Sport Science

ISSN 2667-5463

The Effect Of Digital Leadership On Psychological Comfort

Veysel ALBAYRAK

Munzur University, Faculty of Sport Science, Tunceli/Türkiye

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38021asbid.1345149

ORİGİNAL ARTICLE

Abstract

This study aims to examine the effect of digital leadership on academicians working in the field of sports sciences on their psychological comfort. The population of the study consists of academicians working in the field of Sports Sciences in Turkey, the sample consists of 378 academicians working in the field of Sports Sciences in Turkey. The study included 113 professors, 86 associate professors, 63 asst. Prof. doctors, 60 lecturers, and 56 research assistants. The study group was determined by the random sampling method. The Digital Leadership Scale developed by Bilginoğlu and Yozgat (2023) and the Psychological Comfort Scale developed by Yener (2015) were used as data collection tools. In the data analysis, frequency distribution was used to determine the features, a t-test was used to examine the relationship between two independent variables and a one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between more than two variables. The difference between the variables was interpreted based on the significance level $p<0.05$. There is no significant difference between the gender variable and the psychological comfort and digital leadership scales when the research findings are examined. There are significant differences between age and title variables and psychological comfort and digital leadership. On the other hand, while there was a significant difference between psychological comfort levels in working years and daily digital device usage periods, there was no significant difference between digital leadership levels.

Keywords: Sports, Academician, Digital Leadership, Psychological Comfort.

Corresponding Author:
Veysel ALBAYRAK
albayrakvysl@gmail.com

Dijital Liderliğin Psikolojik Rahatlığa Etkisi

Öz

Bu çalışma, dijital liderliğin spor bilimleri alanında çalışan akademisyenlerin psikolojik rahatlıkları üzerindeki etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmanın evrenini Türkiye'de Spor Bilimleri alanında görev yapan akademisyenler, örneklemini ise Türkiye'de Spor Bilimleri alanında görev yapan 378 akademisyen oluşturmaktadır. Çalışmaya 113 Profesör, 86 Doçent, 63 doktor öğretim üyesi, 60 öğretim görevlisi ve 56 araştırma görevlisi katılmıştır. Çalışma grubu tesadüfi örnekleme yöntemi ile belirlenmiştir. Veri toplama aracı olarak Bilginoğlu ve Yozgat (2023) tarafından geliştirilen Dijital Liderlik Ölçeği ve Yener (2015) tarafından geliştirilen Psikolojik Rahatlık Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Verilerin analizinde özellikleri belirlemek için frekans dağılımı, iki bağımsız değişken arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için t-testi ve ikiden fazla değişken arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılmıştır. Değişkenler arasındaki fark $p<0,05$ anlamlılık düzeyine göre yorumlandı. Araştırma bulguları incelendiğinde cinsiyet değişkeni ile psikolojik rahatlık ve dijital liderlik ölçekleri arasında anlamlı bir fark yoktur. Yaş ve unvan değişkenleri ile psikolojik rahatlık ve dijital liderlik arasında anlamlı farklılıklar vardır. Öte yandan, çalışma yılları ile günlük dijital cihaz kullanım sürelerine göre psikolojik rahatlık düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunurken, dijital liderlik düzeyleri arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmadı.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Spor, Akademisyen, Dijital Liderlik, Psikolojik Rahatlık.

Received:
17.08.2023

Accepted:
10.10.2023

Online Publishing:
29.10.2023

Introduction

Leadership has emerged as a phenomenon of interest throughout human history. Leadership is also an important concept in terms of the struggle for the existence of organizations. Yukl (2009) looked at leadership from a broad perspective and defined it as a social process that affects the interpretation of internal and external events, the choice of purpose, the organization of activities, individual motivations and abilities, and power relations of the members of a group.

In the post-modern era, unlike in previous ages, leaders should be role models for others, constantly learn, have a vision of the future, respect the members of the organization and try to bring the organization to its best performance, have an innovative perspective, adapt to change very quickly, empathize, be motivating, act differently, leave their comfort zones, and when necessary, break the traditional patterns of the organization they lead (Prentice, 2013). This change around organizations has pushed organizations to search for different leadership, and after 1980 post-modern leadership theories emerged. One of the most recent post-modern leadership theories is digital leadership.

Digital leadership is a type of leadership that, in the case of the Internet, encompasses the ability to use digital tools, and mobile devices, and personalize technology for its purpose (Sheninger, 2014). Digital leaders are leaders who have a global perspective, and digital literacy, can collaborate with different groups, are open to innovations, active and determined. Also, the digital leader can be defined as a digital leader who dominates digital technology and is a continuous learner, who uses digital technology in management processes, who uses it efficiently by the goals and objectives of the organization, and who brings together strategy, culture, technology, communication, and data to realize them (Mert, 2021).

Digital leadership is a quest and a call to transform the culture of a school into one that will unleash the creativity of students so that they can create learning works that exhibit conceptual mastery. In addition, digital leadership is to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and confidence to succeed in education, careers, and jobs that have not yet been created. Teachers, students, networks, connections, media, resources, and tools; creates a unique entity that has the potential to respond to individual learners, educators, and even societal needs (Gerstein, 2013; Pagatpatan, 2019). Digital leaders may not use digital technology very well, but leaders who guide people with high competence in the digital field in achieving the goals of the organization are also leaders with a digital leadership spirit (Asri and Darma, 2021).

Those born digitally or the children of the digital age, which we can call Generation Z, are individuals of future societies. The way of education, perspective, behavior patterns, scientificity,

attitude to life, habits, and personal characteristics of the individuals of this age will be shaped in the light of the digital education they receive, and the developed societies and countries that foresee this change and transformation are very interested in this. For this reason, education digitalization has become a public policy and has become the most important part of education policies (Parlak, 2017). To create, implement and maintain the new education policies that emerge, the digital competencies of the academicians and the digital leadership levels should be at a good level. Educators who are not at a good level or who can not at a good level can feel bad, inadequate, and anxious.

Edmondson (2003) defines Psychological Comfort as "interpersonal anxiety that individuals perceive in their workspaces". The reactions of other employees in the form of the individual saying his opinion on any subject, asking questions, giving feedback, bringing up mistakes, and putting forward a new idea draw the framework of the perception of psychological comfort in the organization and ensure the formation of a positive or negative psychological comfort perception. Yener (2015b) on the other hand, emphasizes that the reactions expressed at points such as expressing an individual's opinion, asking questions, giving feedback on any subject, and expressing situations or mistakes that he does not like affect the perception of psychological comfort positively or negatively. The perception of psychological comfort is not accepted as a concept by individuals, but as a general perception that all members of the organization feel and share (Kahn, 1990: 694). At some point, the perception of psychological comfort is a reflection of inner peace in the working environment (Edmondson, 2002).

For the perception of psychological comfort to occur within the organization, there must be an interpersonal relationship and interaction process and employees must have access to an experience at this point (Şakar and Kızılkaya Namlı, 2023). This experience is an important factor in the positive and negative shaping of the psychological comfort perception that occurs as a result of individuals observing the reactions of others (Yener, 2015). Supportive and positive relationships between corporate practices, leadership, and employees are among the factors that positively affect the perception of psychological comfort (Newman et al., 2017). At the same time, respect and tolerance are also mentioned as important factors in shaping the perception of psychological comfort positively (Yener, 2015b). Baer and Frese (2003) add empathy to these factors.

In light of this information, it can be said that academicians with good digital leadership will be good both in developing themselves scientifically and in transferring this information to their students, and therefore they will have a positive effect on the anxiety levels in their fields of study. In this context, this study, it is aimed to measure the digital leadership and psychological comfort levels of academicians working in the field of sports sciences in Turkey.

Materials and Methods

Research Model

The study is designed in the relational screening model from quantitative research methods. Relational scans are investigations that are carried out without interfering with the relationship between two or more variables. It is aimed to describe the relationship between the variables as it is (Büyüköztürk, 2017).

Research Group (universe-sample)

The population of the study consists of academicians working in the field of Sports Sciences in Turkey, the sample consists of 378 academicians working in the field of Sports Sciences in Turkey. 113 professors, 86 associate professors, 63 asst. Prof. doctors, 60 lecturers, and 56 research assistants participated in our study. There are 2643 academicians actively working in the basic field of sports sciences when the academic data of the Higher Education Board are examined. In the study, the appropriate sampling method was preferred from the non-random sampling types. The sample size was determined by the G*Power 3.1.9.7 power analysis program. In the power analysis, a medium-sized (correlation ρ H1 = 0.2) relationship, α error 0.05, and power (1-β err probe) 0.95 values were selected and the total sample size was determined as at least 319 people. This study was conducted with the decision of Munzur University Non-Interventional Research Ethics Committee No. 2023/09 and dated 05/07/2023.

Data Collection Tools

In our study, the personal information form, the Digital Leadership Scale Turkish form (DLST) developed by Bilginoğlu and Yozgat (2023), and the Psychological Comfort Scale Turkish form (PCST) developed by Yener (2015) were used to determine the personal information of the participants.

The Turkish form of the Digital Leadership Scale developed by Bilginoğlu and Yozgat (2023) consists of 8 questions of 5-point Likert type. The total reliability coefficient of the scale was determined as .925.

The form of Psychological Comfort Scale Turkish developed by Yener (2015) consists of 7 questions of 5 Likert type and 2 sub-dimensions. The form of Psychological Comfort Scale Turkish developed by Yener (2015) consists of 7 questions of 5 Likert type and 2 sub-dimensions.

Tablo 1

Psychological Comfort Scale and Digital Leadership Scale Normality Analyses

	Statistic	**Std. Error**

Tolerance	Mean	10,7090	,13533
	Skewness	-,698	,125
	Kurtosis	,070	,250
Initiative	Mean	13,1693	,15950
	Skewness	-,415	,125
	Kurtosis	-,117	,250
PCST	Mean	23,8783	,26528
	Skewness	-,415	,125
	Kurtosis	-,179	,250
DLST	Mean	32,0529	,45759
	Skewness	-,265	,125
	Kurtosis	-,433	,250

It was found that Skewness (Distortion) and Kurtosis (Flatness) values were in the range of -1.5 to +1.5 in the total score of all sub-dimensions and scales when the results of the academic Psychological Comfort Scale and the academic Digital Leadership Scale normality test were examined in Table 1. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) mentioned in their study that the normality test of the data of research studies in the social field should be determined by looking at the Skewness and Kurtosis values. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) stated that Skewness and Kurtosis values in the range of -1.5 to +1.5 show a normal distribution of data and therefore parametric tests should be used.

Data collection

Participants were contacted using the Google Forms online survey collection method from the collection of data. After the voluntary consent form was filled out, the scale questions related to the study were filled out.

Research Ethics

The study was conducted by Munzur University Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee on 05.07.2023; It was decided by a majority of votes that it was in compliance with the ethical rules. Resolution number: 2023/09.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained from the Digital Leadership Scale and Psychological Comfort Scales were transferred to the SPSS 22.00 program and the percentage and frequency values of the variables determined in line with the study were determined. A normality test was performed to determine the tests deemed appropriate in the study. As a result of the normality test, skewness, and kurtosis values were examined. When the normality values are examined, it is deemed appropriate to use

parametric tests. In this respect, the independent samples t-test was used for gender and marital status variables and the one-way variance (ANOVA) test was used for age, title, working year, and daily technological device usage time variables. Pearson correlation test was used to determine the relationship between the Digital Leadership Scale and the Psychological Comfort Scale. In the statistical analysis, the significance level was accepted as $p<0.05$ to determine the difference between the groups.

Findings

In this part of the study, the answers given by academicians working in the field of sports sciences will be discussed and interpreted.

Tablo 2

Distribution of Participants in Relation to Gender Variable

	Gender	**N**	**X**	**Ss**	**t**	**p**
Tolerance	Man	316	10,62	2,74	-1,483	,139
	Woman	62	11,16	1,88		
Initiative	Man	316	13,14	3,06	-,336	,737
	Woman	62	13,29	3,30		
PCST	Man	316	23,76	5,24	-,957	,339
	Woman	62	24,45	4,70		
DLST	Man	316	32,00	9,15	-,230	,819
	Woman	62	32,29	7,50		

When the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions of the individuals participating in the study and the total scores of the scale and their distributions related to the gender variable were examined, there was no significant difference between the tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and the total scores of the scale. It is seen that women have more average scores than men when the total score averages of the scale are examined($p<0.05$).

There was no significant difference between the average score of the scale and the gender variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the gender variable were examined($p>0.05$).

Tablo 3

Distribution of Participants in Relation to Age Variable

	Age	**N**	**X**	**Ss**	**f**	**p**	**Tukey**
Tolerance	24 30 years[a]	98	11,42	2,35	5,475	**,005***	a-b,c
	31-37 years[b]	154	10,58	2,61			

	38 years and older[c]	126	10,30	2,75			
	Total	378	10,70	2,63			
Initiative	24 30 years[a]	98	14,06	2,88	5,635	**,004***	a-b,c
	31-37 years[b]	154	12,89	3,16			
	38 years and older[c]	126	12,80	3,06			
	Total	378	13,16	3,10			
PCST	24 30 years[a]	98	25,48	4,67	6,841	**,001***	a-b,c
	31-37 years[b]	154	23,48	5,29			
	38 years and older[c]	126	23,11	5,11			
	Total	378	23,87	5,15			
DLST	24 30 years[a]	98	33,81	8,00	3,328	**,037***	a,c
	31-37 years[b]	154	32,00	9,19			
	38 years and olrder[c]	126	30,74	9,01			
	Total	378	32,05	8,89			

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and the total scores of the scale and the distribution of the age variable were examined($p<0.05$). The significant difference between the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and average scores and the gender variable was examined by the Tukey test. The significant difference in the tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and the average scores of the scale appears to be caused by participants aged 24-30 years with those 31-37 years, and participants 38 years and older. A significant difference was seen between the average score of the scale and the age variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the age variable were examined($p<0.05$). When the reason for the significant difference is examined with the Tukey test, it is seen that it is caused by participants who are between the ages of 24-30 with participants who are 38 years and older.

Tablo 4

Distribution of Participants in Relation to the Working Year Variable

	Working Year	**N**	**X**	**Ss**	**f**	**p**	**Tukey**
Tolerance	0-3 years[a]	60	10,66	3,04			b,d
	4-7 years[b]	78	11,61	1,91	6,814	,000	c,d
	8-11 years[c]	52	11,30	1,52			
	12 years and above[d]	188	10,18	2,85			

	Total	378	10,70	2,63			
Initiative	0-3 years[a]	60	13,20	3,20			
	4-7 years[b]	78	13,89	2,62	2,446	,064	
	8-11 years[c]	52	13,38	2,18			
	12 years and above[d]	188	12,79	3,40			
	Total	378	13,16	3,10			
PCST	0-3 years[a]	60	23,86	5,62	5,112	,002	b,d
	4-7 years[b]	78	25,51	4,12			
	8-11 years[c]	52	24,69	3,20			
	12 years and above[d]	188	22,97	5,63			
	Total	378	23,87	5,15			
DLST	0-3 years[a]	60	34,50	8,08			
	4-7 years[b]	78	32,64	7,69			
	8-11 years[c]	52	30,96	9,05	2,326	,074	
	12 years and above[d]	188	31,32	9,44			
	Total	378	32,05	8,89			

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance sub-dimension and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions of the individuals participating in the study and the total scores of the scale and their distributions related to the working year variable were examined($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in the initiative sub-dimension of the scale ($p>0.05$). The significant difference between the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and average scores and the working year variable was examined by the Tukey test. In the tolerance sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between participants with 4-7 years of working years and participants with 12 years or more of working years, participants with 8-11 years of working years, and participants with 12 years or more of working years. At the same time, the significant difference in the average scores on the scale is seen to be caused by the participants with 4-7 years of working years and the participants with 12 years and above working years. There was no significant difference between the average score of the scale and the working year variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the working year variable were examined($p>0.05$). When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the participants with 0-3 years of working have the highest score.

Tablo 5

Distribution of Participants in Relation to the Title Variable

	Title	N	X	Ss	f	p	Tukey
Tolerance	Research Assistant[a]	56	11,60	2,75	4,468	,002	
	Lecturer[b]	60	9,80	2,83			A,b
	Asst. Prof. Dr.[c]	63	10,50	2,45			B,d
	Associate Professor[d]	86	11,16	2,31			
	Professor[e]	113	10,51	2,62			
	Total	378	10,70	2,63			
Initiative	Research Assistant[a]	56	13,85	3,32			
	Lecturer[b]	60	12,93	2,95			
	Asst. Prof. Dr.[c]	63	13,38	3,07	1,580	,179	-
	Associate Professor[d]	86	13,34	2,95			
	Professor[e]	113	12,69	3,15			
	Total	378	13,16	3,10			
PCST	Research Assistant[a]	56	25,46	5,45			
	Lecturer[b]	60	22,73	5,23			
	Asst. Prof. Dr.[c]	63	23,88	5,14	2,916	,021	A,b
	Associate Professor[d]	86	24,51	4,78			
	Professor[e]	113	23,21	5,08			
	Total	378	23,87	5,15			
DLST	Research Assistant[a]	56	34,89	7,95			
	Lecturer[b]	60	32,00	7,55			A,d
	Asst. Prof. Dr.[c]	63	32,28	10,11	2,400	,050	
	Associate Professor[d]	86	30,20	8,82			
	Professor[e]	113	31,94	9,09			
	Total	378	32,05	8,89			

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance sub-dimension and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions of the individuals participating in the study and the total scores of the scale and the distributions related to the title variable were examined($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in the initiative sub-dimension of the scale ($p>0.05$). The significant difference between the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and the average scores and the title variable was examined by the Tukey test. In the tolerance sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between the participants who are research assistants with the participants who are lecturers, and between the participants who are lecturers and the participants who are asst. Prof. doctors. At the same time, it is seen that the significant difference in the average scores on the scale is caused by the participants who are research assistants and the participants who are lecturers. A significant difference is seen between the

average score of the scale and the title variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the research regarding the digital leadership scale and the title variable are examined($p<0.05$). When the reason for the significant difference that emerged was examined with the Tukey test, it is seen that it was caused by the participants who were research assistants and the participants who were associate professors

Tablo 6

Distribution of Participants' Daily Digital Device Usage Time

	Time	**N**	**X**	**Ss**	**f**	**p**	**Tukey**
Tolerance	0-2 hours[a]	44	11,04	2,70			
	2-4 hours[b]	116	10,03	2,41	5,640	**,004**	b,c
	4 hours and more[c]	218	11,00	2,67			
	Total	378	10,70	2,63			
Initiative	0-2 hours[a]	44	12,63	3,52			
	2-4 hours[b]	116	12,29	3,21	9,415	**,000**	b,c
	4 hours and more[c]	218	13,74	2,82			
	Total	378	13,16	3,10			
PCST	0-2 hours[a]	44	23,68	5,59			
	2-4 hours[b]	116	22,32	5,10	8,680	**,000**	b,c
	4 hours and more[c]	218	24,74	4,91			
	Total	378	23,87	5,15			
DLST	0-2 hours[a]	44	30,09	9,58			
	2-4 hours[b]	116	30,98	9,56	3,231	**,051**	-
	4 hours and more[c]	218	33,01	8,27			
	Total	378	32,05	8,89			

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance and initiative sub-dimensions and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and the total scores of the scale and the distributions of the daily digital device usage time variable of the individuals participating in the study were examined($p<0.05$). The significant difference between the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and average scores and the daily digital device usage time variable was examined by the Tukey test. Significant differences in tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and average scores of the scale appear to occur between participants who use digital devices for 2-4 hours daily and participants who use digital devices for 4 hours or more daily.

There was no significant difference between the average score of the scale and the daily digital device usage time variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the daily digital device usage time variable were examined($p>0.05$). When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the highest score is the individuals who use digital devices for 4 hours or more daily.

Tablo 7

Findings of the Coordination Analysis Between the Psychological Comfort Scale and the Digital Leadership Scale

		Tolerance	**Initiative**	**PCST**	**DLST**
Tolerance	Pearson Correlation	1	,617**	,881**	,364**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,000	,000
	N	378	378	378	378
Initiative	Pearson Correlation	,617**	1	,916**	,542**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,000	,000
	N	378	378	378	378
PCST	Pearson Correlation	,881**	,916**	1	,511**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		,000
	N	378	378	378	378
DLST	Pearson Correlation	,364**	,542**	,511**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	
	N	378	378	378	378

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

It was found that there was a significant relationship in the positive direction when the correlation analysis between the psychological comfort scale and the digital leadership scale was examined in Table 7($p<0.01$).

Discussion and Conclusion

The effect of academicians working in the field of sports sciences on digital leadership levels and psychological comfort levels was investigated in this study.

In our study, there was no significant difference between the average scores of the digital leadership scale and the gender variable. Banoğlu (2016) did not find a significant difference in gender variables in his study on technology leadership levels of school principals. At the same time, there was no significant difference in gender in the study where Görgülü et al. examined the technological self-efficacy of school administrators. On the other hand, in Aydın's (2022) study examining the digital leadership levels of school principals, a significant difference was found

between the gender variable and the digital leadership scale. It is seen that female school principals have more average scores than men when the average scores are examined. Aydın's study contradicts this study.

A significant difference was seen between the average score of the scale and the age variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the age variable were examined($p<0.05$). The resulting significant difference appears to be due to participants aged between 24 and 30 years and participants aged 38 and older. Artüz and Bayraktar (2021) concluded in their research that employees between the ages of 18-30 have a higher level of digital leadership. Gürsel (2020), in his study, found that there was no significant difference in the technology leadership of school principals according to the age variable. This conclusion contradicts the finding of this research.

In the study, when the distributions of individuals related to the digital leadership scale and the working year variable were examined, there was no significant difference between the average score of the scale and the working year variable ($p>0.05$). When the average scores are examined, it is seen that the participants with 0-3 years of study have the highest score. In the study where Görgülü et al. examined the technological self-efficacy of school administrators, it was seen that the working year variable did not affect the self-efficacy of technological leadership. When the average scores in the study are examined, it is seen that the highest average is in school administrators between 16-20 years and the lowest average score is in the participants with seniority years between 6-10 years. This finding is in line with Can's (2008) findings that there is no significant difference between the professional seniority of educational administrators and their views on technology leadership, and Şişman-Eren's (2010) findings that there is no significant difference between the leadership behaviors of school principals in the provision and use of educational technologies and their professional seniority.

A significant difference was seen between the average score of the scale and the title variable when the distributions of the individuals participating in the study regarding the digital leadership scale and the title variable were examined($p<0.05$). It is seen that participants who are research assistants and participants who are associate professors cause a significant difference. When the literature was examined, it was seen that there was no comparison between digital leadership and academicians with the title variable. For this reason, the findings of our study were discussed with similar studies. Tutar (2022) examined the level of digitalization of academicians, he did not find a significant difference between the titles of academicians and their digitalization. In the study conducted by Yılmaz et al., on the lecturers of Afyon Vocational School, there was no statistical difference in terms of title in his study on the use of information and communication technologies. Özgür (66) found a statistical difference between the variable of the department they studied and

their attitudes towards technology in the study conducted by the students on information and communication technologies. Aras (62), in his study on sports education students and academicians, did not find a statistically significant difference between the departments they studied and their attitudes toward e-learning.

There was no significant difference in the tolerance and initiative sub-dimensions of the gender variable and the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions, as well as in the total scores of the scale when the findings of the study were examined. In the study conducted by Gecen (2021) on the psychological comfort of Y and Z generation employees, no difference was found regarding the gender variable. When the average scores taken from the scale are compared, it is seen that women have a slightly higher average score than men. In the research conducted by Horuz and Taşgit (2020), it was seen that there was no significant difference between men's and women's perceptions of psychological comfort.

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance, and initiative sub-dimensions and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and the total scores of the scale, and the distribution of the age variable were examined($p<0.05$). The significant difference in the tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and the average scores of the scale appears to be caused by participants aged 24-30 years and those aged 31-37 years, and participants aged 38 years and older. Yener's (2016) study found that Generation Z individuals had higher levels of psychological comfort than individuals from Generation Y. On the other hand, although there is no significant difference between Generation Y and Generation Z in the study conducted by Geçen (2021), the findings of the study do not correspond to our study.

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance sub-dimension and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions of the individuals participating in the study and the total scores of the scale and their distributions related to the working year variable were examined($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in the initiative sub-dimension of the scale ($p>0.05$). In the tolerance sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between participants with 4-7 years of working years and participants with 12 years or above of working years, participants with 8-11 years of working years, and participants with 12 years or above of working years. At the same time, the significant difference in the average scores on the scale is seen to be caused by the participants with 4-7 years of working years and the participants with 12 years or above working years. In the study conducted by Yener (2016), it was seen that those who worked for more than 5 years had more psychological comfort than those who worked for less than 5 years.

It is seen that the number of studies looking at the relationship between psychological comfort and title variable is limited when the literature is examined. For this reason, it has been

discussed with studies of a similar nature. A significant difference was seen between the tolerance sub-dimension and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions of the individuals participating in the study and the total scores of the scale and the distributions related to the title variable were examined($p<0.05$). There was no significant difference in the initiative sub-dimension of the scale ($p>0.05$). In the tolerance sub-dimension, there is a significant difference between the participants who are research assistants and the participants who are lecturers, and between the participants who are lecturers and the participants who are asst. Prof. doctors. At the same time, it is seen that the significant difference in the average scores on the scale is caused by the participants who are research assistants and the participants who are lecturers. In the study conducted by Türk (2013) in which the basic psychological needs of academicians were examined in terms of basic variables, there is no significant difference between the psychological need scale according to the title variable.

A significant difference was seen between the tolerance and initiative sub-dimensions and the average scores of the scale when the psychological comfort scale sub-dimensions and the total scores of the scale and the distributions of the daily digital device usage time variable of the individuals participating in the study were examined($p<0.05$). Significant differences in tolerance, initiative sub-dimensions, and average scores of the scale appear to occur between participants who use digital devices for 2-4 hours daily and participants who use digital devices for 4 hours or more daily. When the literature was examined, no study revealed the difference between psychological comfort and the variable of daily digital device usage.

In line with the study findings, it is seen that the total score of the digital leadership scale of the academicians participating in our study is higher than the average with 32.05 and the total score of the psychological comfort scale is above the average of 23.87. When the correlation analysis between the psychological comfort scale and the digital leadership scale was examined, it was found that there was a significant relationship in a positive direction. Accordingly, it can be said that the high level of digital leadership of academicians will positively affect their psychological comfort. In light of this information, it is revealed that both psychological comfort and digital leadership levels affect each other in direct proportion to each other. It may be recommended to investigate this study with different sample groups.

Ethics Committee Permission Information

Ethics review board: Munzur University Social and Human
Sciences Research Ethics Committee

Date of ethics assessment document: 05.07.2023

Issue number of the ethics evaluation document: 2023/09

Statement of Researchers' Contribution Rates

Single author 100% contribution at all stages of the research.

References

Aras, E. (2019). Examination of the opinions of academic staff and sports education students working in sports education ınstitutions on distance education. Master's Thesis. Fırat University, Institute of Health Sciences, Elazığ.

Artüz, S. D., and Bayraktar, O. (2021). The effect of relation between digital leadership practice and learning organization on the perception of individual performance. *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Social Sciences*, *20*(40), 97-120.

Asri, A. A. S. M. A. N., and Darma, G. S. (2020). Revealing the digital leadership spurs in 4.0 industrial revolution. *International Journal of Business*, Economics & Management, *3*(1), 93-100.

Aydın, K. (2022). *The relationship between digital leadership and organizational wisdom in educational organizations.* Doctoral Dissertation, Anadolu University,Turkey.

Baer, M., and 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.

Banoğlu, K., Vanderlinde, R., and Çetin, M. (2016). Analysis of the technology leadership profiles of school principals in the context of the learning organizational culture and technological ınfrastructure of schools: F@Tih Project Schools and others. *Education and Science*, *41*, 188.

Bilginoğlu, E., and Yozgat, U. (2023). The *validity and reliability of the measure for digital leadership: turkish form. ın multidimensional and strategic outlook in digital business transformation: human resource and management recommendations for performance ımprovement*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 53-67.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2017). *Scientific research methods* (23rd ed.). Pegem Academy.

Can, T. (2003). Technological leadership competencies of bolu secondary school administrators. *The Turkish Online Journal Of Educational Technology*, *2*(3), 94-107.

Drucker, P. (1993). *The post-capitalist society.* Istanbul: İnkılap Publishing House.

Edmondson, A. C. (2002). Managing the risk of learning: Psychological safety in work teams cambridge, MA, *Division of Research*, Harvard Business School, 255-275.

Edmonson, A. C. (2003). *Psychological safety, trust and learning in organizations*, A-Group Level Lens, Retrieved 20 February 2014, Science Direct Database.

Geçen, E, Ö. (2010). The effect of organizational commitment and psychological comfort perceptions on y and z generation employees on the ıntention to leave the job: research on a business in ikitelli organized ındustrial zone, Istanbul aydın university ınstitute of graduate education. Department of Business Administration Department of Human Resources Management.

Gerstein, J. (2013). Schools Are Doing Education 1.0; Talking About Doing Education 2.0; When They Should Be Planning Education 3.0. User-Generated Education . http://Usergeneratededucation.Wordpress.Com/2013/03/22/Schools-Are-Doing-Education-1–0-Talking-About-Doing-Education-2–0-When-They-Should-Be-Planning-Education-3–0

Görgülü, D., Küçükali, R., and Ada, Ş. (2013). Technological Leadership Self-Efficacy of School Administrators. *Educational Technology Theory and Practice*, *3*(2).

Gürsel, R. K. (2020). The relationship between school principals' technology leadership competencies and technology and social media use. Master's Thesis. Istanbul Sebahattin Zaim University, Institute of Graduate Studies, Istanbul.

Horuz, İ., and Taşgit, Y. E. (2020). The relations between employees' perception of psychological security and political tactical behavior, *Atatürk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, *34*(4), 1513-1541.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy Of Management Journal*, *33*, 692-724.

Mert, G. (2021). A new dimension in the digital world: digital leadership. *Satın Alma Dergisi*, *9*(97), 50-51.

Newman, A., Donohue, R. and Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literatüre. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(3), 521-535.

Özgür, H. (2013). Examination of the relationship between the adoption and educational use of social networks in terms of various variables. *Journal of Dicle University Institute of Social Sciences*, *10*, 169-181.

Pagatpatan, A. A. (2019). Digital leadership of school administrators in relation to teachers and principals performance: İnputs For Techno-Learning Development Model.

Parlak, B. (2017). Education in the digital age: an analysis of possibilities and practices. *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, *22*, 1741-1759.

Prentice, A. E. (2013). *Leadership For The 21st Century*. California: Libraries Unlimited.

Schepers, J., Jong, A., Wetzels, M. and Ruyter, K., (2007). Psychological safety and social support in gropuware adoption. A multi-level assessment in education. *Computers and Education 51*, 757-775.

Sheninger, E. (2014). *Digital leadership; Changing paradigms for changing times*. California: Sage Publications.

Şakar, M. and Kızılkaya Namlı, A. (2023). Öznel zindeliğin psikolojik sağlamlık üzerindeki etkisinde zihnin istemli ve istemsiz gezinmesinin aracılık rolu . *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sports* , *12*(3) , 352-361 . DOI: 10.22282/tojras.1296627

Şişman Eren, E. (2010). *Leadership behaviors of primary school principals in providing and using educational technologies.* Published Ph.D. Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.

Tutar, Ö. F. (2022). *The effect of digitalization levels of academicians working in the field of sports sciences on academic performance*. Ph.D. Thesis, Fırat University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Elazığ.

Türk, S. (2013). Investigation of the basic psychological needs and satisfaction levels of academicians in terms of various variables. Doctoral Dissertation, Marmara University, Turkey.

Yener, S. (2015). *Investigation of the mediating variable relationship of psychological security perception in the relationship between shared leadership behavior and intention to leave work*. Institute of Social Sciences, Haliç University.

Yener, S. (2015). Validity and reliability study of the turkish form of psychological comfort perception. *ODÜ Journal of Social Research*, *1*, 280-305.

Yener, S. (2015). Validity and reliability study of the turkish form of the psychological comfort scale. *Ordu University Institute of Social Sciences Journal of Social Sciences Research*, *5*(13), 280-305.

Yılmaz, H., Başat, H. T., and Özer E. A. (2020). Study on the use of ınformation and communication technologies in teaching materials by ınstructors: The case of afyon vocational school. *Academy Journal of Social Sciences*, *7*(21), 42-59.

Yukl, G. (2009). *Leadership in organizations.* New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.