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.
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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. 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 of 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 to 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; Simşek, 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; Simşek, 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.

\[ H_{1a} \] While gender affects the teachers’ organizational commitment, teachers’ working region moderates this effect.

\[ H_{1b} \] While gender affects the teachers’ organizational commitment, the teachers’ school level moderates this effect.

\[ H_2 \] 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.

\[ H_{2c} \] 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 meta-analysis 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 sub-dimensions. 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.
Table 1  
Characteristics of the Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample region: Gender-O’Reilly and Chatman’s Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>East Anatolia</td>
<td>South-Eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>Central Anatolia</td>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>Black Sea</td>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample region: Publishing Year of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Type</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample region: School Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample region: Marital Status-Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>East Anatolia</td>
<td>Black Sea</td>
<td>Central Anatolia</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample region: Gender-O’Reilly and Chatman’s Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>East Anatolia</td>
<td>Central Anatolia</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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...
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 \(H_{2a}\) 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 \(H_{2b}\), 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>The Effect of Gender on Organizational Commitment: The Results of Meta-Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator [Region]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegean</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-Eastern Anatolia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Anatolia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Sea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmara</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator [School Level]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.
findings do not support the hypothesis H1c, 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) .05 for affective sub-dimension, (v) .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 H2c 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.
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 mid-level 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.
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