FACULTY LOYALTY IN HIGH PRIORITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

KAY FRANCES RAINWATER WALKER

(Under the direction of William W. Swan)

ABSTRACT

Schools are organizations. In order to survive and grow, schools must have loyal employees at each level of the organization. This research was conducted to determine which properties in high priority schools in Georgia might be related to employee loyalty to each of the organizational levels of the schools.This study examined the relationships among the organizational variables of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness to teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal, and teacher colleagues.

The sample of schools consisted of 29 elementary schools from 7 school systems in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia. The schools were chosen from a list of 121 elementary schools which the Georgia Office of Education Accountability had labeled "High Priority Schools" in 2001. The sample represented 24% of all schools in the selected population of high priority urban schools.

Each teacher who participated in the study completed two surveys. One survey was the School Climate and Health Questionnaire, which measured institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. The second survey was the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire, which measured teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal, and teacher colleagues. Between 25% and 50% of the teachers in each school returned the surveys.

The school was the unit of analysis. Three hypotheses were tested. It was found that teacher loyalty to the system was not significantly related to institutional integrity. However, teacher loyalty to the principal is significantly related to principal openness and collegial loyalty is significantly related to teacher openness. Post hoc analyses revealed significant relationships among the loyalty variables.

INDEX WORDS: Loyalty, institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, school climate, urban schools, school improvement

FACULTY LOYALTY IN HIGH PRIORITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

KAY FRANCES RAINWATER WALKER

A.B., The University of Georgia, 1976

M.Ed., The University of Georgia, 1979

Ed. S., Emory University, 1993

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2003

FACULTY LOYALTY IN HIGH PRIORITY SCHOOLS: AND IMPORTANT BUT

OVERLOOKED CONCEPT

by

KAY FRANCES RAINWATER WALKER

Major Professor: William W. Swan

Committee: C. Thomas Holmes
C. Kenneth Tanner

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2003

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my family who has provided me with inspiration, patience, encouragement and love. My husband, Jim, and my children, Dan and Evan, have been my mainstays throughout my education and career and have shown their pride in my accomplishments.

This project is also dedicated in loving memory of my mother, Frances Lewis Rainwater. She raised me to value an education; she worked hard all of her life to assure that I received the best one she could provide for me. Without her love and support, I would never have accomplished my goals. My only regret is that she did not live to see me achieve this particular goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

America is facing a shortage of qualified teachers, and one reason for this shortage is the number of teachers leaving the profession. According to the National Center for Education Statistics ("Attrition among…" 1998), teacher attrition is the largest single factor determining the demand for additional teachers in the nation's schools. Ingersoll (as cited in Hardy, 1999) stated that "the problem (of a teacher shortage) isn't so much a shortage. It's retention. If we could cut down on turnover, the problem could be eliminated immediately" (p. 13).

Employee loyalty has been shown to have a statistically significant positive relationship to employee retention (Hackett, Lapierre, & Hausdorf, 2001). Generating faculty loyalty may be one way for school leaders to retain teachers in their schools and in the profession. Other researchers have described additional benefits to schools as a result of faculty loyalty. Guido-DiBrito, Chavez, Wallace, and DeBrito (1997) stated, "Loyalty can be used as a barometer of the health and effectiveness of a division, as a cushion and morale builder during difficult times, and as a sustaining motivator in service to students and society" (p. 252).

The study of organizational loyalty is related to the study of formal organizations because school systems are formal organizations. Parsons (1961) proposed that formal organizations have three levels of authority – institutional, managerial, and technical. The school system is the institutional level of educational organizations, the principal is the managerial level of school organizations, and the teachers are the technical level of

school organizations. Reiss (1994) found a statistically significant positive relationship between faculty loyalty to these three levels of school organizations and faculty loyalty to the school district, principal, and teacher colleagues.

The study by Reiss (1994) was significant for several reasons. First, previous research had found statistically significant positive relationships between organizational loyalty and several desirable qualities of organizations: higher organizational performance (Steers, 1977), employee retention (Porter & Steers, 1973), attendance (Angle & Perry, 1981), and organizational adaptability (Morris & Sherman, 1981). Second, Reiss's study examined organizational loyalty, not as a unidimensional concept (Gouldner, 1957) nor a bidimensional mode represented by loyalty to the organization and supervisor (Blau & Scott, 1962) but as a model that predicted the existence of three types of organizational loyalty: loyalty to the institution, to the supervisor, and to colleagues. Third, Reiss's study added to the knowledge of how loyalty in educational settings could be facilitated and directed by delineating behaviors exhibited by school leaders which were positively related to teacher loyalty. And fourth, the study by Reiss was significant in that it measured loyalty and school climate factors in urban districts. Because students in urban schools historically do not perform as well on high-stakes, standardized tests, leaders in these schools are under more pressure to show continually improving student performance (Hannaway & Talbert, 1993). Better performance may be expected if teachers remain in the system and the schools longer, have better attendance, and are more loyal to their supervisors and colleagues. And as Hannaway and Talbert (1993) stated, urban schools should be studied in their own right:

Educational reform calls for policy research that can inform choices constrained by the realities of local school contexts…It is important to define the kinds of metropolitan areas, educational systems, and schools that constitute meaningful reference groups for one another and thus sensible populations for effective schools research….what works in one kind of educational setting may actually hinder in another. (p. 182)

Reiss (1994) found that organizational properties influence faculty loyalty. He determined that the property of institutional integrity has a positive relationship to faculty loyalty to the school district ($r = .36$, $p < 05$). He found that the greater the degree of openness in the principal, the greater was the faculty loyalty to the principal ($r = .63$, $p < .05$). He found that the greater the degree of openness of teachers, the greater was the collegial loyalty ($r = .69$, $p < .05$). He performed multiple regression to explore relationships among all the variables and determined that principal behaviors were the most significant correlate of teacher loyalty to the district, principal, and colleagues.

It is important to continue the study of faculty loyalty in 2003. Reiss (1994) explained that leaders were under pressure in 1994 to improve student achievement, particularly in urban districts, to justify the federal money that moves to those systems and schools. Today, with legislation such as the Georgia A+ Education Reform Act (2000) and the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, educational leaders are under even more pressure to improve student achievement and show evidence of effectiveness in schools. The A+ Education Reform Act stipulates a system of grading schools based on student achievement scores. If a school receives a failing grade for five years in a row, the school staff may be replaced. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 allows parents

to transfer their children from schools which do not show evidence of student achievement and positive school climate. School leaders can benefit from information that provides strategies which encourage the retention of teachers and the retention of students in their schools.

The study of employee loyalty within organizations has its foundations in the work of earlier researchers who proposed various theories of organizations and organizational characteristics. These theories include the rational school of thought (Weber 1921/1964); classical organizational theory (Fayol, 1916/1949; Taylor, 1911); the human relations approach (Follett, 1924); the behaviorist view (Barnard, 1938); and systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1952; Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Parsons (1967), a systems theorist, proposed that in order to continue its existence, every organization must solve four basic problems: adaptation, goal achievement, integration (the organization's ability to establish and coordinate cohesion among its employees), and latency (maintenance of the organization's values and culture). Hoy and Miskel (1987) proposed that the integration function of schools was reflected in employee job satisfaction. These researchers also proposed that employee loyalty and a sense of identity with the institution are typical indicators that a school is effectively performing for the latency function.

Promoting teacher loyalty is an especially important role for school leaders of today because of the continuing and increasing shortage of qualified teachers. Pipho (1998) commented on the shortage of qualified teachers: "A number of factors together have created this situation: a growing student population, tougher certification/testing standards for new teachers, and mandates for lower class size have combined with a

strong economy that has created jobs that attract potential teachers to other fields" (p. 181). A survey regarding attrition administered by the National Center of Education Statistics ("Attrition among…" 1998) found that six percent of full-time public school teachers and ten percent of full-time private school teachers who taught during the 1993-94 school year left teaching before the start of the 1994-95 school year. Twenty-one percent of public school teachers who left teaching between the 1993-94 and 1994-95 school years left to pursue another profession. Among teachers who cited dissatisfaction as a reason for leaving, more than one-fourth specified that inadequate administrative support was one of the main reasons for that dissatisfaction. If principals are to be effective leaders, they must demonstrate attributes that will encourage teachers to remain in their school systems and in the profession.

Statement of the Problem

The current study was undertaken to determine if there were statistically significant relationships among institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and teacher loyalty to the school system, loyalty to the principal, and loyalty to teacher colleagues. Responses for teacher loyalty to the system, principal, and colleagues came from the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ) instrument, and responses regarding institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness came from the School Climate and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ).

Statistical tests were performed to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between faculty loyalty to the system and institutional integrity. Similarly, the relationship between faculty loyalty to the principal and principal openness and the relationship between faculty loyalty to colleagues and teacher openness were examined.

Operational Definitions

This section includes definitions of the terms important to the study. These definitions are based on use of the terms in this study.

Technical Level of an Organization - The technical level of an organization is defined as the level on which the actual product of the organization is manufactured or dispensed; it is the level on which the work is done. Teachers in educational institutions exemplify this level (Blau & Scott, 1962).

Managerial Level of an Organization - The managerial level of an organization is defined as the level on which personnel are responsible for coordinating and supervising the work (Blau & Scott, 1962). The principal of the school operates on the managerial level.

Institutional Level of an Organization - The institutional level of an organization connects it with the wider social system (Blau & Scott, 1962). Personnel at the institutional level establish the legitimacy of the enterprise and communicate between the formal structure and its environment. The school system, represented by the superintendent and the superintendent's staff, epitomizes the institutional level in school systems.

Personal Loyalty - Loyalty to a given level of the organization is defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Such loyalty can be characterized by at least three related factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). Loyalty represents an

active relationship with the organization such that individuals are willing to exert considerable effort in order to contribute to the organization's well being.

Organizational Loyalty - Organizational loyalty to a given level of the organization is defined as the synthesis of the individual attitudes and behaviors directed toward that level of the organization (Reiss, 1994).

Loyalty at Each of the Three Levels of the School Organization – (a) Loyalty to the institutional level of school systems is a strong belief in and acceptance of the system's goals and values, a willingness to exert substantial effort on behalf of the system, and a strong desire to maintain employment in the school system. (b) Loyalty to the principal, who operates at the managerial level, is a strong belief in and acceptance of the principal's goals and values, the willing compliance to perform duties for the principal that are not required by the formal organization, and a strong desire to maintain a professional relationship with the principal. (c) For the technical level, loyalty to teacher colleagues is the sharing of norms and values with the school staff, a willingness to exert effort beyond that normally expected in order to help colleagues achieve an organizational goal, and a strong desire to maintain a professional relationship with the faculty (adapted from Mowday et al. 1979; Parsons, 1967).

Institutional Integrity - Institutional integrity is defined as the school system's ability to adapt to its environment and cope in ways that maintain the soundness of its educational programs. Schools in systems with integrity are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Principal Openness - Principal openness is defined as the degree to which the principal listens to and is open to teacher suggestions, gives genuine and frequent praise,

and respects the professional competence of the faculty. Principal openness is composed of supportive behaviors and is exhibited when principals give teachers freedom to perform without close scrutiny and provide facilitating leadership behavior devoid of bureaucratic trivia (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Supportive Principal Behavior - Supportive principal behavior is defined as behavior of a principal that includes frequent praise of teachers. Criticism is constructive. Supportive principals respect the professional competence of their staffs and exhibit both a personal and professional interest in each teacher (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Principal Closedness – Principal closedness is defined as behavior that is restrictive. It hinders rather than facilitates teacher work (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Restrictive Principal Behavior – Restrictive principal behavior is defined as behavior that results in teachers being burdened with paperwork, committee requirements, routine duties, and other demands. Teachers working for principals who exhibit restrictive behavior do not have enough time to do meaningful work (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Teacher Openness - Teacher openness is characterized by the degree to which teacher behavior supports open and professional interactions. Teachers know each other well and are personal friends. They cooperate and are committed to their students. The behavior is open and authentic and is measured by the degree of collegial, intimate, or disengaged behaviors that are exhibited (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Collegial Teacher Behavior - Collegial teacher behavior is defined as behavior which facilitates a pervasive professional relationship between teachers. The faculty

members enjoy working together, are proud of their school, and are accepting of each other (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991).

Intimate Teacher Behavior -Intimate teacher behavior is defined as behavior in which strong social relationships are developed among the faculty. Teachers are close personal friends, socialize together regularly, and provide strong social support for each other (Hoy et al. 1991).

Teacher Closedness – Teacher closedness is defined as a situation which occurs as a result of disengaged teacher behavior. Disengaged teacher behavior is behavior in which teachers do not enjoy working with each other, are not supportive of their colleagues, and are not optimistic about the ability of students to succeed (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

High Priority Elementary Schools - High Priority Elementary Schools in Georgia are defined as public elementary schools, grades kindergarten through fifth grade, in which 70% or more students in specific categories of students in the school did not meet standards set by the state on the 2000 or 2001 administration of the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT). The data were disaggregated into these categories: all students; Asian, African-Amercan, Hispanic, white, multi-racial; students with disabilities; limited English proficiency; female, male; and low socioeconomic status and high socioeconomic status.

Urban Schools – Urban is defined as being in or near a city (Thorndike & Barnhart, 1991). Urban schools in this study are located in the Atlanta, Georgia metropolitan area (as defined by the United States Office of Management and Budget, 1999).

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were developed to address the questions raised in the statement of the problem. These questions concern the possible relationships between the organizational characteristics of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and teacher loyalty to the school system, to the principal, and to colleagues.

H :1

There is a statistically significant correlation between institutional integrity as measured by the relevant subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) and faculty loyalty to the school system as measured by the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ).

H :2

There is a statistically significant correlation between principal openness as measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionairre – Revised for Elementary Schools (OCDQ-RE) and teacher loyalty to the principal as measured by the RSLQ.

H :3

There is a statistically significant correlation between teacher openness as measured by the OCDQ-RE and teacher loyalty to teacher colleagues as measured by the RSLQ.

Importance of the Study

The study of teacher loyalty at three different levels of the school organization is important for several reasons. First, organizational loyalty, operationalized as

organizational commitment, has been shown to be positively related to employees'

intentions to stay with a job and with a profession (Hackett et al. 2001). By increasing the

knowledge of characteristics that are related to increased faculty loyalty, school decision

makers may alter factors within the school organization to increase loyalty and

subsequently increase teacher retention in the school system and within the profession.

Second, gaining teacher loyalty may result in other positive outcomes for the

school leader. Research on school effectiveness has shown a positive correlation between

expressive activities such as teacher loyalty and instrumental activities such as student

achievement (Uline, Miller, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998). Hoy and Hannum (1997) found

a positive correlation between loyal teachers and student achievement and noted that, to

be considered successful, school leaders must show evidence of student achievement.

Uline et al. (1998) found that teachers who are loyal to the school and the principal are

willing to put forth additional effort to help children achieve at a higher level.

Third, this study focused on urban schools which have faced significant

educational challenges and whose leaders are under pressure to demonstrate improvement

in student achievement (Hannaway & Talbert, 1993). Created in 2000, the Georgia Office

of Education Accountability provides statistics of state school performance on the

Georgia Criterion Referenced Tests (CRCT), which measure student mastery of the state

curriculum. The Georgia Office of Education Accountability has labeled certain schools,

including many urban elementary schools, "High Priority Schools" because at least 70%

of certain target groups do not pass one or more sections of the CRCT. The target groups

are: all students; Asian, African-American, Hispanic, white, multi-racial, Native

American; students with disabilities; limited English proficient; female, male; low

socioeconomic status, and high socioeconomic status. The Georgia A+ Education Reform Act of 2000 specifies that High Priority Schools which do not show improvement within five years may face replacement of administrative and teaching staffs and/or takeover by state agencies. Improving achievement in low-performing schools is of particular interest in the literature and in the media, and the loyalty of the faculty has been shown to have an impact on student achievement. As Reiss (1994) suggested:

> If urban school administrators can learn to recognize those variables that affect the openness of the institutional, managerial, and technical levels of the school, there may be a better chance that teachers will become more loyal, perform better, attend more often, and thereby have a more positive effect on the urban child's scholastic achievement (p. 12).

In addition, according to Hardy (1999), urban schools struggle to find applicants and often turn to uncertified teachers to fill their classrooms.

Fourth, the study of how school leaders can develop stronger teacher commitment has been paid little scholarly attention (Kushman, 1992; Reiss & Hoy, 1998; Uline et.al. 1998). This study is important in that it will add to the body of knowledge about teacher loyalty and commitment, particularly as a multidimensional construct, by examining loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues. Commenting on the relationship between organizational loyalty and commitment, Reiss (1994) stated:

> Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) defined organizational commitment as a belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to exert substantial effort on behalf of the organization, and a desire to maintain membership in the organization. Steers (1977) stated that loyalty was the strength

of identification and involvement with the organization. Mowday et al. (1979)

concluded that loyalty was commitment to the organization (p. 42).

Noting the importance of teacher commitment, Kushman (1992) stated "Commitment, in

the sense of having teachers go above and beyond the minimum job requirements in

pursuit of educational and organizational excellence, is important because educating

children in the future will be a much more difficult and complex task" (p. 39). Reiss and

Hoy (1998) stated that, "Principals who command loyalty from their teachers have the

potential to be more effective in their leadership efforts to improve learning and

teaching…[and] teachers who are loyal to each other build the cohesion necessary for

successful cooperation and interaction" (p. 22).

<div align="center">Limitations of the Study</div>

1. This study was limited to public elementary schools in the metropolitan area of

Atlanta, Georgia which had been labeled "High Priority Elementary Schools" by the

Office of Education Accountability. This designation applied to schools in which 70% of

students from at least one of 13 categories did not pass the Georgia Criterion Referenced

Competency Tests in 2000 or 2001.

2. This study was limited to elementary school teachers. Since only elementary

school teachers were surveyed, generalizations can only be made to similar elementary

schools.

3. This study was an ex post facto study and not a true experimental design. For

that reason, cause and effect relationships may not be concluded.

Organization of the Study

This study was an attempt to determine the degree of faculty loyalty to the school system, the principal, and colleagues at selected elementary schools in Georgia and to determine the relationship of selected institutional, principal, and faculty characteristics that may be associated with loyalty. Chapter I introduced the topic, stated the problem, defined the terms, presented the research questions, explained the significance of the study, and listed limitations of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the related literature on the topic including theories and models of organizations from a historical perspective. Elements of these perspectives are examined in detail as they are related to schools. Next, the research related to the dependent variables of faculty loyalty to the institution, principal, and colleagues is reviewed. Finally, research related to the independent variables of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness is examined.

Chapter III describes the methods used to collect, interpret, and analyze the data. Specifically, the chapter restates the problem, presents the hypotheses, explains the research design, describes the population of the study, explains the data collection process, describes the instruments used, explains the variables, and explains the methods of statistical analyses. Chapter IV reports the findings of the study based on the testing of each hypotheses.

Chapter V contains a summary of the results and a statement of the conclusions reached as a result of the research. Chapter V also presents recommendations for consideration for future studies.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature on teacher loyalty to the school system, to the

principal, and to teacher colleagues. This study is based on the work of earlier researchers

(Hoy et al. 1991) who delineated three variables associated with faculty loyalty:

institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. In researching the

behavior of school employees and using the Parsons Model for Organizations (1967) as a

framework, Reiss (1994) examined the same three independent factors and found that

they had a statistically significant positive relationship to teacher loyalty to the system,

the principal, and teacher colleagues (r = .36, r = .63, r = .69).

In researching employee loyalty, several theories and models of organizational

behavior were examined. This literature review begins with an overview of

organizational theory from a historical perspective. Four movements are discussed: the

rational theory (Weber, 1921/1964); classical organizational theory (Fayol, 1916/1949;

Taylor, 1911); the human relations approach (Follett, 1924); and the behaviorist view

(Argyris, 1957; Barnard, 1938). In addition to the four basic movements, systems theory,

an offshoot of the behaviorist view, was examined (Bertalanffy, 1952; Hearn, 1958; Hoy

& Miskel, 2001). Next, a part of the Parsons Model for Organizations (Parsons, 1967) is

examined in detail. Research relating to employee loyalty (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990:

Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982) and motivation (Maslow, 1954) is reviewed.

The final section of the review examines research related to variables critical to

studying loyalty. First, research related to teacher loyalty to the organization, loyalty to

the principal, and loyalty to colleagues is examined. Second, research related to institutional integrity is examined as a part of organizational health (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Miles, 1965). Third, principal openness and teacher openness are examined as elements of school climate (Halpin & Croft, 1963; Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

<div align="center">Organizational Models</div>

<div align="center">Rational School of Thought</div>

Efforts to develop a systematic conceptual base for administering complex organizations are relatively recent. In fact, most scholars reason that such efforts were closely associated with the industrial revolution and began as the nineteenth century closed (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988). Weber (1921/1964) conceived of the notion of the ideal bureaucracy as an authority structure based on rational behavior. The organization, according to Weber, was improved to the extent that personal, irrational, and emotional factors were eliminated from official acts. Weber described three types of authority: traditional authority, rational-legal authority, and charismatic authority. Traditional authority was derived from tradition, that is, authority given to kings. Charismatic authority rested on the appeal of leaders who claimed allegiance because of the force of their extraordinary personalities. Rational-legal authority was anchored in impersonal rules that have been legally established in order to achieve some valued end. Rational-legal authority was projected throughout the organization in such ways as to directly control human activity toward the organizational goals of high predictability and maximum efficiency.

Commenting on Weber's model for organizations, Hanson (1991) noted that Weber defined a set of principles of organizations that would lead an organization to

higher levels of efficiency. These principles were hierarchal structure, division of labor, control by rules, impersonal relationships, and career orientation. Hanson stated that positions within the organization were ranked in a hierarchical order, with information flowing up the chain of command and directives flowing down the chain of command. Operations of the organizations were characterized by impersonal rules that explicitly stated duties, responsibilities, standardized procedures, and conduct of employees. Positions were highly specialized. All of these characteristics had one objective: to promote the efficient attainment of the organization's goals.

Hoy (1994) stated that this rational school of thought exemplified "an era of intellectual thought that focused on rationality and efficiency devoid of attention to people except as instruments of production" (p. 179). Knezevich (1975) reported that the results of adopting the ideal bureaucratic model were impartial and unbiased treatment; minimum confusion, conflict, and friction between management and labor; promotion based on competency and job performance; and security for employees based on skill and knowledge. Weller and Weller (2000), criticizing this model, noted the lack of emphasis on the importance of human relations and informal groups; the rigid rules and regulations; the impersonal and authoritarian nature of management; and the inability to react quickly to pressures for change. Despite the shortcomings of the rational model, Herriott and Firestone (1984) reported that elementary schools conform to the image of a rational bureaucracy.

<p style="text-align:center">Classical Organizational Thought</p>

Taylor (1911) was another early twentieth century organizational theorist whose classic work on management science focused on the development of scientific principles

that could be applied directly to the supervision of employees. The first principle he proposed was that all productive effort should be measured by accurate time study, and a standard time should be established for every task undertaken by the organization. Second, he proposed that wages should be proportional to output, and the rates should be determined by the findings of the time studies. Third, he proposed that management should take over from the workers the responsibility of determining the best methods for their work and train the workers accordingly. Fourth, managers should be trained to apply scientific principles of management, such as management by exception. And fifth, he proposed that the organization be designed so that it best served the purpose of improving the coordination of activities among the various specialists.

Taylor's (1911) model for efficient organizations was based on clear delineation of authority, separation of planning from operations, incentive schemes for workers, management by exception, and task specialization. Taylor's view of the motivation of workers was that man is rational and will make choices based on the promised degree of monetary reward. Taylor devised payment systems that were closely related to the kind of effort he sought. Strong criticism of this theory has argued that it treats human beings like machines and assumes that workers are satisfied by money alone. Weller and Weller (2000) described this leadership style as "authoritarian and insensitive to human needs" (p. 53).

Fayol (1916/1949), another classical management theorist, concentrated on concepts of top management. In his classic volume *General Administration*, he defined the basic functions of management as planning, or defining goals and outcomes; organizing, or the structuring of authority and the division of labor; commanding, or

supervising subordinates; coordinating, or implementing measures to ensure effective interaction between resources and employees; and controlling, or ensuring outcomes are consistent with plans. Thirty years later, the scientific management orientation was adapted for the public sector by Gulick and Urwick (1937) who developed a list of activities that they maintained were required for the efficient administration of public affairs: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Kimbrough and Nunnery (1988) stated that "Fayol and Gulick saw a precise definition of the functions of an administrator as another important notion in the development of a theory of administration" (p. 266). Motivation of employees was not included as a factor in these models.

Hanson (1991) reported that today's schools adhere in several ways to the principles of scientific management. First, today's schools emphasize formation of a hierarchy with graded levels of authority. Next, today's schools employ scientific measurement of tasks and levels of performance and constantly attempt to define the one best way of performing a task. Additionally, today's schools use division of labor and definite rules of behavior, and emphasize discipline among employees, recruitment based on ability, and technical knowledge. Hanson noted that an advantage of a scientific style of management is that it provides a model of organization and administration that has a compelling logic.

Critics of the scientific style of management applied to schools listed several weaknesses. First, these models do not consider the impact of forces in the environment on the organization. Second, power is concentrated too heavily at the top of the organization. Third, the scientific models give inadequate attention to people or assume

that they function from purely economic motives (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988;

Sergiovanni, 1992; Weller & Weller, 2000). The rational and scientific models of

organizations neglected to address intrinsic employee motivations such as loyalty.

<p style="text-align:center;">Human Relations Movement</p>

The scientific style of management prevailed until the 1930's. Hanson (1991)

stated, "Until the 1930's, the basic assumption had been that the chief factors behind

employee motivation and morale were wages and physical working conditions" (p. 53).

This assumption was challenged by the work of Mayo (1933) with the famous Hawthorne

studies, which were carried out between 1923 and 1926 at the Hawthorne plant of the

Western Electric Company and were aimed at determining the relationship between the

intensity of illumination and worker output. While the researchers established no clear

relationship between illumination and worker productivity, they found that social and

psychological factors were crucial to worker motivation. These results demonstrated the

inadequacy of the scientific theory of organizations which held that motivation of

workers was primarily based on economic factors or physical working conditions.

Another important finding of the Hawthorne studies was that workers tended not

to act or react as individuals but as members of informal groups. Rossman, Corbett and

Firestone (1988) defined the informal group as "a system of interpersonal relations which

forms within an organization to affect decisions of the formal organization" (p. 336). In

the Hawthorne studies, workers in the Bank Wiring Room established their own goals for

production. Mayo (1933) found no relationship between productivity and factors such as

intelligence or finger dexterity. These researchers did find that the workers were

controlling their own productivity within the group because they feared that management would change the piece-work rate if they consistently produced at higher levels.

As a result of these discoveries of the impact of social-psychological factors on the motivation of employees, a new management ideology known as the human relations approach was developed. A leading figure in the human relations approach to organizational and management theory was Follett whose book *Creative Experience* (1924) advocated her organizational theory. Later researchers who examined her ideas confirmed that group dynamics were important in successful organizations. Graham (1995) explained Follett's theory as "a self governing principle which facilitates the growth of individuals and of the groups to which they belong. By directly interacting with one another to achieve their common goals, the members of a group fulfill themselves through the process of the group's development" (p. 276). Additionally, Graham stated that the movement encouraged leaders in organizations to recognize the needs of the informal groups and to mesh these needs with the goals of the organization.

In their review of the human relations movement, Haas and Drabek (1973) summarized five principles of the movement. First, workers are viewed as complex individuals rather than as cogs in a machine. Second, individuals are most satisfied when working in interactive groups. Third, group norms are the regulators of group activity and effective organizations are sets of interlocking, functioning groups. Fourth, individual motivation and sense of participation in the entire organization occur when groups are linked together to form a total functioning organization. Last, the participative group method of management is more effective than other types of management systems.

Critics of the human relations approach identify some negative aspects of the movement. For example, Kimbrough and Nunnery (1988) noted that psychosocial aspects of organizations are emphasized at the expense of structural-technical aspects. These authors added that the intent of the movement may be viewed as manipulative – to secure worker compliance with the directives of management. Kimbrough and Nunnery say further that there was a lack of evidence to confirm some of the postulates advanced, for example the evidence is less than conclusive in regard to the often-assumed relationship between increased employee satisfaction and increased productivity.

In spite of the criticism of the human relations movement, the basic viewpoint of the approach is still widely accepted by educational administrators and provides an important base for the systems approach. The human relations approach is important to this study in that it recognizes the importance of intrinsic motivation to worker productivity.

<div align="center">Behavioral Science Approach</div>

The behavioral science approach to organizational theory was an attempt to integrate human relations and classical management principles. An early proponent of the behavioral science approach was Barnard (1938), who described elements of the approach as follows:

The vitality of organizations lies in the willingness of individuals to contribute forces to the cooperative system. . . . The continuance of willingness also depends upon the satisfactions that are secured by individual contributors in the process of carrying out the purpose. If the satisfactions do not exceed the sacrifices required,

willingness disappears, and the condition is one of organization inefficiency (p. 92).

Another proponent of behavioral science, Argyris (1957) stated that effective leadership behavior involves fusing the individual and the organization in such a way that both simultaneously reach optimum self-actualization. Studies by Maslow (1954) and McGregor (1960) gave rise to collegial theories of management that stressed employees' social needs and their desire to be challenged, recognized, and involved in decision making and planning. These researchers demonstrated that bureaucratic structures and leadership styles could be modified to create motivating jobs which would encourage people to use and expand their capacities for creativity and autonomy.

Maslow (1954) and McGregor (1960) further connected the behavioral science approach to organizational theory. Maslow's theory of needs stated that people have a hierarchy of needs and that lower-level hierarchy needs must be satisfied before higher-level needs can be satisfied. He suggested that the manager's job is to provide ways for people to meet their needs and the goals of the organization simultaneously.

McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y offer two contrasting views of employee work performance and management strategies. According to McGregor, Theory X holds that employees have an inherent dislike of work and must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives. McGregor argued the superiority of Theory Y, which holds that managerial controls should be more consistent with the view that employees do not inherently dislike work, and that under certain circumstances

employees will exercise self-control, display the capacity for creativity, and seek responsibility.

In discussing organizational management, Hanson (1991) described elements of the behavioral science approach that are evident and widely accepted in educational administration today. These elements include cooperative decision-making, group granted administrative authority, administrative attempts to promote staff harmony and morale, and an emphasis on anthropological, psychological, and sociological content in educational leadership training programs.

The behavioral science models, in concert with the human relations approach, emphasized the notion of employee satisfaction as an important aspect of organizational efficiency. There is some empirical evidence that this notion applies to schools. Zigarelli (1996) found a statistically significant positive relationship between teacher morale and student achievement ($r = .73$). Similarly, Sweetland and Hoy (2000) determined a statistically significant positive relationship between teachers' feelings of empowerment, the capacity to make decisions and act on them, and student achievement ($r = .69$).

<div align="center">Systems Theory</div>

Organizational thought was significantly advanced through the rational, scientific, human relations, and behavioral science movements. However, these theories did not consider an organization's relationship to its environment, the factors of which strongly affect life in organizations. Systems theory, as applied to organizations, provides a framework for the study of environmental influence on organizations.

Bertalanffy (1952) is generally credited with being the first advocate of a notion that one theory could provide a vehicle for understanding and integrating knowledge from diverse, highly specialized fields:

If we survey the various fields of modern science, we notice a dramatic and amazing evolution. Similar conceptions and principles have arisen in quite different realms. . . . The principles of wholeness, or organization, and of the dynamic conception of reality become apparent in all fields of science. (p. 176)

Hearn (1958) agreed with Bertalanffy and expanded the definition of a system to include the notion that organizations of people could be considered systems:

General systems theorists believe that it is possible to represent all forms of animate and inanimate matter as systems; that is, all forms from atomic particles through atoms, molecules, crystals, viruses, cells, organs, individuals, groups, societies, planets, solar systems, even the galaxies, may be regarded as systems. (p. 38)

In the late 1950's, scholars such as Hearn, concerned with the administration of complex organizations, began to think of organizations as systems, concentrating on the whole, rather than the sum of the parts (Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988).

Flagle, Huggins, and Roy (1960) stated that, "A system is an integrated assembly of interacting elements designed to carry out cooperatively a predetermined function" (p. 60). Hall and Fagan (1968) defined the system as, "a set of objects together with relationships between the objects and between their attributes" (p. 81). Hoy and Miskel (2001) defined a system as a set of interdependent elements forming an organized whole.

In spite of differences in terms used, a common thread among these definitions is the reference to a system being a set of elements or parts which taken together form a whole.

Two kinds of systems are open systems and closed systems. Whereas open systems have permeable boundaries that allow interaction with their environments, closed systems have impermeable boundaries that allow neither inputs nor outputs. Early models of organizations were explained almost exclusively in terms of forces inside the organization, which was isolated from its environment. Little attention was devoted to the impact of environmental or outside forces on internal organizational behavior. In brief, organizations were seen as closed systems (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Today, it is generally accepted that organizations not only are influenced by their environments but also are dependent upon them (Hoy & Miskel, 2001). Few contemporary organizational theorists accept the premise that organizations can be completely understood in isolation from events occurring externally. Certainly, environmental factors are important forces affecting life in schools.

Open Systems

Schools are open systems, which receive inputs from the environment, transform those inputs, and produce outputs. For example, schools are social systems that take resources such as labor, students, and money from the environment and subject these inputs to an educational transformation process to produce literate, educated citizens. Schools also comply with other critical systems properties of organizations including the capacity to receive and process feedback from the environment, the tendency to move toward equilibrium, and the ability to adapt to changes in the environment (Hanson, 1991; Hoy & Miskel, 2001).

Haas and Drabek (1973) characterized the open systems perspective as it relates to organizations by delineating eight points. Schools comply with each point and so can be considered open systems. First, organizations are viewed as systems within systems. Schools contain subsystems such as students, teachers, transportation systems, and others. Second, all organizational subsystems, including those in schools, are open systems because they receive feedback and make adaptations to their respective environments. Haas and Drabek stated further that organizations follow the principle of equifinality which states that the same final state can be reached from different initial conditions and in different ways. Different schools in the same system might react to pressures from the environment in different ways, yet still reach the same final state. For example, all schools in Georgia are encouraged to improve scores on standardized tests, however, each school may approach the problem differently and may or may not arrive at the same state of improved scores.

Haas and Drabek's (1973) fourth point was that an organization has feedback and regulatory mechanisms that permit the organization to adapt to the environment. For instance, the newly mandated school councils in Georgia could provide an avenue for schools to receive direct feedback from the community and to make appropriate adjustments to programs based on this feedback. Haas and Drabek continued by saying that organizations are identified according to the primary activities they undertake. A school's primary activities generally include developing and delivering instruction and maintaining detailed records of outcomes. The seventh point that Haas and Drabek made is that organizations have boundaries that distinguish them from their environments. Schools have boundaries such as building walls and fences that distinguish them from

their environments. Additionally, laws and regulations create boundaries that distinguish schools from other elements in their environments. Finally, these researchers noted that organizational system interactions reflect differing layers of control and autonomy. As an example, teachers have relative autonomy in their classrooms, yet are controlled by forces such as required curriculum objectives and administrative evaluations. Similarly, principals are held accountable to the school system office, which in turn is accountable to the school board.

There is some criticism of the open systems theory as it applies to educational organizations (Haas & Drabek, 1973; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1988). For example, use of the theory for empirical research has produced problems such as trying to define a school's specific boundaries and systems of feedback. However, the definition of a system as an entity that consists of a network of subsystems applies neatly to schools. Subsystems in schools can include departments, classes, or informal groups. The work of Parsons (1960), a systems theorist, forms the conceptual framework for this study.

Parsons' Model of Organizations

Parsons (1960) suggested that all organizations are social systems that must solve four basic problems in order to survive and endure. The first problem is adaptation, or the accommodation of the organization to environmental demands. The second problem is goal achievement, or the defining of the organization's objectives and the actions to obtain them. The third problem is integration, or the establishment of a set of relations among the members of the organization that serve to unify them into a single unity. Inherent in the Parsonian emphasis on the integration of members into the organization is the idea that effective organizations will have members who share the values of the

organization, are willing to exert extra effort in their roles, and have a desire to continue

their membership in the organization (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). And the fourth

problem that Parsons suggested must be solved by every organization is latency, or the

maintenance of the organization's cultural patterns over time.

Parsons (1967) also suggested that educational institutions, like other complex

systems, could be conceptualized in terms of technical, managerial, and institutional

levels of operation. These levels of operation serve to establish structures that enable the

organization to solve the four basic problems that each organization must solve. The first

level of operation suggested by Parsons is the technical level which is involved in actual

task performance within the organization. Teachers in schools represent this level as they

have the primary responsibility for providing instruction to students. The managerial

level serves to coordinate task performance and to ensure the presence of needed

resources to the technical level. Educational administrators at various levels comprise the

managerial system in schools. The institutional level serves to relate the organization to

its environment. The superintendent and superintendent's staff function at the

institutional level. Both teachers and school administrators need support from the

institutional level if they are to perform their respective functions in a harmonious

fashion without undue pressure from individuals and groups outside the school.

Parsons (1967) also promoted the importance of maintaining employee loyalty in

the organization. Related to the integrative function, he maintained that the organization

must find ways to command the loyalties of its members and to motivate their effort. He

emphasized that in order for an organization to survive, grow, and achieve its goals, each

level of the organization must generate employee loyalty. Blau and Scott (1962) had

previously stated "There is empirical research that supports the conclusion that superiors who command the loyalty of their subordinates are more likely than others to influence employee behavior" (p. 39). Barnard (1938) had also recognized the magnitude of loyalty and summarized its importance in his discussion of the willingness to cooperate in organizations, stating that "it is clear that willingness of persons to contribute efforts to the cooperative system is indispensable" (p. 82). More recent research, cited later in this literature review, has provided additional evidence that employee loyalty at each of Parsons's three levels of organization is an important element of an effective organization.

The importance of worker loyalty has been clearly established. The relationship of loyalty to the levels of operation within an organization yields three loyalty dimensions, which are a central focus of this study. These three dimensions in relation to schools are loyalty to the school system, loyalty to the principal, and loyalty to fellow teachers.

Loyalty

This section describes research related to three variables of this study. These variables were loyalty to an institution or organization, loyalty to a supervisor, and loyalty to colleagues. Loyalty to each level of the organization was defined as active commitment to, belief in, and acceptance of the goals and values of that level of the organization, resulting in a strong desire to maintain a secure relationship with that level of the organization (Blau & Scott, 1962; Mowday et al., 1979).

Loyalty to the Organization

Organizational loyalty has been researched during the past two decades, in part because of the positive organizational outcomes and the powerful motivational

implications of commitment (Brown, 1996). Studies have linked employee loyalty to the organization with lower turnover (Blau, 1986) and increased ability to meet strategic goals (Oswald, Mossholder, & Harris, 1994). Additionally, according to Blau (1986), employees who are loyal to their organizations are motivated to work hard and to stay with their organizations. Hackett et al. (2001) concluded that the level of organizational commitment directly influenced employees' intentions to withdraw or stay with an organization and to withdraw or stay with a profession.

Although the terms organizational commitment and organizational loyalty are used interchangeably in the literature, Mowday et al. (1979) distinguished between organizational commitment and loyalty by explaining that commitment represents something beyond passive loyalty. These researchers maintained that loyalty can be expressed in terms of an individual's beliefs and opinions, whereas commitment involves an active relationship with the organization such that individuals are willing to give actively of themselves in order to contribute to the organization's well-being. The most commonly cited definition of organizational commitment is that of Mowday et al. as follows:

> Organizational commitment is the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (p. 82).

This definition of commitment has been used as the definition of loyalty in several research studies (Johnston & Venable, 1986; Reiss & Hoy, 1998; Stroh & Reilly, 1997).

Given the importance of employee commitment to organizational outcomes, it is important to understand characteristics of organizational commitment. Brown (1996) reported that much of the literature on organizational commitment defined multiple types of commitment. He noted that employees developed attitudinal commitment as a result of some combination of work experiences, perceptions of the organization, and personal characteristics; this combination led to positive feelings about an organization and the feelings evolved into commitment. Employees develop behavioral commitment, according to Brown, as a result of engaging in committing behaviors – behaviors that, in effect, make it costly to reverse a position or to disengage from some line of activity. These committing behaviors include building up a nontransferable retirement fund, accruing vacation time, or gaining academic tenure. He concluded that attitudinal commitment can foster behavioral commitment.

In addition to delineating different types of organizational commitment, researchers have also extensively examined factors that are antecedents to commitment. Angle and Lawson (1993) suggested that these antecedents may be dichotomized into two components, personal characteristics and situational factors. The former included such variables as gender, age, tenure, and education; the latter included job and organizational characteristics, as well as work experiences. Since situational factors may be influenced by organizational leaders, that component is relevant to this study.

Moreover, researchers have found several organizational characteristics to be positively related to organizational commitment. Generally, these researchers have found

that positive work environments, those in which the employees perceive the organization to be effectively accomplishing its goals, produce higher levels of commitment in employees. Mott (1972) discovered that organizational effectiveness was particularly relevant to organizational commitment. Angle and Perry (1981) found that more efficient and adaptable organizations produce a higher level of commitment on the part of employees. Meyer and Allen (1991) in their summary of research on the antecedents of organizational commitment concluded that higher affective commitment to the organization is more likely in employees with positive work experiences. In a subsequent study, Jaros (1997) suggested that employers may develop commitment in employees by providing positive work experiences such as task autonomy, supervisory feedback, and organizational dependability.

Leader behavior may also influence employee commitment to an organization. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) examined two types of leader behavior, initiating structure and consideration; they found statistically significant positive correlations between these types of leader behavior and the organizational commitment of employees (r = .69; r = .87). Initiating structure included behaviors concerned with productivity, planning, coordinating, disciplining, clarifying, and problem solving. Consideration included behaviors concerned with supportiveness, consultation, representation, and recognition. These researchers also found participative decision making to be an antecedent to employee commitment.

The development of attitudinal commitment to the organization has also been linked to the practice of Total Quality Management (TQM), a popular management philosophy and practice designed to enhance productivity and quality, reduce waste, and

increase customer satisfaction (Allen & Brady, 1997). Anderson, Rungtusunatham, and Schroeder (1994) identified seven key concepts important to TQM: employee fulfillment, visionary leadership, internal and external cooperation, learning, process management, continual improvement, and customer satisfaction. In addition, they identified organizational commitment as one element of employee fulfillment. Similarly, Harber, Burgess, and Barclay (1993) found that the implementation of TQM positively influenced employees' organizational commitment. In response to demands for educational improvement, many school systems have embraced the principles of TQM as a means of school reform.

Johnson (1993) contended that organizational commitment was the single greatest factor in performance improvement because committed employees produced beyond their potential for reward or compensation. Blau and Scott (1962) summarized the importance of loyalty or commitment to an organization to the organization's effectiveness as follows:

> The organization must keep motivated and directed. This requires the loyalty of participants, so organizations strive to maintain a strong internal culture and value system. All organizations confront these challenges. The structures and activities they construct to respond effectively vary according to the organization's role and purpose within the larger society (p. 102).

In support of Blau's comments regarding the relationship between organizational loyalty and effectiveness of the organization, there is some empirical evidence relating organizational commitment of teachers to school effectiveness. Miskel, Fevurly and Stewart (1979) found moderate to high relationships between perceived organizational

effectiveness and teacher loyalty. Hoy and Ferguson (1985) found strong positive

relationships between teacher organizational commitment and staff cohesiveness and

attitudes toward innovation. Empirical evidence also relates organizational commitment

of teachers to student achievement. Kushman (1992) found that organizational

commitment was positively related to student achievement in urban elementary and

middle schools.

<div align="center">Loyalty to the Principal.</div>

Loyalty to a superior officer in an organization has been linked to the concept of

authority, which itself has been variously defined. Weber (1921/1964) defined three types

of authority: traditional, legal, and charismatic. Hoy and Miskel (2001) identified two

other types of authority, formal and informal. Formal authority in an organization is

established through legally sanctioned rules, regulations, and policies. Central to formal

authority is the principle that a legally established and enforceable agreement exists, and

that those who join the organization voluntarily agree to abide by a code of conduct and

to accept directives from those placed in positions of authority. Weller and Weller (2000)

stated the following regarding formal authority:

> For principals, formal authority can be used to enforce policy and regulations
>
> necessary for safety and order, and to ensure minimal compliance in areas of legal
>
> responsibility and sanctioned policy…such actions do not lead to employees'
>
> taking initiative, assuming responsibility, or being highly effective at their jobs
>
> (p. 46).

Weller and Weller (2000) described informal authority as that which comes from

personal behavior, expertise, or charisma which attracted a following of supporters. In

addition, informal authority comes from group allegiance and the general acceptance of following the leader's will. Hoy and Rees (1974) connected the concepts of loyalty and informal authority by saying, "Those superiors who can command loyalty from subordinates seem to have a distinct advantage in enlarging their authority base by establishing effective informal authority over subordinates" (p. 49). Blau and Scott (1962) suggested that it is the superior who commands the loyalty of the subordinates who is able to expand his or her influence beyond the narrow scope of formal authority. They further proposed that "superiors who command the loyalty of a group – who are liked, accepted, respected – have more control than others over group members partly because they have greater confidence in their authority to issue directives" (p. 144). Sidotti (1976) found that teachers were more loyal to principals and were more satisfied with their jobs when principals exhibited high informal authority, regardless of their formal authority.

Relating to the exercise of authority, supervisory styles may also affect the degree of employee loyalty. Blau and Scott (1962) conducted studies in two social welfare agencies and identified certain supervisory styles that could be related to main effect criteria such as subordinate loyalty to the superior, productivity, work satisfaction, and group solidarity. Data were collected by systematic procedures as well as by unstructured observations, interviews, and analyses of records and documents. The researchers found that, "…worker productivity was largely associated with factors that were related to loyalty, perhaps because supervisors who had won the loyal support of their subordinates were most successful in commanding willing compliance with their directives" (p. 162). Additionally, the researchers found that emotional detachment, consistency, and

hierarchical independence were supervisory styles that were related to the ability of the supervisor to command the loyalty of subordinates.

Blau and Scott (1962) defined loyalty as the liking, acceptance, and respect for one's superior. Murray and Corenblum (1966) defined loyalty more rigorously by adding a cognitive orientation involving a set of beliefs that embodied an unquestioning faith and trust in the leader. Murray and Corenblum operationalized loyalty in four ways: (a) the desire to remain under the influence of one's present supervisor; (b) the liking for one's supervisor; (c) a degree of faith and trust in a supervisor; and (d) a direct expression of a feeling of loyalty to the supervisor (p. 79).

Hoy and Rees (1974) adapted Murray and Corenblum's (1966) loyalty measure in a study that found a positive, significant relationship between non-authoritarian behavior of principals and teachers' loyalty to the principals. Weller and Weller (2000) stated that "loyalty and trust are also awarded to principals who accept responsibility for their own behavior, remain calm during crisis situations, and are ethical and professional in their work" (p. 46).

Hierarchical influence has also been found to be associated with subordinate loyalty to a supervisor. Hoy and Rees (1974) defined hierarchical influence as the extent to which the principal is perceived as being able and willing to exert influence upwards in the hierarchy on the teachers' behalf and to take actions on behalf of the teachers. In a sample of secondary schools, Hoy and Rees (1974) found a positive correlation between hierarchical influence of the principal and teacher loyalty to the principal. Similarly, Johnston and Venable (1986) found a positive relationship between hierarchical influence and teacher loyalty to the principal in a sample of elementary schools.

Additional qualities of a supervisor have been found to foster loyalty in employees. In a qualitative study of loyalty between senior student affairs officers, their university presidents, and their department heads at four college campuses, Guido-Dibrito et al. (1997) found that loyalty of a subordinate to a supervisor was dependent on some expectation of reciprocal loyalty. The researchers noted, "When loyalty is reciprocated, the process creates a dynamic exchange between giver and receiver that enriches the relationship and the environment. If loyalty is not reciprocated, the giver feels robbed or cheated, and loyal feelings fade and die" (p. 247). The researchers also found that loyalty may be shared between supervisors and staff members who indicate similarities within and beyond the organization, for example shared interests in family values or sports. They concluded that trust is the most important component of loyalty and support is the most common manifestation of loyalty.

In discussing lessons for school administrators from Machiavelli's *The Prince*, Wilkinson (1992) proposed that one of the most important tasks of the school leader is to establish loyalty and cooperation of teachers. She quoted from Machiavelli, "No matter how powerful one's armies, to enter a conquered territory one needs the goodwill of the inhabitants" (p. 239). She suggested that new administrators should develop the loyalty of existing faculty members by using guidelines from Machiavelli. First, the new administrator should assess the personal power of teachers within the established structure to gain information, and then restructure faculty organizations in order to balance the power. Second, the new administrator should delegate authority carefully so as not to risk giving excessive authority to an assistant who may resort to treacherous

practices to retain that authority. And third, she suggested that an administrator must be loyal to the people (teachers) on whom he or she depends for a successful operation.

<u>Loyalty to Colleagues</u>

In addition to loyalty to the organization and to the supervisor, the degree of loyalty of employees to one another has been shown to affect organizational outcomes (Buchanan, 1974; Hoy & Ferguson, 1985). Studies of loyalty to colleagues are founded in studies of groups in the workplace.

Mayo (1933) in the Hawthorne studies revealed the importance of group dynamics in the workplace. These researchers discovered that the influence of collegial groups affected the amount and quality of work produced. The human relations movement (Follett, 1924) also emphasized the importance of the human aspect in the workplace. In commenting on the work of Follett, Graham (1995) explained that the human relations movement "facilitated the growth of individuals and of the groups to which they belong. By directly interacting with one another to achieve their common goals, the members of a group fulfill themselves through the process of the group's development" (p. 276).

Sergiovanni (1992) further examined the informal group dynamic in schools and he made a distinction between collegiality and congeniality. He defined congeniality as characterized by loyalty, trust, and easy conversation among teachers. He maintained that congeniality, in the form of loyalty and affection for colleagues, contributes to the establishment and nurture of collegiality. Sergiovanni defined collegiality as "common membership in a community, commitment to a common cause, shared professional values, and a shared professional heritage" (p. 91).

The importance of collegiality in the workplace has been examined more recently as researchers have corroborated the findings of the Hawthorne studies and the work of Follett. Hoy and Miskel (1987) explained the importance of the collegial group in their discussion of the formal and informal structures of organizations, specifically schools. The formal structure provides for official rules and regulations, hierarchy of authority, and a formal communication structure. The informal structure is a system of interpersonal relations that forms spontaneously within all formal organizations and which affects the productivity of the organization. The informal structures or groups of employees serve as effective vehicles of communication, as a means of cohesion, and a method to help new and younger teachers make an easier adjustment to the faculty social system.

Hoy and Miskel (1987) explained that collegiality in a school was characterized by a faculty that participated in shared problem solving, discussion of effective teaching practices, and friendly interpersonal relations. Rosenholz (1989) found collegiality to be an important element that differentiated "learning enriched" from "learning impoverished" schools.

McLaughlin and Warren (1992) argued that collegiality represented a professional community, where teachers loved to innovate, were enthusiastic about the work, and were focused on helping students to learn. They concluded that the nature of the professional community that existed in the workplace was critical to the character of teaching and learning.

Collegiality, as a part of school climate, has been linked to school effectiveness. Uline et al. (1998) maintained that school effectiveness has expressive and instrumental functions. Instrumental functions are measured by quantitative measures such as student

test scores; expressive functions are faculty trust, healthy interpersonal relationships among employees, and a cohesive school. In their study of relationships between these functions and school effectiveness, they found that teacher trust in colleagues was most highly correlated with effectiveness (r = .72). Zigarelli (1996), in a study of school effectiveness constructs, found a positive relationship between teacher satisfaction/collegiality and student performance (r = .73).

Graves (2001) found that collegiality among faculty members contributed to teacher energy. He concluded that when teachers had strong emotional connections with colleagues, their teaching energy was high and they were more effective teachers. It follows that the encouragement of collegial loyalty should be a focus of effective administrators.

<center>Institutional Integrity</center>

Institutional integrity has been established in the work of previous researchers. Hoy et al. (1990) defined institutional integrity as the "school's ability to cope with its environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its programs" (p. 264). Their concept of institutional integrity was based on the work of Parsons (1961) who first suggested that all social systems must solve four basic problems if they are to endure and prosper. These four needs were adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and latency. Hoy et al. (1990) expounded on these points by stating that organizations must solve the following problems: acquiring sufficient resources and accommodating to their environments; setting and implementing goals; maintaining solidarity within the system; and creating and preserving a distinctive value system (p. 264). Parsons (1967) also noted that organizations had three levels of authority over these basic functions – technical,

managerial, and institutional. The institutional level linked the organization with its

environment. In an educational context, both administrators and teachers need support if

they are to perform their respective functions in a harmonious fashion without undue

pressure from sources outside the school. Reiss and Hoy (1998) established a positive

relationship between institutional integrity of a school system and faculty loyalty to the

system (r = .36, p < .01).

Institutional integrity is related to school health. Miles (1969) defined a healthy

organization as one that "not only survives in its environment, but continues to cope

adequately with its environment over the long haul, and continuously develops and

expands its coping abilities" (p. 35). Hoy and Sabo (1998) found that "healthy schools

have institutional integrity; that is, teachers are protected from unreasonable and hostile

outside forces" (p. 211). Hoy and Hannum (1997) stated that "healthy organizations

manage successfully with disruptive outside forces while effectively directing their

energies toward the mission and objectives of the organization" (p. 290). It can be

concluded that institutional integrity is a proponent of a healthy school climate.

Principal and Teacher Openness

The concepts of principal and teacher openness had their underpinnings in the

notion of school climate. Weller and Weller (2000) defined school climate as "shared

perceptions of its inhabitants, its 'morale,' and its attitude toward its function as an

educational organization" (p. 5). Additionally, Weller and Weller (2000) stated that

"leaders must develop a climate in which followers have trust and confidence in their

leaders and can identify with the goals the leaders attempt to achieve" (p. 57). Lunenberg

and Ornstein (1996) defined school climate as the "environmental quality within the

organization, and it may be referred to as open, bustling, warm, easy going, informal, cold, impersonal, hostile, rigid, or closed" (p. 74).

Hoy and Miskel (1987) explained open climate as characterized by a climate in which both the principal and faculty are genuine in their behavior. The principal leads through example by providing the proper blend of structure and direction as well as support and consideration. Teachers work well together and are committed to the task at hand. Characteristics of principal openness are that the principal listens to and is open to teacher suggestions; gives genuine and frequent praise; and respects the professional competence of the faculty. Principals also give the teachers freedom to perform without close scrutiny and provide facilitating leadership behavior. Similarly, teacher behavior supports open and professional interactions. Teachers know each other well and are close personal friends. The behavior of both the principal and the faculty is open and authentic.

Hoy et al. (1991) further defined the concepts of principal and teacher openness. They defined principal openness in terms of three behaviors – supportive, directive, and restrictive behaviors. Supportive principal behavior is demonstrated by concern for teachers; directive principal behavior is rigid and overbearing control; and restrictive behavior is behavior that hinders rather than facilitates teacher work. Open principal behavior, according to Hoy et al. (1991) is supportive, nonrestrictive, and nondirective. Hoy et al. (1990) found a positive, statistically significant correlation between principal supportive behavior and organizational commitment ($r = .32$, $p < 01$).

Similarly, Hoy et al. (1991) defined teacher openness as having three levels of behavior: collegial, intimate and engaged. Collegial behavior is demonstrated by a faculty that enjoys working together, is proud of its school, and is accepting of each other.

Intimate teacher behavior is characterized by faculty members who maintain strong social

relationships with each other, are close personal friends, and provide strong social

support for each other. Disengaged teacher behavior is characterized by teachers who put

time into the classroom, but little evidence of performance of duties is seen. Open teacher

behavior is collegial, intimate, and engaged. Reiss and Hoy (1998) found a positive and

significant relationship between teacher openness and loyalty to colleagues.

Summary

This chapter was a review of literature relating to teacher loyalty to the school

system, to the principal, and to colleagues. This chapter also included a review of

literature relating to three variables which may affect teacher loyalty: institutional

integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. Since the study of organizations is

important to the study of employee loyalty, this literature review began with a look at

organizational theory from a historical perspective.

Based on the review of literature, this study was undertaken to determine if there

was a relationship between faculty loyalty to three levels of school organizations, and

three elements of school climate in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia. The

selected schools were those identified as "High Priority Schools" by the Georgia Office

of Education Accountability. The conceptual framework of this study is based on the

work of Parsons (1967), a systems theorist, who delineated the three levels of

organizations and the work of Hoy et al. (1991) who delineated the three elements of

school climate that may have a relationship to teacher loyalty to the three levels of school

organizations. Given that teacher loyalty has been shown to have a positive relationship

to student achievement and teacher retention, and that under-performing schools are

under great pressure to show improvement in these areas, it was decided to examine the relationship between these elements in low-performing schools in a selected area of urban Georgia. This addition to the body of knowledge about school climate, leader behaviors, and teacher loyalty may encourage today's leaders to develop qualities that will foster teacher loyalty and improve school climate.

<div align="center">Organizational Theory</div>

Scientific management, the human resources approach, the behavioral science approach, and systems theory have all had a significant impact on the administration and management of schools in America. Elements of each of these organizational models can be found in schools today. The human relations approach is especially significant to this study because it emphasized the importance of social and psychological factors on employee motivation and satisfaction. Recent research in education has confirmed that employee satisfaction and loyalty contribute to school effectiveness and student achievement (Uline et al. 1998). Systems theory is also relevant in that schools today conform to the systems model of organizations (Haas & Drabek, 1973).

Parsons (1961), a systems theorist, identified four problems that must be solved for any organization to survive. These four problems are adaptation, goal achievement, integration, and latency. Employee loyalty relates to integration, or the establishment of a set of relations among the members of the organization that serve to unify them into a single unity. Parsons (1967) also identified three levels of operation in organizations: the technical, managerial, and institutional levels. This study examined teacher loyalty to each of these three levels of school systems. The variables of teacher loyalty to the school

system, principal, and colleagues are examined as a function of the variables of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness.

Teacher Loyalty To Three Levels of the Organization

Employee loyalty to the organization or institution has been extensively researched during the past two decades. Studies have linked employee loyalty to the organization with lower turnover (Blau, 1986), increased ability to meet strategic goals (Oswald et al.1994), and intention to stay with an organization and with a profession (Hackett et al. 2001). Antecedents that promote employee loyalty include organizational effectiveness (Mott, 1972) and organizational adaptability (Angle & Perry, 1981). In addition, leader behaviors which influence employee commitment to an organization include support and recognition of employee accomplishments (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In education, organizational commitment has been shown to be positively related to student achievement (Kushman, 1992) and staff cohesiveness and attitudes toward innovation (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985).

Employee loyalty to a superior officer is linked to the concept of authority. Hoy and Miskel (2001) identified two types of authority, formal and informal. Formal authority is established through legally sanctioned rules and regulations. Informal authority comes from group allegiance and the general acceptance of following the leader's will (Weller & Weller, 2000). Sidotti (1976) found that teachers were more loyal to principals and were more satisfied when principals exhibited high informal authority.

Employee loyalty to colleagues is a third variable examined in this study. Mayo (1933) revealed the earliest evidence of the importance of group interactions to an organization's effectiveness in the Hawthorne studies. This researcher found that the

influence of collegial groups affected the amount and quality of work produced. The human relations movement (Follett, 1924) further emphasized the importance of the human aspect in the workplace. More recently, researchers have established relationships between employee collegiality and organizational effectiveness. Zigarelli (1996) found a positive relationship between teacher collegiality and student performance. Graves (2001) found that collegiality among faculty members contributed to teacher energy. He concluded that energetic teachers are more effective.

Variables Affecting Teacher Loyalty

Institutional integrity is defined as the system's ability to cope with its environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its programs. Reiss and Hoy (1998) established a positive relationship between institutional integrity of a school system and faculty loyalty to the system.

Principal openness is related to the concept of informal authority. Informal authority comes from group allegiance and the general acceptance of following the leader's will (Weller & Weller, 2000). Henderson and Hoy (1983) found that rigid principals are not successful in developing loyalty and trust whereas those showing support and empathy acquire informal authority and loyalty. A principal who exhibits principal openness shows support and empathy, listens to and is open to teacher suggestions, gives genuine and frequent praise, and respects the professional competence of the faculty (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). Principal openness has been previously shown to have a positive relationship to teacher loyalty to the principal (Reiss & Hoy, 1998).

Teacher openness is defined as collegial and intimate behavior of a faculty. It is characterized by a faculty who enjoy working together, are proud of their school, and

accept one another (Hoy et al.,1991). Teacher openness has been previously shown to have a positive relationship to teacher loyalty to colleagues (Reiss & Hoy, 1998).

Schools in This Study

Current suggestions for school reform include improving the workplace commitment of teachers, especially for schools serving poor, minority, and underachieving students (Kushman, 1992). In research on effective inner-city schools, teacher commitment is viewed as a key ingredient (Rosenholtz, 1989). This study examined teacher loyalty and antecedents which may be related to loyalty in elementary schools in the metropolitan area surrounding Atlanta, Georgia which have been identified as "High Priority Schools" by the Georgia Office of Educational Accountability. This designation was based on data which show that 70% or more of one of 13 categories of the students in these schools failed the state curriculum tests in one or more areas. These schools were selected for use in this study in order to gain more information on teacher commitment in low performing schools.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

This study was undertaken to determine if there were any statistically significant relationships between the organizational characteristics of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and faculty loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues in selected elementary schools in Georgia. The School Climate and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ) (Appendix A) was used to assess institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. The Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ) (Appendix B) was used to assess faculty loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues.

This chapter presents the steps that were taken to collect and analyze the data. These steps included (1) stating the problem, (2) specifying the null hypotheses, (3) selecting the sample and the population for the study, (4) specifying the correlative variables, (5) selecting instrumentation, (6) collecting data, (7) performing the statistical analyses, and (8) specifying the significance level for the study.

Restatement of the Problem

The current study was undertaken to determine if there were statistically significant relationships between the organizational characteristics of (1) institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and (2) teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal, and colleagues in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia.

Responses for the degree of institutional integrity, principal openness and teacher openness were gathered using the School Climate and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ), and responses regarding teacher loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues were gathered using the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ).

Responses regarding institutional integrity were examined for their relationship to responses regarding teacher loyalty to the system. Responses regarding principal openness were examined for their relationship regarding teacher loyalty to the principal. Responses regarding teacher openness were examined for their relationship regarding teacher loyalty to colleagues.

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were developed to address the relationship between the organizational characteristics of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness to faculty loyalty to the school system, the principal, and colleagues in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia.

Ho:1

There is no statistically significant relationship between institutional integrity and faculty loyalty to the school system in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia.

Ho: 2

There is no statistically significant relationship between the degree of principal openness and faculty loyalty to the principal in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia.

Ho: 3

There is no statistically significant relationship between the degree of teacher openness and faculty loyalty to colleagues in selected urban elementary schools in Georgia.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of teachers in urban Georgia schools identified as "High Priority Schools." Since loyalty was studied as an organizational property rather than an individual trait, the unit of analysis in this study was the school. "High Priority Schools" are those in which 70% or greater of one or more of the following groups of students scored "Does Not Meet Expectations" on the reading and/or math sections of the Georgia Criterion Reference Test in 2000 or 2001: all students; African-American, Asian, Hispanic, white, multi-racial, Native American; students with disabilities; limited English proficient; male, female, low socioeconomic status, and high socioeconomic status. The Georgia Department of Education and the Office of Education Accountability has labeled these schools "High Priority Schools."

Population Sample

This study focused on urban schools which had been identified as "High Priority Schools." The school systems which were included were chosen based on data provided by the United States Office of Management and Budget (1999) which identifies metropolitan areas (MAs) according to published standards that are applied to Census Bureau data. The general concept of an MA is that of a core area containing a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities having a high degree of economic and social integration with that core. The school systems in this identified

metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia are Clayton County Schools, Cobb County Schools, Marietta City Schools, DeKalb County Schools, Decatur City Schools, Douglas County Schools, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta City Schools, and Gwinnett County Schools. Gwinnett County had no elementary schools identified as "High Priority Schools" so this system was not included in the study. The schools were chosen to examine the degree of loyalty of teachers in urban schools that have academically challenged students.

One hundred twenty-one elementary schools in the previously identified school systems in the metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia were labeled "High Priority Schools." All 121 principals were contacted by mail and follow up calls asking for permission to survey faculty members. Thirty-four principals agreed to participate. The principal of each school was mailed copies of two surveys to be completed by fifty percent of the teachers in each school. The surveys were the School Climate and Health Questionnaire which measured institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire which measured teacher loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues.

<center>Variables</center>

The following variables were selected for this study. There are three loyalty variables: teacher loyalty to the school system, teacher loyalty to the principal, and teacher loyalty to colleagues. There are three climate variables: institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness.

 Loyalty Variables

The three loyalty variables in this study were faculty loyalty to the school system, faculty loyalty to the principal, and faculty loyalty to colleagues. The variables were measured by means of the Revised Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire, developed by Reiss (1994) and Reiss and Hoy (1998). The responses on this survey were used in the statistical analysis of relationships between teacher loyalty and the organizational characteristics of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness.

Climate Variables

The climate variables in this study were institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. These variables were measured by a School Climate and Health Questionnaire (Reiss & Hoy, 1998). The responses for these variables were used in the statistical analysis of a possible relationship between these variables and teacher loyalty to the school system, principal, and colleagues.

Instrumentation

There were two survey instruments employed in this study. The School Climate and Health Questionnaire was used to measure the variables of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. This instrument is composed of the 42-item Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-Revised for Elementary Schools (Hoy & Clover, 1986) which measures principal and teacher openness and 6 items from the Organizational Health Inventory (Hoy & Clover, 1986) which measure institutional integrity. The Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (Reiss, 1994 and Reiss & Hoy, 1998) was used to measure the variables of teacher loyalty to the system, principal, and colleagues (see Appendix A for a copy of the School Climate and Health Questionnaire,

Appendix B for a copy of the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire, and Appendix C for permission to use both instruments).

School Climate and Health Questionnaire

The School Climate and Health Questionnaire was developed by Reiss and Hoy (1998) to assess teachers' perceptions of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. The instrument is composed of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire – Revised for Elementary Schools (OCDQ – RE) (Hoy & Clover, 1986) and six questions from the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) (Hoy & Feldman, 1987). The variables of principal and teacher openness are measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Revised for Elementary School (OCDQ-RE). The OCDQ-RE, which has been extensively tested for reliability and validity (see Hoy & Clover, 1986) is composed of 42 questions defining 6 subscales. The subscales that measure teacher behavior are collegial, intimate, and disengaged; the subscales that measure principal behavior are supportive, directive, and restrictive. Hoy and Clover (1986) concluded, "the instrument has two general factors – one a measure of openness of teacher interactions and the other a measure of openness (or closedness) of principal behavior" (p. 86). Hoy et al. (1991) found the alpha coefficients of reliability on the six subscales from their studies to be: supportive, .95; directive, .89; restrictive, .80; collegial, .90; intimate, .85; and disengaged, .76.

Institutional integrity was measured with the institutional integrity subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools (OHI-E). Hoy et al. (1991) noted that a factor analysis of several samples of the OHI-E supported the construct

validity of the concept of institutional integrity. Additionally, in three pilot studies of the

OHI-E, Hoy et al. (1991) found reliability coefficients of .83, .87, and .89.

Loyalty Questionnaire

The instrument used to measure teacher loyalty to the system, principal, and

colleagues was the same instrument used in a study by Reiss (1994) and Reiss and Hoy

(1998). The instrument is a revised version of the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire,

developed by Reiss (1993). Reiss added parts of instruments by Hoy and Williams (1971)

and Angle and Perry (1981) to the original RSLQ to establish concurrent validity. One

difference in the instrument used in this study and in the study by Reiss (1994) is that the

Reiss study measured faculty loyalty to the union or association. Because Georgia does

not have teacher unions, that part of the Reiss study was not replicated in this study.

Consequently, questions on the loyalty questionnaire used by Reiss (1994) which

concerned loyalty to the union or association were not included on the questionnaire used

in this study.

Reiss and Hoy (1998) noted the development of the loyalty questionnaire used in

the study by Reiss (1994) and in this study. There were two pilot studies; the original

instrument, composed of 42 questions, was tested with a sample of 120 secondary school

teachers. A factor analysis, with varimax rotation, showed that there were four underlying

factors; in fact the four predicted dimensions were confirmed. The coefficient alphas for

the four subscales were the following: principal, .90; colleagues, .70; district (system),

88; and union, .84.

Reiss and Hoy (1998) explained that in order to improve the instrument's

reliability, a second pilot study was completed using a revised questionnaire. Again factor

analysis showed that there were four distinct factors corresponding to the predicted dimensions. The coefficient alphas for the loyalty variables in the second pilot study were the following: principal, .91; colleagues, .74; district (system), .90; and union .86. The two independent pilot studies provided construct validity for faculty loyalty.

The questions on the original Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (Reiss, 1993) were rewritten to reflect the unit of analysis as the school. All the statements that began with the word "I" were altered to read, "Teachers in this school," and additional loyalty to colleagues questions were written in an attempt to improve reliability on that subscale. A factor analysis for the data in the Reiss (1994) study, with varimax rotation, demonstrated again that there were four distinct loyalty factors, which could be interpreted as the predicted dimensions. The four eigenvalues were greater than 1, and 71% of the variance in faculty loyalty was explained. The coefficient alpha of reliability for each of the four loyalty dimensions in the Reiss (1994) study were the following: principal, .96; colleagues, .95; district (system), .83; union, .83.

In addition to questions from the original Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire, two additional instruments were utilized to revise the instrument for the Reiss (1994) study. Loyalty to the principal was measured with the Hoy and Williams' (1971) loyalty scale, and organizational adaptability was measured by the Angle and Perry (1981) instrument. As predicted, Hoy and Williams' measure of loyalty to an immediate superior was highly correlated with faculty loyalty to the principal ($r = .89$, $p < .01$), and organizational adaptability was correlated to faculty loyalty to colleagues ($r = .58$, $p < .01$).

According to Reiss and Hoy (1998) "In brief, the revised RSLQ is a reliable measure of faculty loyalty with concurrent and construct validity " (p. 9). There are ten statements on loyalty to colleagues, nine on loyalty to the principal, and four on loyalty to the district. The six questions on loyalty to the union were omitted from the survey used in this study.

<div align="center">Data Collection Procedures</div>

First, a letter was sent to each superintendent of the eight indicated systems requesting permission to survey teachers in the selected schools in that system (see Appendix D). The letter included background information about the researcher as well as the significance and purpose of the study. A form was attached for the superintendent to reply signifying acceptance or denial of the request. An officer of five of the eight systems replied that research proposals would be approved only after the researcher completed complex applications. All five applications were submitted within two weeks of receiving the instructions, and the applications were subsequently approved. Two superintendents approved the research project without further application. One system superintendent denied the request to do research in his system.

The principals of the "High Priority" elementary schools in the participating systems were contacted and asked permission to survey faculties. The principals who agreed to allow faculties to participate in the research were sent a package containing a letter describing the method of data collection and the surveys (Appendix E.) The principals were asked to distribute two surveys to 50% of the faculty which had been randomly selected. The teachers were asked to return the surveys in self-addressed, stamped envelopes. Each survey included a statement assuring the participants that the

results would remain completely anonymous. At least a 25% response was received from 29 of the 34 schools, and these schools were included in the data analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed on the loyalty variables and the climate variables. Relationships between the variables were examined.

<u>Climate Variables</u>

Principal openness is a construct obtained from supportive (S), directive (D), and restrictive (R) behaviors. The formula, as given in Hoy (2003) for computing principal openness is:

$$\text{Principal Openness} = \frac{(SdS \text{ for } S) + (SdS \text{ for } D) + (1000 - SdS \text{ for } R)}{3}$$

Teacher Openness is a construct obtained from collegial (C), intimate (Int), and disengaged (Dis) behaviors. The formula, as given in Hoy (2003) for computing teacher openness is:

$$\text{Teacher Openness} = \frac{(SdS \text{ for } C) + (SdS \text{ for } Int) + (1000 - SdS \text{ for } Dis}{3}$$

Each school's measure of principal and teacher openness was calculated by first scoring the items of every teacher with the value marked by that teacher (1 to 4). Scores were reversed on the appropriate questions. The average school score was calculated for each item.

The sum of the average school item scores for each principal and teacher behavior was calculated by adding together the scores of the items that measured the appropriate behavior. Resulting from these calculations were scores that represented sums for supportive behavior, directive behavior, and restrictive behavior. These sums were used

to compute principal openness. There were also sums for collegial behavior, intimate behavior, and disengaged behavior that were used to compute teacher openness.

Second, the sample mean and standard deviation were calculated for each behavior. Third, the standard score for each behavior was computed by subtracting the sample mean of that behavior from each school's mean for the behavior, dividing each difference by the sample's standard deviation for that behavior, multiplying each quotient by 100, and finally adding 500 to each product. Sample means and standard deviations are provided by Hoy (2003) on the World Wide Web.

Principal openness was determined by taking one-third the result obtained by the difference between the standard score for directive behavior from the standard score for supportive behavior, then subtracting the standard score for restrictive behavior from the difference, and adding 2000. Teacher openness was computed by taking one-third the result of summing the standard score for collegial behavior with the standard score for intimate behavior, then subtracting the standard score for disengaged behavior, and adding 1000.

Institutional integrity was measured with the institutional integrity subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools (OHI-E). The subscale is composed of six statements. Each school's measure of institutional integrity was calculated by first scoring the items of every teacher with the value marked by that teacher (1 to 4). Scores were reversed on the appropriate questions. The average school score was calculated for each item. The sum of the average school item scores for institutional integrity was calculated by adding together the scores of the items that measured institutional integrity.

<u>Loyalty Variables</u>

Loyalty to each level of the institution was measured by the revised Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (Reiss & Hoy, 1998). Each schools' score on each of the three factors was calculated by first scoring the items of every teacher with the value marked by that teacher. The average school score was then calculated for each of the three factors. The sum of the average scores for each level of the organization was calculated by adding together the scores of the items that measured each level. Last, sample means and standard deviations were calculated for loyalty at each level.

Each of the hypotheses was tested using the Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation. First, the variables were considered in isolation (correlation). Next, correlations were determined for all variables.

Level of Significance

The level of significance is a statement of the predetermined level on which a null hypothesis could be rejected. The choice of the researcher in establishing the level of significance is based on the suspected probability of making a wrong conclusion about a tested null hypothesis. If the significance level is .05, this means that the result may be due to chance or sampling error five percent of the time.

If the null hypothesis is true and the researcher rejects it, a Type I error is made. To minimize the probability of a Type I error, the researcher can set a more conservative level of significance, for example .01 which would mean that the result may be due to chance one percent of the time. However, setting a more conservative level of significance increases the probability of the occurrence of a Type II error. A Type II error occurs when the researcher accepts a false hypothesis.

In this study, a Type I error would result if it were falsely found that there were statistically significant relationships between the mean scores of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal, and colleagues. A Type II error would result if the results falsely indicated no significant relationship between the mean scores of institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness and teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal, and colleagues. In this study, a relationship was said to be significant if the probability of the occurrence of its value due to chance or sampling error was less than 5 chances in 100 ($p < .05$). This level was the same level of significance used in the study by Reiss (1994) on which this study is patterned.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine three aspects of school climate and

faculty loyalty to three levels of school organizations in urban elementary schools.

Specifically, the study was undertaken to determine if there were significant correlations

between institutional integrity and faculty loyalty to the school system; principal

openness and faculty loyalty to the principal; and teacher openness and faculty loyalty to

teacher colleagues. The climate variables in this study were institutional integrity,

principal openness, and teacher openness. The loyalty variables were teacher loyalty to

the school system, to the principal, and to teacher colleagues. The unit of study was the

school. Between 25 and 50 percent of the faculties in selected urban elementary schools

responded to questions about school climate on an instrument entitled the School Climate

and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ) and to questions about faculty loyalty on an

instrument entitled the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ). This chapter

specifies the results and findings of the study.

Population and Sample

Data were collected from a sample of elementary school faculties in the

metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia. The systems included in the study were chosen

based on the United States Office of Management and Budget (1999) designation of the

counties in which the systems are located as being part of the metropolitan area of

Atlanta, Georgia. The sample of schools was chosen from a population of elementary

schools in these metropolitan systems which were labeled "High Priority Schools" by the

Office of Education Accountability (2001). Of the nine systems which are included in this metropolitan area, one system had no "High Priority" elementary schools on the 2001 list, so this system was not included in the study. A letter was sent to the superintendents of the remaining eight systems, asking for permission to conduct research in the systems. After extensive application procedures were completed, seven of the systems granted approval for this research. Initially, principals in a random sample of five schools in each of the seven systems were contacted for permission to survey their faculties. It was discovered that many principals were not willing to participate. Subsequently, all 121 "High Priority" elementary school principals in each of the seven systems included in the metropolitan area were contacted by the researcher, requesting permission to perform the research. A total of 34 principals agreed to the research.

Survey instruments were mailed to the 34 principals in the seven systems that had agreed to participate in the study. Principals were asked to distribute the two surveys to 50% of their teachers. Lists of teachers in each school were obtained from school websites or from system offices that had agreed to the research. A random table of numbers was used to choose the 50% of teachers to be given surveys. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided to the teachers to return the surveys. Between 25 and 50% of the faculty responded from 29 schools; 476 usable surveys were returned. The respondents consisted of 216 females and 22 males. The mean number of years of experience as a teacher for the group was 11, ranging from a low of less than one year to a high of 32 years experience. The number of students enrolled in the selected schools ranged from a low of 346 to a high of 1178. Schools from each of the seven districts

responded with an approximately equal number from north, south, east, and west of the city of Atlanta and inside the city of Atlanta participating.

Regarding sample size, Borg and Gall (1989) suggest that for a correlational study, it is necessary to estimate the probable size of the correlation you are likely to obtain based on previous research, and then use a table (p. 240) to determine the number of cases required to be statistically significant. In a similar study (Reiss, 1994), the correlation between institutional integrity and loyalty to the system was $r = .36$; the correlation between principal openness and loyalty to the principal was $r = .63$; and the correlation between teacher openness and loyalty to teacher colleagues was $r = .69$. According to Borg and Gall (1989) an adequate sample for a previous correlation of .36 is 50, and an adequate sample for correlations of .63 and .69 is 15, for a sample of 27. It was concluded that surveys from a sample of 29 schools would be sufficient for this study. Table 1 shows the number of schools that participated and the number of surveys returned per system.

<div align="center">Restatement of the Null Hypotheses</div>

Three null hypotheses were developed for this study:

Ho1: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between institutional integrity and faculty loyalty to the school system in urban elementary schools in Georgia which were designated High Priority schools in 2001.

Ho2: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between principal openness and faculty loyalty to the principal in urban elementary schools in Georgia which were designated High Priority schools in 2001.

Ho3: There will not be a statistically significant relationship between teacher openness and faculty loyalty to other teachers in urban elementary schools in Georgia which were designated High Priority schools in 2001.

TABLE 1

Participating Systems and Numbers of Usable Surveys Returned (N = 29)

School System	Number of Participating Schools	Average Percentage Faculty Participation	Males	Females	Avg. Years Exp.	Usable Surveys Returned
1	6	35.3	3	57	10.5	120
2	5	32. 2	2	40	8.7	84
3	3	35.3	0	23	12.3	46
4	3	31.6	6	13	9.3	38
5	3	33.6	3	17	8.5	40
6	5	37 8	5	44	14.4	98
7	4	31.5	3	22	13.3	50

Statistical Analysis

The institutional level was measured by the concept, institutional integrity, or the degree to which teachers are protected from outside pressures and are permitted to perform their jobs (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). The managerial level was measured by the construct, principal openness, a concept composed of three dimensions of principal behavior: (a) supportive behavior which reflects a basic concern for teachers and the

extent to which a principal listens to and is open to teacher suggestions; (b) directive

behavior, a rigid and close supervisory style; and (c) restrictive behavior, which imposes

a hindrance upon, rather than an encouragement of, teacher work (Hoy et al., 1991).

These three behaviors compose a factor called principal openness.

The technical level was measured by the construct, teacher openness. The

dimensions of teacher behavior that constitute teacher openness were: (a) collegial

teacher behavior, reflective of the professional interaction among the faculty; (b) intimate

teacher behavior, the degree that teachers socialize with each other; and (c) disengaged

teacher behavior, which represents a disregard for the job and the function of the teacher

in the school (Hoy et al, 1991) These behaviors constitute teacher openness.

The survey instrument used in this study to measure the variables of school

climate was composed of the Organizational Climate Descriptive Questionnaire –

Revised for Elementary Schools (Hoy et al., 1991) which measured principal and teacher

openness and the institutional integrity subscale of the Organizational Health Inventory

for Elementary Schools (Hoy et al., 1991). Procedures for scoring and analyzing data

obtained on the OCDQ-RE portion of the survey were followed explicitly as instructed

by Hoy et al., (1991). First, mean scores for each item on the survey were computed for

each school. For example, if fifteen surveys were returned, the scores for each item were

added and then that number divided by 15. Next, the mean scores which measured each

aspect of supportive, directive, restrictive, collegial, intimate, and disengaged behaviors

were added together. For example, items on this survey which measured supportive

behavior were numbers 4, 10, 17, 18, 25, 26, 31, 33, and 47. The sum of the mean scores

for these items represented the supportive behavior score for that school. In the same

way, directive, restrictive, collegial, intimate, and disengaged behaviors were quantified for each school. Items on the survey which measured directive behavior were 5, 11, 19, 27, 34, 38, 39, 44, and 46. Items which measured restrictive behavior were 12, 20, 28, 35, and 41. Items which measured collegial behavior were 1, 6, 13, 21, 29, 36, 42, and 45. Items which measured intimate behavior were 2, 7, 14, 22, 30, 37, and 43. Items which measured disengaged behavior were 3, 9, 15, and 23. The institutional integrity subscale of the survey instrument used in this study was measured by items numbered 8, 16, 24, 32, 40, and 48.

Hoy (2003) has provided information on a large and diverse sample of New Jersey elementary schools which gives a basis for comparing school climate scores. The average scores and standard deviation for each climate dimension are given, as well as instructions for standardizing scores. The formula given for standardizing the scores for supportive behavior is SdS for S = 100 x (S-23.34)/7.16 + 500, where S is the supportive score for the school, 23.34 is the mean of the normative sample, and 7.16 is the standard deviation of the normative sample. The formula for standardizing scores for directive behavior is SdS for D = 100 x (D – 19.34)/5.43 + 500, where D is the directive behavior score for the school, 19.34 is the mean of the normative sample, and 5.43 is the standard deviation of the normative sample. The formula for standardizing scores for restrictive behavior is SdS for R = 100 x (R – 12.98)/ 3.42 + 500 where R = the restrictive behavior score for the school, 12.98 is the mean score of the normative sample, and 3.42 is the standard deviation of the normative sample. The formula for standardizing scores for collegial behavior is SdS for C = 100 x (C – 23.11)/ 4.20 + 500 where C is the collegial score for the school, 23.11 is the mean collegial score of the normative sample, and 4.20

is the standard deviation of the normative sample. The formula for standardizing scores for intimate behavior is SdS for Int = 100 x (Int – 17.23)/ 4.10 + 500 where Int is the school score for intimate behavior, 17.23 is the mean intimate behavior score of the normative sample, and 4.10 is the standard deviation of the normative sample. The formula for standardizing scores for disengaged behavior is SdS for Dis = 100 x (Dis – 6.98)/ 2.38 + 500 where Dis is the school score for disengaged behavior, 6.98 is the mean of the normative sample for disengaged behavior, and 2.38 is the standard deviation of the normative sample.

Principal openness is a construct obtained from supportive, directive, and restrictive behaviors. The formula, as given in Hoy (2003) for computing principal openness is:

$$\text{Principal Openness} = \frac{(\text{SdS for S}) + (1000\text{-SdS for D}) + (1000\text{-SdS for R})}{3}$$

Teacher openness is a construct obtained from collegial, intimate, and disengaged behaviors. The formula, as given in Hoy (2003) for computing teacher openness is:

$$\text{Teacher Openness} = \frac{(\text{SdS for C}) + (\text{SdS for Int}) + (1000\text{- SdS for Dis})}{3}$$

Standard scores for each behavior for each school and scores for teacher and principal openness were computed using these formulas.

Loyalty to the system, principal, and teacher colleagues was measured by the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ). Questions which measured loyalty to the system were numbers 3, 7, 10, 15, and 19. Questions which measured loyalty to the principal were 2, 6, 9, 13, 18, 21, 24, 27, and 29. Questions which measured loyalty to teacher colleagues were 1, 5, 8, 11, 14, 16, 17, 22, 23, and 28. In all cases, the unit of analysis was the school; that is, the data for each school were aggregated into mean

scores for the 29 schools of the sample. Mean scores for each item were computed for each school, and Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation were employed. The correlations between each sets of variables were computed for each school and reported to the appropriate principals. Next, the results for each system were computed and reported to the superintendents; and last, statistics were determined for the entire sample and are reported here.

<div align="center">Findings</div>

The descriptive statistics of each variable were calculated, and are shown in Table 2. A comparison of the means of the variables in this sample with the means of the variables in a similar study by Reiss (1994) of urban, special needs elementary schools in New Jersey showed that the faculty in this study have a lower perception of institutional integrity (12.68 vs.16.06.) The measure of Principal Openness was slightly higher in this study (501.30 vs. 499.90). The measures of Teacher Openness, District Loyalty, Principal Loyalty, and Collegial Loyalty were all higher (more positive) in this study than in the New Jersey sample (505.00 vs. 499.9; 22.52 vs. 15.28; 39.55 vs. 37.53; 46.75 vs. 42.53).

As shown in Table 3, no significant relationship was found between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system. Correlations between the dimensions of climate and aspects of loyalty supported two of the hypotheses. These statistics are found in Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 2

Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard Deviation, And Range of the Variables (N =29)

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Institutional Integrity	12.68	1.42	10.71	15.60
Teacher openness	505.00	29.03	442.28	543.01
Principal openness	501.30	38.94	436.91	559.82
System loyalty	22.52	2.74	18.50	26.50
Principal loyalty	39.45	4.86	33.81	49.50
Collegial loyalty	46.75	3.40	42.43	51.61

TABLE 3

Correlation Results for Institutional Integrity and Teacher Loyalty to the School System

	Institutional Integrity	System Loyalty
Institutional Integrity		
Pearson Correlation	1.0	-.13
Sig. (2-tailed)		.71
N	29	29

TABLE 4

Correlation Results for Principal Openness and Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

	Principal Openness	Loyalty to Principal
Principal Openness		
Pearson Correlation	1.0	.64
Sig. (2-tailed)		.04
N	29	29

TABLE 5

Correlation Results for Teacher Openness and Teacher Loyalty to Teacher Colleagues

	Teacher Openness	Loyalty to Colleagues
Teacher Openness		
Pearson Correlation	1.0	.69
Sig. (2 Tailed)		.03
N	29	29

Hypothesis One

The first null hypothesis stated, "There will not be a significant relationship between institutional integrity and faculty loyalty to the school district in urban, 'High Priority' elementary schools in Georgia." To test this hypothesis, a correlation analysis was performed. The correlation between institutional integrity and loyalty to the school system, as indicated in Table 3, was $r = -.13$. The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant relationship found between institutional integrity and faculty loyalty to the school system.

Hypothesis Two

The second null hypothesis stated, "There will not be a significant relationship between principal openness and faculty loyalty to the principal in urban, 'High Priority"

elementary schools in Georgia." To test this hypothesis, a correlation analysis was performed. The correlation between principal openness and faculty loyalty to the principal, as shown in Table 4, was $r = .64$, $p \leq .04$, indicating a strong positive relationship between principal openness and faculty loyalty to the principal. Principal openness accounted for 41% of the variation in faculty loyalty to the principal. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Three

The third null hypothesis stated, "There will not be a significant relationship between teacher openness and faculty loyalty to other teachers in urban, 'High Priority' elementary schools in Georgia." The correlation between teacher openness and faculty loyalty to other teachers, as shown in Table 5, was $r = .69$, $p \leq .03$, indicating a strong positive relationship between teacher openness and faculty loyalty to other teachers. Teacher openness accounted for 48% of the variation in faculty loyalty to other teachers. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Post Hoc Analysis

In addition to analyzing the hypothesized relationships between institutional integrity and loyalty to the system, principal openness and loyalty to the principal, and teacher openness and loyalty to other teachers, a post hoc exploratory analysis was conducted. Correlations between all variables were examined to determine if relationships existed among them. These results are shown in Table 6.

As shown in Table 6, there is a significant, positive correlation between loyalty to the system and loyalty to the principal in this sample ($r = .70$, $p \leq .025$). Similarly, there are strong positive correlations between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to teacher

colleagues (r = .65, p ≤ .043) and loyalty to the school system and loyalty to teacher

colleagues (r = .88, p ≤ .001). These findings seem to suggest that loyalty is a personal

trait; if one is loyal to one level of the organization, one is loyal to all levels.

TABLE 6

Correlations of all Climate and Loyalty Variables

	Inst Int	Princ O	Teach O	Sys Loy	Princ Loy	Teach Loy
Inst Int	1.0	.08	-.37	-.13	.08	-.18
Princ O	.08	1.0	.25	.34	.64*	.33
Teach O	-.37	.25	1.0	.62	.41	.69*
Sys Loy	-.13	.34	.62	1.0	.70*	.88**
Princ Loy	.08	.64*	.41	.70*	1.0	.65*
Teach Loy	-.18	.33	.69*	.88**	.65*	1.0

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

In summary, the results regarding the hypothesized relationships showed

that there existed a significant, positive relationship between principal behaviors,

operationalized as Principal Openness, and teacher loyalty to the principal. Similarly,

there existed a significant, positive relationship between teacher behaviors,

operationalized as Teacher Openness, and teacher loyalty to teacher colleagues. The

results of the post hoc analysis showed that the teacher loyalty to the system is positively

related to teacher loyalty to the principal and loyalty to colleagues. Teacher loyalty to the

principal is also positively related to teacher loyalty to the system. Additionally, when the results of this study were compared to a similar study by Reiss (1994), teachers in Georgia were found to be generally more loyal to the system, principal, and their colleagues than teachers in a similar sample in New Jersey. Teachers in Georgia also had a more positive perception of climate associated with teacher and principal behaviors than the teachers in the New Jersey sample.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The review of the literature of this study presented and discussed research on organizational theory from a historical perspective, Parsons' (1967) model of organizations, organizational loyalty, and school climate. The literature reviewed suggested that employee loyalty is an essential element of thriving, growing organizations, and schools are organizations in which employee loyalty is related to positive outcomes. Studies by Brown (1996) and Blau (1986) have linked employee loyalty to lower turnover and higher motivation, and Kushman (1992) found a positive relationship between teacher loyalty and student achievement. According to studies by Hoy & Clover (1986), Hoy et al. (1991), and Reiss & Hoy (1998), there are certain elements of system, principal, and teacher behavior that are positively related to teacher loyalty. It can be concluded that teacher loyalty is a desired proponent of a successful school, and that leader behaviors may be related to employee loyalty. This study examined teacher loyalty and system, principal, and teacher behaviors to determine if there was a relationship between these elements.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were significant relationships between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the system; principal openness and teacher loyalty to the principal, and teacher openness and teacher loyalty to other teachers. Three hypotheses were developed to examine these problems.

This study included a sample of 29 elementary schools located in the metropolitan area of Atlanta, Georgia that met three criteria: (1) the school was located in one of the nine metropolitan counties of Atlanta as identified by the U.S. Census Bureau; (2) the school was listed as a "High Priority" elementary school on the list published by the Georgia Department of Education in 2001; and (3) the superintendent of the system and principal of the school agreed to the research. Because participation was voluntary, 100% participation was not expected. At least 25% of the faculty from each participating school returned the surveys.

The unit of analysis of this study was the school. The climate variables were institutional integrity, principal openness, and teacher openness. The loyalty variables were teacher loyalty to the school system, to the principal, and to other teachers.

The instrument used in this study to measure the climate variables was taken, with permission, from a similar study by Hoy et al. (1991). Six questions from the Organizational Health Inventory measured institutional integrity. Principal and teacher openness were measured by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Hoy et al., 1991) which includes six subscales. The subscales that measure principal behavior are supportive, directive, and restrictive. The subscales that measure teacher behavior are collegial, intimate, and disengaged.

Loyalty to the three levels of the organization was measured by the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (Reiss & Hoy, 1998). The RSLQ is a 30 item survey which measures teacher loyalty to each of the three levels of school organizations. Descriptive data about each teacher were obtained from this survey as well.

Of the 121 principals who were asked for permission to do research in their schools, 34 agreed to the research. Of the 34 schools to which surveys were mailed, 29 schools produced a minimum 25% response rate. 476 usable surveys were returned for analysis. Ordinal scores for each of the variables were calculated from the completed surveys and Pearson product-moment correlation coeffecient procedures were performed to determine if there were significant relationships between the climate and loyalty variables. Post hoc analyses were done to determine if there were relationships between any of the variables.

Results

The results of this study showed that there was a significant positive relationship between open principal behavior (Principal Openness) and teacher loyalty to the principal. Principal Openness is composed of elements of principal behavior that include supportive activities and a lack of behaviors that are directive and restrictive. Similarly, a significant, positive relationship was found between Teacher Openness, characterized by a faculty that supports each other, enjoys working together, and is proud of its school, and teacher loyalty to fellow teachers. The post hoc analysis revealed a high correlation between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to the system, and loyalty to the principal and loyalty to other teachers.

Conclusions

As a result of this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Findings from this study confirmed earlier literature citations and research findings that open and supportive principal behavior and collegial teacher behavior are positively related to teacher loyalty to the principal and to teacher

colleagues. Earlier research which showed a positive relationship between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system was not supported by this study.

2. Post hoc analysis from this study confirmed findings from earlier studies that have found significant, positive correlations between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to other levels of the school organization. In this study, there was a significant, positive correlation between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to the school system, and loyalty to the principal and loyalty to teacher colleagues. Reiss (1994) found a moderately positive relationship between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to the school district ($r = .37$, $p < .01$) and a strong relationship between loyalty to the principal and loyalty to other teachers ($r = .56$, $p < .01$). These findings are also consistent with Hoy and Williams (1971) who concluded that teachers view principals as part of a "management team" which included the principal's superordinates in the central office.

3. Leadership training in Georgia should be focused on helping emerging leaders to develop supportive and open leadership behaviors. New leaders should be led to understand that restrictive and directive behaviors should be utilized only in extreme cases of ineffective teaching. Given the current teacher shortage, the increased numbers of students entering school, and the projected numbers of teachers who will be retiring in the near future, fostering teacher loyalty to all levels of the school organization will be paramount to our profession. The research regarding leader behaviors which are positively related to teacher loyalty should be made an integral part of the training of educational leaders.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for future research, based on the results of this study:

1. This research should be expanded to include secondary schools, as well as schools that are deemed successful or especially effective. Achievement data in schools with high or low levels of teacher loyalty should be gathered to determine if there are relationships between these variables. Further study should be made of characteristics of principal leadership styles that appear to encourage the loyalty of teachers.

2. An examination of current leadership training activities in Georgia's colleges and universities should be conducted to determine if current and/or future leaders are given the opportunity to develop not only task related skills such as budgeting and scheduling, but also to develop "people" related skills that can foster employee loyalty. Supportive behaviors should be encouraged and practiced and restrictive and directive behaviors minimized.

3. Further analysis should be done regarding relationships among the different types of teacher loyalty in school organizations. While loyalty to the principal and colleagues is very important, leaders should also be concerned with teacher loyalty to the school system. With the current emphasis on school improvement in low performing schools, loyalty to the school system may encourage good teachers to apply for positions in these schools, thereby improving results for the school system.

4. This study revealed a strong level of teacher loyalty to the principals in high priority schools. Although it is generally assumed that teachers prefer autonomy in their classrooms, it is worth a look at the possibility that by providing more feedback regarding instruction, principals might channel teacher loyalty into more effective instruction and student learning.

REFERENCES

A+ Education Reform Act, (2000). O.C.G.A $ 20-2-290. {On-line}.HB656<http://www.legis.state.ga.us/2001-02/fulltest HB656.htm

Allen, M. W., & Brady, R. M. (1997). Total quality management, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and intraorganizational communication. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10,* 316-341.

Anderson, J. C., Rungtusanatham, M., & Schroeder, R. G. (1994). A theory of quality management underlying the Deming Management Method. *Academy of Management Review, 19,* 472-509.

Angle, H. L, & Lawson, M. B. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? *Journal of Business Research, 26,* 49-61.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 26,* 1-14.

Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and organization.* New York: Harper & Row.

Attrition among full time public and private school teachers (1998). In *The Condition of Education. National Center for Education Statistics* [On-line]. Retrieved October 13, 2001: http://nces.ed.gov.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bertalanffy, L. (1952). *Problems of life.* New York: Wiley Press.

Blau, G. J. (1986). Job involvement and organizational commitment as interactive predictors of tardiness and absenteeism. *Journal of Management, 12,* 577-584.

Blau, P., & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational Research.* New York: Longman.

Brown, R. B. (1996). Organizational commitment: Clarifying the concept and simplifying the existing construct typology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49,* 230-251.

Buchanan, B. II. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of work managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 19,* 533-546.

Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. (C. Storrs, Trans.). London: Pittman. (Original work published 1916)

Flagle, C. D., Huggins, W. H., & Roy, R. H. (1960). *Operations research in systems engineering*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Follett, M. P. (1924). *Creative experience*. New York: Longmans.

Georgia Office of Educational Accountability (2002). Miscellaneous reports, 2000-2001. Retrieved April 2, 2002. http://www.goea.org/pdfs/GA_Priority_Schools.pdf.

Gouldner, A. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 2* (7), 281-306.

Graham, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Graves, D. H. (2001). Build energy with colleagues. *Language Arts, 79* (1), 12-19.

Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1937). *Papers in the science of administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration.

Guido-Dibrito, F., Chavez, A. F., Wallace, J. A., & DiBrito, W. F. (1997). Loyalty between senior student affairs officers and their supervisors and staff members. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*, 244-254.

Haas, J. E., & Drabek, T. E. (1973). *Complex organizations: A sociological perspective*. New York: Macmillan.

Hackett, R. D., Lapierre, L. M., & Hausdorf, P. A. (2001). Understanding the links between work commitment constructs. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58*, 392-413.

Hall, A. D. & Fagen, R. E. (1968). Definition of system. In W. Buckley (Ed.), *Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist* (p. 81). Chicago: Aldine.

Hannaway, J, & Talbert, J. E. (1993). Bringing context into effective schools research: Urban-suburban differences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*, 164-186.

Hanson, E. M. (1991). *Educational administration and organizational behavior*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Harber, D., Burgess, K., & Barclay, D. (1993). Total quality management as a cultural intervention: An empirical study. *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management, 10*, 28-46.

Hardy, L. (1999). Why teachers leave. *American School Board Journal, 186* (6), 12-17.

Hearn, G. (1958). *Theory building in social work*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Henderson, J. E. & Hoy, W. K. (1983). Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. *Educational and Psychological research, 2,* 123-130.

Herriot, R. E., & Firestone, W. A. (1984). Two images of schools as organizations: A refinement and elaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 20* 41-57.

Hoy, W.K. (2003). Homepage of Dr. Wayne K. Hoy, Ohio State University. [On-line] http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/who/

Hoy, W. K. (1994). Foundations of educational administration: Traditional and emerging perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30.,* 178-193.

Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. R. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 22*, 93-110.

Hoy, W. K. & Ferguson, J. (1985). A theoretical framework and exploration of organizational effectiveness in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 21,* 117-124.

Hoy, W. K., & Hannum, J. W. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly. 33,* 290-311.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (3rd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2001). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (6th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. (1974). Subordinate loyalty to immediate superior: A neglected concept in the study of educational administration. *Sociology of Education, 47,* 268-286.

Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 26*, 260-279.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Hoy, W. K. & Williams, L. B. (1971). Loyalty to immediate superior at alternate levels in public schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 7* (1), 1-11.

Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 319-337.

Johnson, R. S. (1993). TQM: *Leadership for the quality transformation.* Milwaukee, WWI: ASQC Quality Press.

Johnston, G. S., & Venable, B. P. (1986). A study of teacher loyalty to the principal: Rule administration and hierarchical influence of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 22,* 4-27.

Kimbrough, R. B., & Nunnery, M.Y. (1988). *Educational administration.* New York: Macmillan.

Knezevich, S. J. (1975). *Administration of public education: A source book for the leadership and management of educational institutions.* New York: Harper & Row.

Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 28*, 5-42.

Lee, A. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 14*, 482-519.

Lunenberg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration concepts.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper and Row.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization.* New York: Macmillan.

McLaughlin, M., & Warren, J. (1992). *What matters most in teachers' workplace context?* Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Center for Research on the Context for Secondary School Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 755).

McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1991). *A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resources Management Review, 1,* 64-98.

Miles, M. B. (1965). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In R. Carlson, A. Gallagher, F.J. Pellegrin, & E.M. Rodgers (Eds.), *Change process in the public schools* (pp. 54-72). Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Miles, M. B. (1969). Planned change and organizational health: figure and ground. In F.D. Carver and T.J. Sergiovanni (Eds.), *Organizations and human behavior* (pp. 375-391). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miskel, C. G., Fevurly, R., & Stewart, J. (1979). Organizational structure and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 15*, 97-118.

Morgan, G. (1986). I*mages of organizations.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morris, J. H., & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal, 24,* 512-526.

Mott, P. (1972). *Characteristics of effective organizations.* New York: Harper & Row.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

Mowday. R. T., Porter, L. M., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.* New York: Academic Press.

Murray, V. V., & Corenblum, A. F. (1966). Loyalty to immediate superior at alternate hierarchical levels in the bureaucracy. *American Journal of Sociology, 72,* 77-85.

No Child Left Behind Act (2001). Bill Summary. {On-line} http://edworkforce.house.gov/issues/108th/education/nclb/billsummary.htm.

Oswald, S. L., Mossholder, K. W., & Harris, S. G. (1994). Vision salience and strategic involvement: Implications for psychological attachment to organization and job. *Strategic Management Journal, 15,* 477-489.

Parsons, T. (1960). *Structures and process in modern society.* New York: Free Press.

Parsons, T. (1961). An outline of the social system. In T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. Naegle, & J. Pitts (Eds.), *Theories of society*. New York: Free Press.

Parsons, T. (1967). Some ingredients of a general theory of formal organization. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), *Administrative theory in education*. New York: MacMillan.

Pipho, C. (1998). A real teacher shortage. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*, 181-182.

Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological Bulletin, 80*, 161-176.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 603-609.

Reiss, F. (1993). *The effect of certain principal and teacher behaviors on teacher loyalty to the principal and association.* Unpublished manuscript. Rutgers University, Graduate School of Education, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Reiss, F. (1994). *Faculty loyalty in and around the urban elementary school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Reiss, F., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Faculty loyalty: An important but neglected concept in the study of schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 8*, 4-25.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools*. White Plains, NY: Longman Press.

Rossman, G. B., Corbett, H. D., & Firestone, W. A. (1988). *Change and effectiveness in schools: A cultural perspective*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Sidotti, P. (1976). *A study of the elementary principal's use of formal and informal authority as it relates to teacher loyalty, job satisfaction, and sense of powerlessness.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22* (1), 46-56.

Stroh, L. K., & Reilly, A. H. (1997). Rekindling organizational loyalty: The role of career mobility. *Journal of Career Development, 24*, 39-53.

Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes: Toward an organizational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36,* 703-729.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management.* New York: Harper Brothers.

Thorndike, E. L. & Barnhart, C. L. (1991). *Advanced Dictionary* (7th ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Uline, C., Miller, D. M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 34*, 462-483.

United States Office of Management and Budget (1999). Metropolitan Areas and Components. Retrieved June 13, 2002: http://www.census.gov/population.

Weber, F. (1964). *The theory of social and economic organization.* (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1921)

Weller, L. D., & Weller, S. (2000). *Quality human resources leadership.* Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Wilkinson, G.A. (1992). Lessons for administrators from Machiavelli's The Prince. *The Clearing House, 38,* 239-240.

Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *Journal of Educational Research, 90,* 103-110.

APPENDIX A

School Climate Questionnaire

Dear Colleague: Thank you for taking a few minutes of your precious time to complete the attached survey. The questionnaire is part of a research project to determine information about your perceptions of school climate and how those perceptions influence loyalty to the school system, principal, and teacher colleagues. This study is being conducted under the aegis of the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia. Pleas note that ALL RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS. There are no right or wrong answers…please respond exactly as you feel. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at 770-993-0584 or kwalker1@bellsouth.net. For questions or concerns about your rights, please call or write: Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411, telephone (706) 542-6514, email IRB@uga.edu.
Directions: Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by circling the appropriate response. All surveys are anonymous.

**RO = rarely occurs; SO = sometimes occurs; OO – often occurs;
VFO = very frequently occurs**

1.   The teachers here accomplish their work with vim, vigor, and pleasure.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
2.   Teachers'closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
3. Faculty meetings are useless.　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
4...The principal goes out of his/her way to help teachers.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
5. The principal rules with an iron fist.　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
6. Teachers leave school immediately after school is over.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
7.   Teachers invite faculty members to visit them at home.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
8.   The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
9.   There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
10.   The principal uses constructive criticism　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
11.   The principal checks the sign-in sheet every morning.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
12.   Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
13.   Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
14.   Teachers know the family backgrounds of other faculty members.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
15.   Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RO　　SO　　OO　　VFO
16. Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the

educational program. . RO SO OO VFO

17. The principal explains his/her reasons for criticism to teachers.

    RO SO OO VFO

18. The principal listens to and accepts teachers' suggestions.

    RO SO OO VFO

19. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.

    RO SO OO VFO

20. Teachers have too many committee requirements.

    RO SO OO VFO

21. Teachers help and support each other.   RO SO OO VFO

22. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.

    RO SO OO VFO

23. Teachers ramble when they talk at faculty meetings.

    RO SO OO VFO

24. Teachers feel pressure from the community.

    RO SO OO VFO

25. The principal looks out for the welfare of the teachers.

    RO SO OO VFO

26. The principal treats teachers as equals.   RO SO OO VFO

27. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.   RO SO OO VFO

28. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.

    RO SO OO VFO

29. Teachers are proud of their school.   RO SO OO VFO

30. Teachers have parties for each other.   RO SO OO VFO

31. The principal compliments teachers.   RO SO OO VFO

32. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.

    RO SO OO VFO

33. The principal is easy to understand.   RO SO OO VFO

34. The principal closely checks classroom (teacher) activities.

    RO SO OO VFO

35. Clerical support reduces teachers' paperwork.

    RO SO OO VFO

36. New teachers are readily accepted by colleagues.

    RO SO OO VFO

37. Teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.

    RO SO OO VFO

38. The principal supervises teachers closely.   RO SO OO VFO

39. The principal checks lesson plans.   RO SO OO VFO

40. The school is open to the whims of the public.

    RO SO OO VFO

41. Teachers are burdened with busy work.   RO SO OO VFO

42. Teachers socialize together in small, select groups.

    RO SO OO VFO

43. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.

	RO	SO	OO	VFO

44. The principal is autocratic.   RO   SO   OO   VFO
45. Teachers respect the professional competence of the their colleagues.
                                                RO   SO   OO   VFO
46. The principal monitors everything teachers do.
                                                RO   SO   OO   VFO
47. The principal goes out of his/her way to show appreciation to teachers.
                                                RO   SO   OO   VFO

48. A few vocal parents can change school policy.
                                                RO   SO   OO   VFO

1 – strongly disagree   ; 2 = moderately disagree; 3 = slightly disagree;
4 = neither agree nor disagree; 5 = slightly agree; 6 = moderately agree;
7 = strongly agree

49. Teachers in this school do a good job anticipating problems.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6   7
50. Teachers in this school do a good job in keeping up with changes in new equipment and
    new ways of doing things.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6   7
51. When changes are made in routine or equipment, teachers in this school adjust to
    the changes quickly.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7
52. Teachers in this school do a good job coping with emergency situations brought on
    by students, equipment, or administrative problems.
                        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Please circle the answer to each of the following items:

53. Sex: MALE   FEMALE
54. Ethnic background: African-American   Asian-American
        Euro-American Hispanic   Other_____
55. Total years of experience in this system (not including the 02-03 school year):
1-5   6-10   11-15   16-20   21-25   over 25
56. Total years of experience at this school (not including the 02-03 school year):
1-5   6-10   11-15   16-20   21-25   over 25

APPENDIX B

Faculty Loyalty Questionnaire

Dear Colleague: Thank you for taking a few minutes of your precious time to complete the attached survey. The questionnaire is part of a research project to determine information about your perceptions of school climate and how those perceptions influence loyalty to the school system, principal, and teacher colleagues. This study is being conducted under the aegis of the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia. Please note that ALL REPSONSES ARE COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS. There are no right or wrong answers…please respond exactly as you feel. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at 770-993-0584 or kwalker1@bellsouth.net. For questions or concerns about your rights, please call or write: Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411, telephone (706) 542-6514, email IRB@uga.edu.

Directions: Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school by circling the appropriate response. **All surveys are anonymous**

1 = strongly disagree   2 = moderately disagree
3 = slightly disagree   4 = slightly agree
5 = moderately agree   6 = strongly agree

1.   Teachers in this school criticize each other when they are wrong.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
2.   Teachers in this school would prefer working with another principal.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
3.   Teachers in this school are loyal to the school system.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
4.   Teachers in this school are willing to put forth a great deal of effort in order to help colleagues be successful.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
5. Teachers in this school have no loyalty to those with whom they work.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   6.   Teachers in this school would accept another assignment to work for this principal
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   7.   Given a choice, teachers would educate their children in this system.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   8.   Teachers in this school do not talk about colleagues behind their backs.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   9.   Teachers in this school know that the principal is not a back stabber.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   10. Teachers in this school would not choose to leave this system.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   11. Teachers in this school share common goals about students and teaching.
         1   2   3   4   5   6
   12. Teachers in this school publicly defend each other against parental criticism.
         1   2   3   4   5   6

13. Teachers in this school are loyal to the principal.
    1   2   3   4   5   6

14. Teachers in this school do not go out of their way to help each other.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
15. Teachers in this school willingly give extra effort and extra time to the system.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
16. Teachers in this school are loyal to each other.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
17. Teachers in this school compromise for the betterment of the school.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
18. Teachers in this school criticize the principal.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
19. Teachers in this school would like to remain in this system.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
20. Teachers in this school do not cover each other's classes.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
21. Teachers in this school speak well of the principal outside of school.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
22. Teachers in this school care about each other.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
23. Teachers in this school find it hard to agree with each other on important professional
        matters.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
24. Teachers in this school would go the extra mile for this principal.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
25. Teachers in this school support teacher grievances.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
26. Teachers in this school support each other even when wrong.
.   1   2   3   4   5   6
27.   If asked, teachers in this school would work extra hours to help the principal.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
28. Teachers in this school go out of their way to help each other.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
29. Teachers in this school defend the principal from criticism.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
30. There is not too much to be gained by trying to change the point of view of the   teachers in
this school.
    1   2   3   4   5   6
Please place an "x" next to your response to each of the following questions:
31. If you had the chance to teach for the same pay in another school under the direction of
another principal, how would you feel about moving?
_____ a.   I would very much prefer to move.
_____ b.   I would slightly prefer to move.
_____ c.   It would make no difference to me.
_____ d.   I would very slightly prefer to remain here.
_____ e.   I would very much prefer to remain where I am.
32.. Generally speaking, how much confidence do you have in your principal?
_____ a. Almost none.
_____ b. Not much.
_____ c. Some.

_____ d. Quite a lot.

_____ e. Complete.

33. If the principal transferred and only you and you alone among the staff were given a chance to go with him or her (doing the same work for the same pay) how would you feel about making the move?

_____ a. I would very much like to move.

_____ b. I would feel a little like making the move.

_____ c. I would not care one way or another.

_____ d. I would feel a little like not moving with him/her

_____ e. I would feel very much like not moving with him/her.

34. Is your principal the kind of person you really like working for?

_____ a. Yes, he/she really is that kind of person.

___ b. Yes, he/she is in many ways.

_____ c. He/she is in some ways and not in others.

_____ d. No, he/she is not in many ways.

_____ e. No, he/she really is not.

35. How loyal do you feel toward your school system?

_____ a. Almost none at all.

_____ b. A little.

_____ c. Some.

_____ d. Quite a bit.

_____ e. A very great dea

36. All in all how satisfied are you with your principal?

_____ a. Very dissatisfied with my principal.

_____ b. A little dissatisfied.

_____ c. Fairly satisfied.

_____ d. Quite satisfied.

_____ e. Very satisfied

37. Principals at times must make decisions which seem to be against the current interests of their subordinates. When this happens to you as a teacher, how much trust do you have that the principal's decision is in your interest in the long run?

_____ a. Complete trust

_____ b. A considerable amount of trust.

_____ c. Some trust.

_____ d. Only a little trust.

_____ e. No trust at all.

38. About how often is your principal responsible for the mistakes in your work unit?

_____ a. Very often.

_____ b. Quite often.

_____ c. Occasionally.

_____ d. Very rarely.

_____ e. Never.

Please circle the answer to each of the following items:

39. Sex: MALE   FEMALE

40. Ethnic Background: African-American   Asian-American
          Euro-American Hispanic   Other_____

41. Total years of experience in this system (not including the 02-03 school year):

1-5   6-10   11-15   16-20   21-25   over 25

42. Total years of experience at this school (not including the 02-03 school year).
1-5   6-10   11-15   16-20   21-25 Over 25

APPENDIX C

Permission to Use Instruments

March 2, 2001

Ms. Kay Walker
240 Brookfield Place
Roswell, GA 30075

Dear Ms. Walker:

You have my permission to use the OCDQ-RE and the Rutgers School Loyalty Questionaire (RSLQ) in your research. Both instruments were developed to be used by researchers. Simply copy and use them. You can get copies and information about the OCDQ-Re on my web page. Go to www.coe.ohio-state.edu/wahoy and then go to research instruments. I have not yet put the RSLQ on line, but I eventually will.

Good luck in your research. Please share the results of your work with us.

Sincerely,

Wayne K. Hoy
Fwacett Professor of
Educational Administration

(This is a reproduced copy of the actual letter received.)

APPENDIX D

Letter to Superintendents

September 12, 2002

Dear Dr…. :

I am writing to you with the request that you allow me to survey randomly selected teachers in a sample of "High Priority" elementary schools of the ….City Schools system in the area of school climate and its impact on faculty loyalty to the system, principal, and colleagues. This request is being made as a result of my participation in the doctoral program in the graduate school of educational leadership at the University of Georgia. My advisor, Dr. David Weller, is an expert in the area of school leadership. We have determined that research in the area of faculty loyalty will positively contribute to the knowledge base, and hopefully help to alleviate the current teacher shortage.

With your permission, I will be administering two Likert-scale survey instruments: One on school climate/health and another on teacher perceptions and beliefs that relate to loyalty. These instruments will be mailed to randomly selected faculty of selected elementary schools in October and November 2002. Each teacher will complete two surveys and mail them directly back to me. The total time of involvement of each teacher should be less than 20 minutes.

I want to assure you that all data will be aggregated and no one, other than Dr. Weller and I, will know which data belong to the …. City Schools, or even that your school system participated. Please be assured that I am sensitive to the extraordinary pressures and situations that can have negative impacts on metropolitan districts, and I will not knowingly do anything to jeopardize the …. City School system.

In exchange for the privilege of working with …..City Schools, I will send to you, during the spring or early summer of 2003, a separate climate and loyalty profile for the High Priority elementary schools in your system.

Thank you for your consideration. Please be kind enough to send your response by October 1, 2002 in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope, so that I can better arrange for the printing of the questionnaires. If you wish to speak to me directly, I may be reached at 770-740-7030 or by email at walkerk@fulton.k12.ga.us.

Sincerely,

Kay R. Walker

APPENDIX E

Letter to Principals

February 20, 2003

Dear Ms.

Thank you so much for agreeing to help me with my study. I am asking that you or a trusted faculty member distribute the attached surveys at a faculty meeting or in the teachers' boxes. Information about distribution and collection procedures are also attached. He or she will return the surveys to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. The time required to complete the surveys should be no more than 15 minutes.

Please be assured that all data will be aggregated and no one, other than my advisor Dr. David Weller and I, will know which data belong to your school. I will provide you with your school's results sometime this spring. We will be providing your superintendent with a climate and loyalty profile for the system in the spring or early summer of 2003.

We are working to add to the database of information about how school leaders can effectively recruit and retain excellent teachers. Given our current teacher shortage, you can agree that this is a worthwhile undertaking. Your participation will assist us in these efforts.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Kay R. Walker