

ISSN 1303-0485 • eISSN 2148-7561

DOI 10.12738/estp.2015.4.2755

Copyright © 2015 EDAM • http://www.estp.com.tr

Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice • 2015 August • 15(4) • 911-924

Received | December 5, 2014

Accepted | April 17, 2015 OnlineFirst | August 7, 2015

Organizational Commitment of Teachers: A Meta-Analysis Study for the Effect of Gender and Marital Status in Turkey

Nazım Çoğaltay^a

Mus Alparslan University

Abstract

This meta-analysis summarizes the influence of Turkish teacher's gender and marital status on their perception of organizational commitment. In total, 30 independent research studies conducted across the country are investigated to analyze the relations between gender and organizational commitment, i.e., a sample group of 11,724 participants. In addition, 17 independent research studies related to marital status and organizational commitment were also collected, i.e., a sample group of 5,467. The results of random effects model show that teachers' organizational commitment is not affected by their gender or marital status. It is understood that the sample region and school level in which teachers work do not moderate this effect.

Keywords: Gender • Marital Status • Organizational Commitment • Meta-Analysis

Assist, Prof. Nazım Çoğaltay (PhD), Department of Educational Sciences, Mus Alparslan University, Mus Turkey

Research areas: Organizational Behavior; Leadership; Meta-analysis Email: ynscogaltay@gmail.com

a Correspondence

In its simplest form, organizational psychology deals with employees' perceptions that they develop over time for their organization. More specifically, most studies that attempt to understand the nature of an organization intend to identify the perceptions of the employees, who are considered the most important component of the organization. This is because the perceptions that the employees hold for their organization motivate their behaviors, which consequently plays a major role in the efficiency of the organization. Within this scope, organizational commitment is one of the most studied types of employee perceptions in the field of organizational psychology. Despite the fact that the studies related to organizational commitment try to clarify its (i) nature, (ii) priorities, (iii) results, and (iv) relations, its recent popularity demonstrates that agreement has not yet been reached. This discontinuity in the literature makes the organizational commitment an intriguing research topic.

Due to the variations in the literature, it is not possible to give an agreed upon or exact definition of organizational commitment. Wiener (1982) defines organizational commitment as the sum of the normative pressures which are internalized to behave according to the purposes of the organization. Organizational commitment is also defined as the employee's desire to stay in the organization, desire to work hard for it, and the adoption of the values and purposes of the organization (Morrow, 1983). Organizational commitment is a concept which expresses the psychological approach of the employee to his or her organization and the relative desire necessary for integrating into the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Meyer and Allen (1991) describe this term as a behavior that forms the employee's relations with the organization and encourages the employee to make the decision to become a permanent member of the organization. Bateman and Strasser (1984), define organizational commitment as a concordance level which is perceived within the employee and the organization. If all these definitions are considered, it can be summarized that the term "organizational commitment" comprises qualifications such as the employee's desire to stay in the organization, the quality of their relationship, and the internalization of their purposes, loyalty, interest and endeavors. Within the literature, there are two main classifications used (Tak, Erdur, & Kitapçı, 2011) with the first being described by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986). These researchers examine organizational commitment in three perspectives: (i) Accordance:

this expresses a superficial dependence related to external awards in which employees believe they can achieve in the organization by their behaviors. From this perspective, the loyalty of the employee to the organization is pragmatic and compulsory in order to reach the awards and escape punishments (Balay, 2000; Lee, 2000, Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). (ii) Identification: this is based on building sincere relationships among the employees. The employee defines him or herself as a member of the organization and takes pride in that. These employees internalize the successes of the organization as his or her success and the failures of the organization as his or her failure (Başaran, 2000; Lee, 2000). (iii) Internalization: this expresses the highest level of loyalty in which the employee defines him or herself as an important component of the organization. It is entirely based on the agreement between the individual's values and those of the organization. In internalization, it is critical that the employee sincerely accepts and internalizes the values and norms of the organization as his or her own without coercion. This occurs when the employee makes his or her inwardness cohesive with the value system of the other people in the organization (Balay, 2000; Bursalıoğlu, 2005).

The second mostly accepted classification organizational commitment is the Allen and Meyer's (1990) classification. These authors also examine the issue in three perspectives: (i) Affective Commitment: this is related the emotional attachment of the employees to their organization. Internalizing the purposes of the organization underlies this more emotional kind of commitment. This commitment is identified by the individual factors, job experiences and structural factors. (ii) Continuance Commitment: this expresses a pragmatic commitment related to the investment made by the employee to the organization. This is thought of as a more compulsory commitment which is developed by the employee when she or he considers the costs for him or her to leave the job. (iii) Normative Commitment: this type of commitment is related to the feeling of responsibility for the job. The development of responsibility is not dependent on punishments, awards or any kind of relationship based on self-interest, but rather on the values related to loyalty and merit. In the literature, in addition to these two classifications, it is also possible to encounter different definitions of organizational commitment (Katz & Kahn, 1977; Kanter, 1968; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979)

There are many factors which are considered to affect organizational commitment perceptions of

employees. The primary factors are demographic characteristics. Gender and marital status comes first in terms of demographic variables affecting organizational commitment. Many studies have tried to test the relationship between organizational commitment and demographic variables. It is thought that there might be different levels of organizational commitment for each gender. Socially speaking, the roles attributed to men and women affect the behavior in their professional lives, and it may influence prospects in their field and for their career (Aven, Parker, & McEnvoy, 1993; Dixon, Turner, Cunningham, Sagas, & Kent, 2005; Simsek, 2002). When organizational commitment is considered in terms of marital status, it is thought that married employees have different experiences than single ones in terms of responsibility; which may have an impact on their perceptions of commitment. It has been proposed that married employees might have a higher level of permanency commitment than their single colleagues because married employees have a greater financial responsibility to their family's needs (Balay, 2000; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Şimşek, 2002).

Many research studies have attempted to analyze the influence of gender and marital status on teachers' organizational commitment but researchers reached many different results. However, due to the variability of the results, (Altın, 2010; Aydoğan, 2010; Beşiroğlu, 2013; Budak, 2009) it is necessary to assess these studies as a whole (). As in all the fields, it is not expected that a single research study can produce sufficiently precise results. The studies assessed in this meta-analysis are inherently limited due to reasons such as cost, time, and place. In addition, among the studies, exact consistency is not encountered. From this perspective, there is a great need for the studies addressing the same issue to be compared and synthesized by educational researchers in order to show the whole picture. In this way, the basic purpose of the study is to examine the effects of teachers' gender and marital status on their organizational commitment perception. In order to achieve this goal, the hypotheses below are tested with the meta-analytic analysis:

 $H_{1.}$ Teachers' genders have an effect on their organizational commitment.

 H_{la} . While gender affects the teachers' organizational commitment, teachers' working region moderates this effect.

 H_{lk} While gender affects the teachers' organizational commitment, the teachers' school level moderates this effect.

 H_{lc} . The gender of the teacher affects the specific sub-dimensions (accordance, identification, internalization, affective, continuance, normative) of the organizational commitment.

 H_2 Teachers' marital status affects their organizational commitment.

 H_{2a} . While marital status affects the teachers' organizational commitment, their work zone moderates this effect.

 H_{2b} While marital status affects the teachers' organizational commitment, their school level moderates this effect.

 $H_{\rm 2c}$ Teachers' marital status affects the specific sub-dimensions (accordance, identification, internalization, affective, continuance, normative) of the organizational commitment

Method

Research Design

In this study, the effects of teachers' gender and marital status on their organizational commitment was tested with meta-analysis method which allowed for seeing the results of the independent quantitative research studies, which are conducted in different places and at different times, as a whole by combining them (Cumming, 2012; Lipsey & Wilson, 2001; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).

Scanning Strategies and Criteria of Inclusion/ Exclusion

Firstly, the literature review for this meta-analysis was conducted by using the Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) and ULAKBİM databases which are used by academic researchers in Turkey. Additionally, the literature review draws resources from Google Scholar academic and EBSCO databases. The end date for the research studies included in the meta-analysis was identified as October 2014. The criteria of inclusion for this study were

- To be a study conducted between 2008 and 2014;
- To have statistical information necessary for the standardized mean-difference meta-analysis (N, and, t-scores);
- The sample group was within the borders of Turkey;
- The sample group consisted of the teachers;
- To be published in the refereed journals for the articles.

In order to find studies of organizational commitment in Turkey, the scanning process used the term "commitment" as a base and included the following key words, titles, and summary fields: organizational commitment, organizational devotion, devotion, and commitment. In this study, many strategies were implemented in order to identify appropriate studies for meta-analysis. Firstly, during the process of scanning, which was reduced to the field of title, summary and key words, all of the studies (97 studies) related to organizational commitment were compiled and a study repository created. After that, the studies which analyzed relevant data for this meta-analysis were categorized by their data and variables and then subject to intense scrutiny. Afterwards, the coding process began. Descriptive statistics of the studies that met these criteria for these meta-analyses are presented in Table 1.

Data Analysis

Effect magnitude obtained in meta-analysis is not a standard measurement and was used for identifying the power and direction of a relation (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2009). In this study, effect magnitude, as the difference between standardized averages (d) are presented (Card, 2012; Cohen, 1988). The effect magnitude is used for comparison of the averages for different independent groups. The effect of this difference is accepted as comparable for the studies, are based on two variables (Hedges & Olkin, 1985). In metaanalysis studies, there are two possible models to use which include (i) fixed effect model or (ii) random effect model. When deciding which model is used, the features of the studies included in the meta-analysis were examined to find out which model's prerequisites were met (Borenstein et al., 2009; Hedges & Olkin, 1985; Littel, Corcoran, & Pillai, 2008). Fixed effect model includes: (i) the assumption of the functional equality of the studies and (ii) the purpose of counting the effect magnitude only for an identified population. If it is believed that the studies are not functionally equal and if generalization to a bigger population is desired with the calculated magnitude effect, the random effect model should be used. While the fixed effect model only estimates one effect which is commonly described in each study, the random effect model estimates the average of the distributions of effect in the studies (Borenstein et al., 2009; Hedges & Olkin, 1985). When the studies selected for this meta-analysis were examined, it was determined that similar studies were not functionally equal (e.g., they used different scales, had different researchers, used different theoretical understandings, etc.) and did not collect data from one identified population (e.g., different school levels, fields, etc.) When all these conditions were assessed together, random effect model was selected as the base model for the purposes of this meta-analysis.

In the obtained research studies, it seems that the relationship between gender and marital status variables are calculated by both organizational commitment (general score of the used scale) and sub-dimension of the organizational commitment. In some of the studies, only statistics related to organizational commitment were reported, others only included the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment, while others include both organizational commitment and the subdimensions. Additionally, some studies also report data related to two different sample groups in the same study. Comprehensive Meta-Analysis was used for all the meta-analysis processes and the uniqueness of these different studies preserved. In this meta-analysis, two moderator variables that were thought to play a role in mean effect magnitude were identified. The first moderator considered was the sample region in which the studies were carried out and the second one was the school level in which the studies took place in. Within the current body of literature, there are not any samples which represent the whole country; all of the samples are limited to a specific region or city. Each one of the regions (East-Anatolia, Black Sea, Aegean, etc.) has different stages of economic development, literacy-rates and cultural structures. Therefore, these differences may cause the teachers who work in these regions to develop different attitudes and perspectives. Additionally, it could be evaluated that different school levels (pre-school, primary education, high school) in which teachers work can also influence the magnitude of the total effect because respective school levels differ from each other in terms students' age, culture and atmosphere. Considering that these differences may play a role in the total effect magnitude, school level is identified as a moderator variable. The decision to include these moderator variables is in-line with other meta-analysis studies that use similar moderator variables (Çoğaltay, Karadağ, & Öztekin, 2015; Karadağ, Bektaş, Çoğaltay, & Yalçın, 2014; Şirin, 2005). This meta-analysis attempts to address the issue by using moderator analysis.

	Options		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tot
	Options		2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	-
	Publishing Year of	N	1	2	5	5	6	10	1	30
	the Study	%	3.3	6.6	16.5	16.5	19.8	30.3	3.3	10
- 1			Thesis	Article						-
	Study Type	N	28	2						30
	71	%	93.4	6.6						10
			Mediterranean	East Anatolia	South-East- ern Anatolia	Central Anatolia	Aegean	Black Sea	Mar- mara	
, a	Sample region	N	4	2	1	4	2	1	18	32
1		%	12.4	6.2	3.1	12.4	6.2	3.1	55.8	10
-	School Level		Primary Education	Mixed	High School					
		N	18	8	6					3
		%	55.8	24.8	18.6					10
			2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	Publishing Year of the Study	N	-	2	3	3	2	6	1	1
		%		11.6	17.4	17.4	11.6	34,8	5.8	1
			Thesis	Article						
	Study Type	N	16	1						1
		%	94.2	5.8						1
			Marmara	Aegean	Black Sea					
,	Sample Region	N	15	1	1	1				1
		%	83.5	5.5	5.5	5.5				1
	School Level		Primary Education	Mixed	High school					
		N	11	2	5					1
		%	56.5	11.0	27.5					1
	Publishing Year of Study		2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
		N	-	2	1	5	4	3	-	1
_		%	-	13.2	6.6	33.0	26.4	19.8	-	1
	Study Type		Thesis	Article						
		N	12	3]
-			80.2	19.8	Dl. d. C.	Central	M: 1	Mar-		1
	Sample Region		Mediterranean 1	East Anatolia	Black Sea	Anatolia 7	Mixed 2	mara 3		1
		%	6.6	6.6	6.6	46.2	13.2	19.8		1
_			Primary Education	Mixed	High school					
	School Level	N	10	4	1					1
			66.0	26.4	6.6					1
			2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	
	Publishing Year of Study			2		2		-		
				50.0		50.0				1
_	Study Type		Thesis	Article						
			3	1						
_			75.0	25.0						1
			East Anatolia	Central Ana- tolia	Mixed					
	Sample Region	N	1	1	2					
		%	25.0	25.0	50.0					1
	0.1 1.		Primary Education	Mixed						
	School Level	N	3	1						
				25.0						

	ole 1 aracteristics of the Stud	lies l	ncluded in the Me	ta-Analysis						
	Options		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
			2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	-
ssification	Publishing Year of Study	N	-	4	6	4	5	9	2	30
		%		13.2	19.8	13.2	16.5	29.7	6.6	100
			Thesis	Article						-
Cla	Study Type	N	29	1						30
yer's		%	96.7	3.3						100
nd Me			Mediterranean	East Anatolia	Black Sea	Mar- mara	Aegean			
Gender - Allen and Meyer's Classification	Sample Region	N	2	2	3	22	2			31 ^b
			6.4	6.4	9.6	70.4	6.4			100
	School Level		Primary Education	Mixed	High school					-
		N	19	6	6					31 ^b
		%	60.8	19.2	19.2					100
п			2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	-
atio	Publishing Year of Study	N	-	3	4	3	2	6	2	20
sific		%		15.0	20.0	15.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	100
Clas			Thesis	Article						-
ers	Study Type	N	20	-						20
Mey		%	100	0						100
Marital Stutus- Allen and Meyer's Classification			East Anatolia	Central Ana- tolia	Black Sea	Mar- mara	Aegean			-
	Sample Region	N	1	1	2	16	1			21 ^b
		%	4.7	4.7	9.4	75.2	4.7			100
			Primary Education	Mixed	Pre-School	High school				
	School Level	N	10	4	1	6				21 ^b
_		%	47.0	18.8	4.7	28.2				100

Note. ^a In two of the research studies included in the meta-analysis, there is a correlation value which belongs to two independent samples so that there are two more data used in the analysis than the independent research studies.

^b In one of the research study included in the study, there is a correlation value which belongs to two independent samples so that there is one more data used in the analysis than the independent research studies.

Publication Bias

Publication bias is based on the assumption that not all studies on a particular topic are published. By assessing studies in which no statistically meaningful relations can be determined or low-degree relations are determined as unworthy to publish can create publication bias (Borenstein et al., 2009; Duval, 2005; Kulinskaya, Morgenthaler, & Staudte, 2008). In turn, this situation can amplify the effect magnitude, which then can be interpreted. Briefly, publication bias effect, which can be also called lost data, can adversely impact the total effect of the meta-analysis and must therefore be taken into consideration.

A number of methods can be used to detect publication bias; the funnel plot method comes first among them. Although the shape provided by this method is not exactly objective, it provides visibility to the question of whether the selected studies are influenced by publication bias (Borenstein et al., 2009; Shadish,

Hedges, & Pustejovsky, 2013). In this study, funnel plots regarding the research studies included in this meta-analysis are presented in the appendices (APP 15–16). The results of the funnel plots demonstrated that there was no observed effect related to publication bias of the studies used in this meta-analysis. In the case of publication bias, the funnel plot is expected to be substantially asymmetrical. It especially shows a possibility of the existence of a publication bias that the studies, which should intensify at the bottom of the funnel, intensify on one definite side of the line, showing the magnitude of average effect (especially on the right side). In this meta-analysis, no proof of publication biases was observed.

Although no proof of publication bias was observed in the funnel plot, the results of Duval and Tweedie's trim-and-fill test, which was applied to determine the effect magnitude of partiality in publications are given in Table 2. As seen in Table 2, there is no difference between the observed effect and artificial effect which was created to fix the effect of

Table 2 The Results of the Duval and Tweedie's Trim and Fill Tests

Conder-Organizational Commitment	W bl	D 1 1	Daine Duadine	CI (Confider		
Observed Values	Variables	Removed study	Point Prediction	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	- Q
Rectified Values	Gender-Organizational Commitment					
Conder-Accordance	Observed Values		.04	02	.10	81.54*
Diserved Values	Rectified Values	0	.04	02	.10	81.54*
Rectified Values 0 .02 .05 .10 27.23' Gender-Identification 0 .06 .04 .16 48.96' Rectified Values 0 .06 .04 .16 48.96' Gender-Internalization .00 .07 .08 28.26' Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 28.26' Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .13 152.67' Gender-Affective Commitment .05 .03 .13 152.67' Gender-Continuance Commitment .0 .05 .03 .13 152.67' Gender-Continuance Commitment .0<	Gender-Accordance					
Conder-Identification	Observed Values		.02	05	.10	27.23*
Diserved Values	Rectified Values	0	.02	05	.10	27.23*
Rectified Values 0 .06 04 .16 48.96' Gender-Internalization Commer-Internalization 30 07 .08 28.26' Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 28.26' Gender-Affective Commitment .05 03 .13 152.67' Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .13 152.67' Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .13 152.67' Gender-Continuance Commitment .02 02 .08 57.21' Rectified Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21' Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69' Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69' Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .17 .00 <t< td=""><td>Gender-Identification</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Gender-Identification					
Conder-Internalization	Observed Values		.06	04	.16	48.96*
Diserved Values	Rectified Values	0	.06	04	.16	48.96*
Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 28.26* Gender-Affective Commitment .05 03 .13 152.67* Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .13 152.67* Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .13 152.67* Gender-Continuance Commitment .02 02 .08 57.21* Observed Values 0 .02 02 .08 57.21* Gender-Normative Commitment .00 07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52*<	Gender-Internalization					
Conserved Values	Observed Values		.00	07	.08	28.26*
Doserved Values	Rectified Values	0	.00	07	.08	28.26*
Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .13 152.67* Gender-Continuance Commitment .02 .02 .08 57.21* Observed Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21* Rectified Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21* Observed Values .00 .07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment .00 .07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Marital Status-Accordance .17 .00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 .00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification .19 .06 .32 4.65 Observed Values .26* .01 .55 21.25* Rectified Value	Gender-Affective Commitment					
Conserved Values	Observed Values		.05	03	.13	152.67*
Observed Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21* Rectified Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21* Gender-Normative Commitment .00 .07 .08 118.69* Observed Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment .00 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment .05 .03 .12 .27.09 Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 .27.09 Rectified Values 0 .17 .00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 .00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .19 .06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .26* .01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* .01 <	Rectified Values	0	.05	03	.13	152.67*
Rectified Values 0 .02 .02 .08 57.21* Gender-Normative Commitment .00 .07 .08 118.69* Observed Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment .00 .00 .07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Marital Status-Accordance .01 .05 .03 .12 27.09 Rectified Values 0 .17 .00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .19 .06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 .06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .26* .01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* .01	Gender-Continuance Commitment					
Conserved Values	Observed Values		.02	02	.08	57.21*
Observed Values .00 07 .08 118.69* Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Observed Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Marital Status- Accordance 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Observed Values 1.7 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Intentification .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization .26* 01 .55 21.25* Observed Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* <td>Rectified Values</td> <td>0</td> <td>.02</td> <td>02</td> <td>.08</td> <td>57.21*</td>	Rectified Values	0	.02	02	.08	57.21*
Rectified Values 0 .00 07 .08 118.69* Marital Status-Organizational Commitment 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Marital Status- Accordance 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Observed Values 1.7 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification .19 06 .32 4.65 Observed Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization .26* 01 .55 21.25* Observed Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09	Gender-Normative Commitment					
Marital Status-Organizational Commitment Observed Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Marital Status- Accordance Warital Status- Accordance Observed Values 1.17 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization Caf* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values </td <td>Observed Values</td> <td></td> <td>.00</td> <td>07</td> <td>.08</td> <td>118.69*</td>	Observed Values		.00	07	.08	118.69*
Observed Values .05 03 .12 27,09 Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Marital Status- Accordance	Rectified Values	0	.00	07	.08	118.69*
Rectified Values 0 .05 03 .12 27,09 Marital Status- Accordance 00 .35 8.52* Observed Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment .00 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 </td <td>Marital Status-Organizational Commitment</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Marital Status-Organizational Commitment					
Marital Status- Accordance 1.17 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Observed Values .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment .00 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0	Observed Values		.05	03	.12	27,09
Observed Values .17 00 .35 8.52* Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification Use of the property of the propert	Rectified Values	0	.05	03	.12	27,09
Rectified Values 0 .17 00 .35 8.52* Marital Status-Identification Observed Values .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment .00 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values .00 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values .00 .02 04 .09 35.60*	Marital Status- Accordance					
Marital Status-Identification Observed Values 1.19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization Observed Values 2.6* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment Observed Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 01 09 .05 38.98*	Observed Values		.17	00	.35	8.52*
Observed Values .19 06 .32 4.65 Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization Use of the color	Rectified Values	0	.17	00	.35	8.52*
Rectified Values 0 .19 06 .32 4.65 Marital Status-Internalization Observed Values .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment 0 .26* 01 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 01 09 .05 38.98*	Marital Status-Identification					
Marital Status-Internalization Observed Values .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Observed Values 01 09 .05 38.98*	Observed Values		.19	06	.32	4.65
Observed Values .26* 01 .55 21.25* Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment Observed Values 0.02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 01 09 .05 38.98*	Rectified Values	0	.19	06	.32	4.65
Rectified Values 0 .26* 01 .55 21.25* Marital Status-Affective Commitment Observed Values .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 01 09 .05 38.98*	Marital Status-Internalization					
Marital Status-Affective Commitment Observed Values .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 01 09 .05 38.98*	Observed Values		.26*	01	.55	21.25*
Observed Values .02 04 .09 35.60* Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment 01 09 .05 38.98*	Rectified Values	0	.26*	01	.55	21.25*
Rectified Values 0 .02 04 .09 35.60* Marital Status-Continuance Commitment Observed Values 01 09 .05 38.98*	Marital Status-Affective Commitment					
Marital Status-Continuance Commitment Observed Values 01 09 .05 38.98*	Observed Values		.02	04	.09	35.60*
Observed Values0109 .05 38.98*	Rectified Values	0	.02	04	.09	35.60*
	Marital Status-Continuance Commitment					
Rectified Values 0 - 01 - 09 05 38 98*	Observed Values		01	09	.05	38.98*
	Rectified Values	0	01	09	.05	38.98*
Marital Status-Normative Commitment	Marital Status-Normative Commitment					
Observed Values .0106 .08 39.36*	Observed Values		.01	06	.08	39.36*
Rectified Values 0 .01 06 .08 39.36*	Rectified Values	0	.01	06	.08	39.36*

publication bias. The reason why there no difference was found was because studies that intensify on both sides of the central line are, in general, already symmetrical. Because of the fact that there was no lost data on the left and right side of the central line, the difference between the artificial effect magnitude and the observed effect magnitude was zero.

Results

The results of the meta-analysis showing the effect of gender on teachers' organizational commitment perception are presented in Table 3. The findings do not support the H₁ hypothesis which proposed that gender has an effect on the teachers' perception of organizational commitment. According to the

random effect model in the Turkey sample, the standardized average difference effect value (d) in teachers' organizational commitment perceptions is calculated as .03. The effect of gender on the teachers' organizational commitment perceptions is statistically unidentifiable (Cohen, 1988; Thalheimer & Cook, 2002).

The findings do not support the H_{1a} hypothesis which predicted that the sampling region has a moderator role in the relations between teachers' gender and organizational commitment. In the conducted moderation analysis, the effect difference between the sample region was found to be non-significant ($Q_b = 2.26, p > .05$). It is seen that in all parts of Turkey, the effect of gender on the perception of organizational commitment is insignificant. These results suggest that the results of the different studies conducted in the seven parts of Turkey can be taken together to form an overall picture of Turkish teachers' organizational commitment.

Hypothesis H_{1b} , regarding the moderator effect of the school level at which teachers work on the relation between gender and organizational commitment was also not supported by the findings. In the moderation analysis conducted, the effect difference between school levels was found to be non-significant ($Q_b = .24$, p > .05). The results suggest that the effect of the gender on the organizational commitment perception is non-significant at all the school levels.

In Table 4, the meta-analysis results showing the effect of teachers' marital status on organizational

commitment perception is presented. The findings do not support the H_2 hypothesis, which theorized that marital status would influence teachers' organizational commitment perception. According to the random effect model in the Turkey sample, standardized average difference effect value (d) in the teachers' organizational commitment perceptions in terms of marital status was calculated to be .05. This value indicates that there is no statistically meaningful effect of marital status on the teachers' organizational commitment perception (Cohen, 1988; Thalheimer & Cook, 2002).

The findings do not support hypothesis H_{2a} , which suggested that the sample region has a moderator role between teachers' marital status and organizational commitment. As a result of the conducted moderator analysis, the effect of the sample region was found to be non-significant ($Q_b = 1.24, p > .05$). Thus, teachers' marital status on the organizational commitment had no effect in all the four regions included in the analysis.

Hypothesis H_{2b} , which suggested that the school level has a moderator role in the relation between marital status and organizational commitment, was not supported by the results of the meta-analysis. The difference between the school levels was not found to have a significant effect ($Q_b = .31, p > .05$). The findings of the analysis suggest that the effect of marital status on the organizational commitment perception is meaningless at all the school levels.

In Table 5, the meta-analysis results showing the effect of gender on the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment are demonstrated. The

Table 3	
The Effect of Gender on Organizational Commitment: The Results of Meta-Analysi	S

Variable	k	k N N		N d	CI(Confidence	Q	0	
variable	κ	IN _{men}	IV women	а	Lower Limit	Lower Limit Upper Limit		Q_b
Gender-Organizational Commitment	32ª	5750	5874	.04	02	.10	81.54*	
Moderator [Region]								2.26
Mediterranean	4	1507	1413	.04	14	.21		
Eastern Anatolia	2	425	352	.11	15	.37		
Aegean	2	1061	820	.10	13	.26		
South-Eastern Anatolia	1	233	191	.15	20	.50		
Central Anatolia	4	527	704	05	24	.14		
Black Sea	1	289	148	10	46	.25		
Marmara	18	2036	2584	.05	05	.14		
Moderator [School Level]								0.24
Primary	18	2542	3130	.05	.04	.14		
Mixed	8	2226	1919	.01	.11	.13		
Secondary	6	982	825	.04	.10	.19		

a *Note.* As the data belonged to two independent samples is shared in the study, 32 data are used in the analysis in spite of the fact that there are 30 data in the independent study. $^*p < .05$.

Table 4
The Effect of Marital Status on Organizational Commitment: Meta-Analysis Results

Variable		N	N	d	CI(Confiden	- Q	0	
variable	k	married	$N_{ m single}$	и	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	Q	Q_b
Marital Status- Organizational Commitment	18 ^a	3861	1606	.05	03	.12	27,09	
Moderator [Region]								1.24
Aegean	1	686	91	12	44	.19		
Central Anatolia	1	175	27	.09	38	.55		
Black Sea	1	378	59	.08	28	.44		
Marmara	15	2622	1429	.06	03	.15		
Moderator [School Level]								0.31
Primary	11	2423	1132	.06	05	.17		
Mixed	2	625	127	02	27	.23		
Secondary School	5	813	347	.04	12	.21		

Note. ^a As the data belonged to two independent samples is shared in the study, 18 data are used in the analysis in spite of the fact that there are 17 data in the independent study.

findings do not support the hypothesis H_{lc} , which posited that teachers' gender has an effect on the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment. According to the random effect model, in the Turkey sample standardized average difference effect value (d) in the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment in terms of the gender variable is calculated as (i) .02 for the accordance sub-dimension, (ii) .06 for identification sub-dimension, (iii) .00 for internalizing sub-dimension, (iv) .02 for continuance commitment sub-dimension, and (vi) .00 for normative commitment sub-dimension. All the values show that the effect of gender on

all sub-dimensions of organizational commitment perception is not statistically significant (Cohen, 1988; Thalheimer & Cook, 2002).

Table 6 below shows the meta-analysis results for the effect of marital status on the sub-dimensions of organizational commitment. The findings partially support Hypothesis H_{2c} which suggested that the marital status of the teacher has an impact on the various sub-dimensions of organizational commitment. According to the random effect model, in the Turkey sample, standardized average difference effect value (d) in the sub-dimensions of the organizational commitment in terms of the marital status variable is calculated as (i).17

Table 5
The Effect of Teachers' Gender on the Sub-Dimensions of Organizational Commitment: Meta-Analysis Results

Variable	k	N _{women}	N_{men}	d	CI (Confidence	ce Interpace)	Q
variable					Lower Limit	Upper Limit	
Gender- Accordance	15	3191	2549	.02	05	.10	27.23*
Gender- Identification	15	3199	2548	.06	04	.16	48.96*
Gender-Internalization	15	3200	2552	.00	07	.08	28.26*
Gender- Affective	31	6216	5647	.05	03	.13	152.67*
Gender- Continuance	31	6216	5647	.02	02	.08	57.21*
Gender-Normative	31	6216	5647	.00	07	.08	118.69*

Note. *p < .05.

Table 6
The Effect of Teachers' Marital Status on Sub-Dimensions of Organizational Commitment: Meta-Analysis Results

Variable	k	$N_{{\it married}}$	N_{single} d		CI (Confidence	Q	
					Lower Limit	Upper Limit	
Marital Status - Accordance	4	1837	501	.17	00	.35	8.52*
Marital Status - Identification	4	1842	503	.19	06	.32	4.65
Marital Status-Internalization	4	1848	502	.26*	01	.55	21.25*
Marital Status-Affective	21	5380	2204	.02	04	.09	35.60*
Marital Status-Continuance	21	5380	2204	01	09	.05	38.98*
Marital Status-Normative	21	5377	2204	.01	06	.08	39.36*

^{*}p < .05.

for the accordance sub-dimension, (ii) .19 for identification sub-dimension, (iii) .26 (p < .05) for internalization sub-dimension, (iv) .02 for affective sub-dimension, (v) .01 for continuance commitment sub-dimension, and (vi) .01 for normative commitment sub-dimension. According to these effect values, marital status has a midlevel effect on the internalization sub-dimension that is statistically meaningful. The results show that the effect of marital status is not statistically significant for all other sub-dimensions (Cohen, 1988; Thalheimer & Cook, 2002).

Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, the effect of gender and marital status on teachers' perceptions of organizational commitment was tested by compiling a large amount of independent research results conducted in Turkey between 2008-2014. The findings suggest that in terms of gender, there is no statistically significant effect for organizational commitment and all of its sub-dimensions. Although results showed that female teachers exhibit higher organizational commitment on average than their male colleagues, this difference was not found to be significantly different from zero. This finding shows that the organizational commitment perception (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mowday et al., 1982; Wiener, 1982), a worker's perspective that he or she is an integral member of the organization and demonstrates behaviors that contributes to the organization, is not affected by gender. This finding contradicts some ideas and research studies regarding gender within the current body of literature. In this context, it is posited that the different roles that are assigned to men and women by the society have an effect on their behaviors and, in this situation, could give rise to differentiation in many areas of organizational psychology (Aven et al., 1993; Dixon et al., 2005; Schermerhorn, Hunt, & Osborn, 2002). Nevertheless; it is not possible to mention a strict consistency in outcomes of research studies conducted about gender in the literature. Some research studies suggested that men have a higher level of organizational commitment (Dixon et al., 2005; Marsden, Kalleberg, & Cook, 1993) while some research studies showed that women have a higher level of organizational commitment (Alvi & Ahmed, 1987; Hrebineak & Alutto, 1972) while still some others demonstrated that gender does not have any significant effect (Allen & Meyer, 1990). In this study, these inconsistent results were combined within a meta-analysis framework and it is understood that gender does not play a significant role in organizational commitment perception. The findings in this study are compatible with those of Mathieu and Zajak's (1990) meta-analysis study.

Additional findings of this study show no statistically significant effects in terms of marital status except in the internalization subscale. Accordingly, married teachers' commitment level in internalization subscale is significantly higher than their single colleagues' commitment to the organization. This finding is important on account of showing that the internalization, which is related to heartfelt acceptance and the adoption of values and norms of the organization as his own values and norms without compulsion by the organization and reflects the highest commitment that individual feels himself as a part of organization (Lee, 2000; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), is influenced by marital status. Married teachers feel more individualization commitment than single teachers. This could be related to the additional responsibilities that come with marriage; such as the increasing requirements and responsibilities to provide food and shelter to their families and to feel financial stable. This may play a role in developing a stronger sense of commitment to the job. The individual may identify with his work more easily because he or she meets these requirements and responsibilities through his or her work (Balay, 2000; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Şimşek, 2002).

According to moderation analysis, sample region has no significant effect, both in terms of gender and marital status. No meaningful effect of gender or marital status on the perception of organizational commitment could be seen from all sample regions. These results indicate that organizational commitment perceptions of male and female teachers working different regions show no significant differences. Although the various regions have different socio-economic status and cultural structures, these characteristics do not cause a meaningful differentiation in organizational commitment perceptions in terms of gender. Furthermore, the moderation analysis of school level showed no statistically meaningful effects on the relations between gender or marital status on teachers' organizational commitment. This finding is important because it demonstrates that teachers' employment at different school levels does not influence their commitment to that organization in terms of gender.

Meta-analysis results conducted in this study can be summarized as the following:

- There were no statistically meaningful effects found from gender on teachers' organizational commitment and its subscales.
- There were no statistically meaningful effects found from marital status on teachers' organizational commitment and its subscales except for individualization. In the case of the individualization subscale, married teachers, on average, have higher levels of organizational commitment perception than single teachers and this differentiation is statistically meaningful.
- Sample region and school level do not moderate the effect of gender or marital status on teachers' organizational commitment.
- In all regions and levels, there is no statistically meaningful effect of gender and marital status on teachers' organizational commitment.

The findings of the study are important as a whole in terms of showing the organizational commitment of teachers is not influenced by their gender or marital status. These findings should not be seen as a final result in terms of these two variables because this meta-analysis was carried out based on existing data obtained from quantitative research. One of the biggest disadvantages of this meta-analysis is that it is based only on quantitative research studies (Karadağ, Çiftçi, & Bektaş, 2015). Qualitative research methods are considered more effective for understanding of the nature of the organization; therefore, it is not completely objective to claim that the obtained results from this study can explain causative effects. Also, to try to explain the effect of gender and marital status on organizational commitment research studies could introduce potential method bias. This meta-analysis study has brought up the need for the inclusion of qualitative research to better understand the determinant and predictive effect of gender and marital status on teachers' organizational commitment perceptions. In addition, it was not possible to access all the studies on this topic despite the strategies used to collect data for this meta-analysis. This is caused by two main reasons: the full-text versions of research studies could not be obtained without the permission of the author on the Council of Higher Education Thesis Central Database, and there is no proper database which provides an index to academic articles in Turkey. For this reason, some research studies, which are thought to probably include convenient data, couldn't be obtained. . It is also considered best practices in meta-analysis studies to include all research studies, whether published or not. However, in the study, only published research studies were included in the analysis. Although any evidence relating to publication bias was not encountered, the impossibility of attaining unpublished research studies shows that this situation cannot be clearly explained. Furthermore, the study current sample included only research studies conducted between the years 2008-2014 within in Turkey, which is another limitation of the study.

In the light of findings achieved by analyses performed throughout study, the following suggestions can be made;

- Based on the non-significant results of the effect of gender and marital status on organizational commitment, qualitative research studies should be included to better understand the determinant and predictor effects of these variables.
- Within the scope of the research studies that were included in this meta-analysis, it was observed that some statistics were not reported in some studies (the (t) value or quantity of samples). In this sense, researchers should report more statistical findings that could enable better meta-analysis and other secondary analyses.
- The accessible to non-public research studies in the Council of Education Thesis Central Database hampered this meta-analysis study and this problem should be resolved.
- A database indexing all scientific studies conducted in Turkey should be established.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis

- *Afacan, Ö. (2011). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adanmışlık düzeyleri ile müdürlerin liderlik davranışlarını algılama düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Akgül, R. (2013). Ortaöğretim kurumlarındaki yöneticilerin yönetimde gücü kullanma stillerinin öğretmen algılarına göre örgütsel bağılığa etkisi (Master's thesis, Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Akgül, S. (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel kimlik algıları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Alaş, B. (2012). Rotasyona uğrayan okul yöneticilerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi: İstanbul ili Fatih ilçesi örneği (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
- *Altın, B. (2010). İlköğretimde görevli öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarıyla yaratıcılıkları ilişkisi (Master's thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Altun, G. (2010). Özel eğitim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmenlerin örgütsel güven düzeyleri ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Alvi, S., & Ahmed, S. W. (1987). Assessing organizational commitment in a developing country: Pakistan, a case study. *Human Relation*, 40(5), 267-280.
- *Apak, E. G. A. (2009). Yıldırma eylemleri ve örgütsel adanmışlık ilişkisi: İlköğretim okulu öğretmenleri üzerinde bir araştırma (Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Aven, F. F., Parker, B., & McEnvoy, G. M. (1993). Gender and attitudinal commitment to organizations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 642–648.
- *Aycan, A., Görün, L., & Tabuk, E. (2012). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılıkları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarının incelenmesi. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 14(1), 29-41.
- *Aydoğan, S. E. (2010). Resmi liselerde çalışan öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri (Master's thesis, Beykent University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Balay, R. (2000). Özel ve resmi liselerde yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı (Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Başaran, İ. E. (2000). Örgütsel davranış insanın üretin gücü. Ankara: Bilim kitap kırtasiye.
- *Başyiğit, F. (2009). Öğretmenlerin karar alma sürecine katılın düzeylerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ile ilişkisi (Master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez/Merkezi/

- Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 95-112.
- *Beşiroğlu, A. (2013). Ortaöğretim kurumları yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin örgütsel bağlılıkla ilişkisi (Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Budak, T. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan kadrolu ve sözleşmeli öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları: Kocaeli ili örneği (Master's thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2005). Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- *Canpolat, C. (2011). Öğretmen kariyer basamakları uygulaması ile öğretmen motivasyonu ve örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişkiler (Master's thesis, Fırat University, Elaziğ, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Card, N. A. (2012). Applied meta-analysis for social science research. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- *Cevahiroğlu, E. (2012). İlköğretim branş öğretmenlerinin algıladıkları liderlik davranışları ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki: İstanbul ili Bayrampaşa ilçesi örneği (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez.Merkezi/
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- *Coşkun, E. (2012). Okul yöneticilerinin etkililiği ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki: İstanbul-Bağcılar örneği (Master's thesis Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez/Merkezi/
- Cumming, G. (2012). *Understanding the new statistics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- *Çoban, D. (2010). Okulların akademik iyimserlik düzeyi ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Çoğaltay, N., Karadağ, E., & Öztekin, Ö. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığına etkisi: Bir meta-analiz çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, 20*(4), 483-500. doi:10.14527/kuev.2014.019
- *Çorbacı, S. (2010). İlköğretim okullarındaki performans yönetimi uygulamaları ile yönetici ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez. yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Daniş, A. (2009). Anadolu teknik ve anadolu meslek lisesi öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri: İzmit örneği (Master's thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Demirsoy, E. (2009). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin iş doyumu ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Demirtaş, H. (2010). Dershane öğretmenlerinde örgütsel bağlılık ve iş doyumu. İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 11(2), 177-206.

- *Dirikan, Y. (2009). Branş ve branş dışı atanan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin çok boyutlu incelenmesi: İstanbul ili Anadolu Yakası örneği (Master's thesis, University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Dixon, M. A., Turner, B. A., Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Kent, A. (2005). Challenge is key: An investigation of affective organizational commitment in undergraduate interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80, 172-180.
- *Doğan, N. (2009). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin duygusal zekaları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki: İstanbul ili Anadolu Yakası örneği (Master's thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Duval, S. (2005). The trim and fill method. In H. R. Rothstein, A. J. Sutton, & M. Bornstein (Eds.), *Publication bias in meta-analysis: Prevention, assessment, and adjustments* (pp. 11-33). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Duval, S., & Tweedie, R. (2000). Trim and fill: A simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*, 56, 455-463.
- *Erdaş, Y. (2009). Denizli merkezde çalışan ilköğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri (Master's thesis, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Ertürk, E. (2011). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullarındaki örgütsel adalet ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Ertürk, M. (2014). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel adanmışlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Gaziantep ili örneği (Master's thesis, Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Güçlü, N., & Zaman, O. (2011). Alan dışından atanmış rehber öğretmenlerin iş doyumları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki. Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(3), 541-576.
- *Günce, S. (2013). İlköğretim okullarında örgütsel adalet ile örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi (Master's thesis, Harran University, Şanlıurfa, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/ UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Hedges, L. V., & Olkin, I. (1985). Statistical method for meta-analysis. United Kingdom: Academic Press.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and rolerelated factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1(4), 555-573.
- *Işık, M. (2009). Okul yöneticilerinin etik liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki: Beylikdüzü (Master's thesis, Beykent University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *İmamoğlu, G. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri ve örgütsel adalet algıları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/ UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment & social organization a study of commitment mechanism in utopian communities. *American Social Review*, 33, 499-517.
- *Karaca, D. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında yöneticilerin insan kaynakları yönetimi işlevlerini yerine getirebilme yeterlikleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağılılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez/Merkezi/

- *Karacaoğlu, K., & Güney, Y. S. (2010). Öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıklarının, örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışları üzerindeki etkisi: Nevşehir ili örneği. Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Hakemli Öneri Dergisi. 17, 137-153.
- Karadağ, E., Bektaş, F., Çoğaltay, N., & Yalçın, M. (2014). The effect of educational leadership on students' achivement: a meta analysis study. Asia Pacific Education Review, 16(1), 79-93. doi:10.1007/s12564-015-9357-x
- Karadağ, E., Çiftçi, Ş. K., Bektaş, F. (2015). Leadership and organizational outcomes: Meta-analysis of empirical studies. In. E. Karadağ (Ed.), *Discussion, limitations and suggestions* (pp. 255-267). New York, NY: Springer.
- *Karagöz, A. (2008). İlk ve ortaöğretim okulu yöneticilerinin öğretmenler tarafından algılanan etik liderlik rolleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki: Bursa ili örneği (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez.Merkezi/
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1977). Örgütlerin toplumsal psikolojisi (trans H. Can & Y. Bayar). Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları.
- *Kaya, İ. (2009). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin durumsal liderlik stillerinin örgütsel bağlılık ve verimlilik düzeylerinin yordama gücü (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Kılıç, Ş. (2011). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel sinizm ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki İlişki: Keçiören ilçesi örneği (Master's thesis, Hacattepe University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/ UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Kılıçoğlu, G. (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık algılarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Master's thesis, Ege University, İzmir, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Kolay, A. (2012). Endüstri meslek liselerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/ UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Kulinskaya, E., Morgenthaler, S., & Staudte, R. G. (2008). Meta-analysis: A guide to calibrating and combining statistical evidence. London: John Wiley & Sons.
- *Kurt, B. (2013). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin değişime karşı dirençleri ile örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: İstanbul ili Pendik ilçesi örneği (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Lee, H. R. (2000). An empirical study of organizational justice as a mediator of the relationships among leader-member exchange and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions in the lodging industry (Doctoral dissertation, Blacksburg, Virginia). Retrieved from http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05012000-14210002/unrestricted/dissertation.pdf
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (2001). Practical meta analysis. London: Sage.
- Littel, H. J., Corcoran, J., & Pillai, V. (2008). Systematic reviews and meta-analysis. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Marsden, P. V., Kalleberg, A. L., & Cook, C. R. (1993). Gender differences in organizational commitment: Influences of work positions and family roles. *Work and Occupations*, 20(3), 368-390. doi:10.1177/0730888493020003005
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and metaanalysis of the antecedents, correlates and, consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.

- *Menep, İ. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağılılığa ilişkin algı düzeylerinin incelenmesi: Şırnak/İdil örneği (Master's thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, P. M., Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research, the case of work commitment. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 34, 40-56.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employeeorganization linkages, the psychology of commitment absenteeism and turnover. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal Of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- *Nayır, F. (2013). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyi. İlköğretim Online, 12(1), 179-189.
- *Nayır, F. (2011). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin öğretmenlere sağlanan örgütsel desteğe ilişkin görüşleri, öğretmenlerin örgütsel destek algısı ve örgütsel bağıllıkla dişkisi (Master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTez/Merkezi/
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effect of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- *Özkan, S. (2010). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılığı ve iş değerleri (Master's thesis, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez. vok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Özdemir, A. (2012). İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin demokratik tutumlarının öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık algısı ile ilişkisi: İstanbul ili Sancaktepe-Çekmeköy ilçeleri (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Paker, N. (2009). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel güvenleri ile örgütsel bağılıkları arasındaki ilişki: Sakarya ili örneği (Master's thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). Systematic reviews in the social sciences. Massachusetts, MA: Blackwell.
- *Sağban, Ş. (2011). Okul müdürlerinin kültürel liderlik rollerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyine etkisi: Afyonkarahisar ili örneği (Master's thesis, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Sarıkaya, E. (2011). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılıkları ve performansları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Maltepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2002). Organizational behavior. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- *Selçuklu, A. E. (2013). Örgütsel bağlılığın bir yordayıcısı olarak kurum kültürü ve psikolojik dayanıklılık: okul öncesi öğretmenler üzerine bir çalışma (Master's thesis, Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez. yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/

- *Selvitopu, A. (2011). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin örgütsel adalet algıları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Shadish, W. R., Hedges, L. V., & Pustejovsky, J. E. (2013). Analysis and meta-analysis of single-case designs with a standardized mean difference statistic: A primer and applications. *Journal of School Psychology*, 52, 123-147.
- *Şama, E., & Kolamaz, C. (2011). Destekleyici ve geliştirici liderlik özellikleri ile örgütsel bağlılık arasındaki ilişki. Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 9(2), 313-342.
- Şimşek, M. (2002). *İnsan faktörü*. İstanbul: Babıâli Kültür Yayıncılık.
- Şirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417-453.
- Tak, B., Erdur, D. A., & Kitapçı, N. (2011). Türkiye'de örgütsel bağlılık yazını (2002-2010): Bir meta analiz çalışması. İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(2), 335-353.
- *Temur, Ö. F. (2012). Öğretmen algılarına göre yöneticilerin karar verme stillerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığına etkisi: Rize ili örneği (Master's thesis, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Rize, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok. gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Thalheimer, W., & Cook, S. (2002). How to calculate effect size from published research: A simplified spreadsheet. Retrieved November 01, 2014 from http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Effect. Sizes_pdf5.pdf
- *Tulunay, Ö. (2010). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin tükenmişlik düzeyleri ve örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel iletişimle ilişkisi: Sivas ili örneği (Master's thesis, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Uğurlu, C. T. (2009). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerine yöneticilerinin etik liderlik ve örgütsel adalet davranışlarının etkisi: Hatay ili örneği (Doctoral dissertation, İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Uygar, M. (2010). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin kültürel liderlik rollerini gerçekleştirme düzeyleri ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılığı arasındaki ilişki (Master's thesis, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok. gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations, a normative view. *Academy Of Management Review, l*(7), 418-428.
- *Yalçın, B. (2009). Eğitim örgütlerinde Meyer ve Allen üç boyutlu örgütsel bağlılık ölçeğinin geçerlilik ve güvenirlik çalışması (Master's thesis, Gaziosmanpaşa University,Tokat, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Yumuşak, H. (2013). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin bezdiri (mobbing) yaşama düzeyi ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Tokat il örneği (Master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Yüce, S. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: Ankara ili örneği (Master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/
- *Zeyrek, A. O. (2008). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı 2005 öğretmenlik kariyer basamakları yükselme sınavında öğretmenlerin başarı durumları ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi: İstanbul ili örneği (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/