

FACULTY TRUST IN PRINCIPAL AND
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

by

LESLIE ROY ABSTON

ROXANNE MITCHELL, COMMITTEE CHAIR

DAVE DAGLEY
JOHN DANTZELER
MARY GIVENS
JOHN TARTER

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy, and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2015

Copyright Leslie Roy Abston 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship of the following constructs: 1) Faculty trust in the principal as defined by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), 2) organizational commitment as defined by Mowday, Porter & Steers (1979), and the Three-Component Model of organizational commitment as defined by Meyer & Allen (1991). This study sought to determine whether faculty trust in the principal was better predictor of Mowday, Porter, & Steers model as measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) or the Meyer & Allen model as measured by the Three Component Model Scale (TCM), while controlling for socioeconomic status (SES). Sixty elementary schools were surveyed and 1,665 teachers voluntarily participated in the study. Instruments used in the study were the Omnibus T-Scale, the OCQ, and the TCM of organizational commitment.

The independent variable in this study was faculty trust in the principal (x). The dependent variables were organizational commitment as measured by (y_1) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and (y_2) Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey). Two hypotheses were tested. The first hypothesis, which stated faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM will positively covary, was moderately supported. The research found faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM positively co-varied. There was a moderate and significant relationship between trust in the principal and the OCQ ($r = .45^{**}, p < .01$), trust in the principal and the TCM ($r = .43^{**}, p < .01$), and between the OCQ and TCM ($r = .34^{**}, p < .01$). SES did not have a significant effect on any of the three variables.

The second hypothesis stated faculty trust in the principal is a better predictor of the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment than the OCQ, while controlling

for SES. This hypothesis was not supported. The analysis showed trust in the principal explained 19% ($\beta = .39, p < .01$) of the variance in OCQ while explaining only 16% ($\beta = .29, p < .01$) of the variance in TCM. Thus, it would appear trust in the principal is a better predictor of OCQ than the TCM.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

α	Cronbach's alpha index of internal consistency
β	Beta
df	Degrees of freedom: The number of values in the final calculation of a statistic that are free to vary.
N	Sample size
M	Mean: The central tendency either of a probability distribution or of the random variable characterized by that distribution.
P	Probability: A number expressing the likelihood that a specific event will occur expressed as the ratio of the number of actual occurrences to the number of possible occurrences.
r	Pearson product-moment correlation
t	Computed value of t test
$<$	Less than
\leq	Less than or equal to
$=$	Equal to
\neq	Not equal to

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the people who have allowed this long journey to come to an end. Without you, this would not have been possible. First, my dissertation committee: Dr. John Tarter, Dr. Roxanne Mitchell, Dr. Dave Dagley, Dr. John Dantzler, and Dr. Mary Givens. A very special thanks is warranted for my dissertation chair, Dr. John Tarter, and his tireless colleague, Dr. Roxanne Mitchell. The countless hours you spent with our cohort is much appreciated. Your selfless dedication to your students is the epitome of what teaching is all about. I would also like to thank Dr. Jennifer Gray and Mr. Gary Horton for their understanding as I went thru this process. Finally, I am eternally grateful to all of the teachers who spent their valuable time responding to the surveys.

I was blessed with some truly great teachers throughout my life. I am afraid that I will forget to name them all, but, I respect and love you all. But, special thanks will have to go to Mr. Skip Beck, Ms. Sue Raines, Ms. Jane Corl, and Mr. Gary Green. You were the best at what you did. All of you have retired. Future generations will suffer without your tremendous impact and knowledge.

My family has also been my backbone throughout the dissertation process. To Courtney, my lovely wife, I sincerely appreciate your understanding and apologize for the countless hours this process has taken away from my time with you. To my sons, Cole and Cade, I hope you are young enough that you may not remember all of the time I missed being away from you. If so, I apologize deeply. I just want both of you to know how proud you make me. You have taught me what unconditional love really means. I would also like to thank my Dad and Mom for all the sacrifices you have made for me throughout my life. I can only hope that I make as much of

an impact on my children as you have on me. I have been truly blessed. There are no finer parents in the world.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Definition of Concepts.....	6
Research Questions	8
Hypotheses.....	8
Limitations	9
Summary	9
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Introduction.....	11
Conceptual Framework.....	11
Faculty Trust	11
History of trust scholarship.....	11
Trust in schools	12
T-scales	13
Omnibus T-scales.....	13
Trust and school effectiveness	15

Trust and collaboration	16
Trust and school mindfulness	17
Trust and principal authenticity	17
Trust and collective efficacy	18
Trust and organizational citizenship behavior	19
Trust and organizational climate.....	19
Trust and organizational justice.....	20
Trust and enabling bureaucracy	21
Trust and openness of school climate	21
Trust and collegial principal leadership	22
Trust and organizational health.....	22
Obstacles to trust in schools.....	23
Summary of trust.....	24
Organizational Commitment.....	24
Side-bet theory	25
From side-bet theory to psychological awareness	26
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	27
Theoretical shift to a TCM of organizational commitment	27
Commitment and efficacy.....	29
Commitment and professional growth.....	30
Commitment and organizational climate	30
Theoretical Framework	33
Rationale for Hypothesis.....	39

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	41
Overview.....	41
Sample.....	41
Data Collection	42
Variables	42
Measures	42
Statistical Treatment	45
Summary	45
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	46
Descriptive Statistics.....	46
Reliability.....	47
Correlations.....	48
Test of Hypothesis	49
Conclusion	51
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	53
Summary of the Findings.....	53
Theoretical Implications	54
Faculty Trust in the Principal, the OCQ, and the TCM	54
Faculty Trust as a Predictor of the TCM rather than OCQ, controlled for SES.....	55
Practical Implications.....	56
Recommendations for Research	58
Limitations of the Study.....	58
Conclusion	60

REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	69
A. OMNIBUS T-SCALE.....	69
B. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	70
C. THREE-COMPONENT MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE	71
D. IRB APPROVAL.....	72
E. INVITATION SCRIPT FOR PRINCIPALS.....	73
F. INVITATION SCRIPT FOR TEACHERS	74

LIST OF TABLES

1. Instrumentation Used for this Study	43
2. Descriptive Statistics of the Measures	47
3. Cronbach's Alpha for Study Variables	48
4. Correlations (Pearson) Among Study Variables.....	49
5. Regression Coefficients Examining the OCQ on Faculty Trust in the Principal	50
6. Regression Coefficients Examining the TCM on Faculty Trust in the Principal	51

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

The following study is an empirical examination of the relationship between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment in elementary schools. Also, the study attempted to find if faculty trust in the principal, while controlled for SES, is a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ. The three models used were Hoy and Tschanen-Moran's (1999) conceptualization of faculty trust, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire created by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) and Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of organizational commitment. This chapter includes a background of the study, purpose of the study, and the significance of the study. Also, definitions of key concepts are provided. Research questions and hypotheses for the study are stated. Finally, the limitations and a summary for this study are discussed.

Background of the Study

Scholarly research on trust began when Deutsch (1958) attempted to define trust based on social learning theory. Rotter (1967) further evolved trust scholarship by defining trust as the expectancy that the word of someone could be relied upon. He also created the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS) to measure his definition of trust. Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) were some of the first researchers that focused exclusively on trust in schools. Tschanen-Moran and Hoy (2000) wrote the study of trust eventually evolved to interpersonal relationships in the 1980s. The fields of sociology, organizational science, and economics also began studying trust during the 1990s. Trust as it relates to schools was researched heavily in the mid-1980s and has continued throughout the 2000s.

The faculty trust section of this study was based on Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1999) concepts of faculty trust. They defined trust as "...an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 189). Trust as an educational construct has been extensively examined in the literature (Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie, 1992; Hoy, Sabo & Barnes, 1996; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Smith, Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy, Gage & Tarter, 2006). Trust has been linked to more effective schools (Uline, Miller & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2001) and school achievement (Tschannen-Moran, 2004). And, according to Hall (1972), effectiveness is the ultimate test of any organization (as cited in Hoy et al., 1992).

One of the first attempts to conceptualize organizational commitment stemmed from Howard Becker's (1960) side-bet theory. Weibo, Kaur, and Jun (2010) wrote that Becker's theory was based on the contract of economic exchange behavior. According to Becker's (1960) theory, employees are committed to an organization because they have hidden investments, or "side-bets," in the organization. In other words, people are committed to the organization because they have financial motivation to remain in the organization. If someone left the organization, their "side-bets" would be lost immediately. Becker (1960) argued that over time costs or "side-bets" would accumulate which made it difficult to remove oneself from an organization.

The study of organizational commitment eventually moved away from solely emphasizing Becker's (1960) side-bet theory. Instead, organizational commitment scholarship began examining the psychological attachment individuals felt towards an organization (Weibo et al., 2010). In other words, employee retention was not solely based on economic factors.

Instead, affective influence played as much, if not more, of a role in organizational commitment than economic influences. This shift in organizational commitment research was advocated by Porter, Steer, Mowday, and Boulian (1974). Porter et al. (1974) defined organizational commitment as "...the individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (p. 604). An individual's involvement and identification with the organization is exemplified by the following: 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 definite desire to maintain organizational membership" (p. 604).

Organizational commitment scholarship evolved even further with the work of Meyer and Allen (1984, 1991). They created a three-component model of organizational commitment. Basically, Meyer and Allen (1984, 1991) argued that the Becker's (1960) side-bet theory and the affective commitment models by Porter et al. (1974) did not fully and/or accurately measure organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1984, 1990, 1991) model contains three scales of commitment: a) affective commitment, b) normative commitment, and c) continuance commitment. The affective commitment scale was used to characterize positive feelings of identification with an organization. The normative commitment scale was used to determine why people felt obligated to remain employed in an organization. The continuance commitment scale was similar to Becker's (1960) side-bet theory in that continuance commitment is associated with employee's commitment to their organization based on the costs associated with leaving the organization (Weibo et al., 2010).

The organizational commitment section of this study was based on Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) model of organizational commitment as well as Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. The Meyer and Allen (1991) model is an

expansion of previous scholarship on affective attachment (Kanter, 1968; Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1979), the desire to remain in an organization (Becker, 1960; Kanter, 1968) and feelings of obligation to an organization (Wiener, 1982). Meyer and Allen's (1991) model includes affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Employees with high levels of affective commitment remain in the organization because they want to. Continuance commitment deals with employees remaining in an organization because they need to. Finally, normative commitment indicates employees remain in an organization because they ought to. Organizational commitment has been defined "...as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Mowday et al., 1979, p. 226). In other words, organizational commitment, especially as it pertains to school settings, is the commitment to a school.

Purpose of the Study

This purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. Specifically, does a relationship exist between faculty trust in the principal as defined by Hoy and Tschannen-Morin (1999) with the commitment model of Mowday et al. (1979) and the three component model of organizational commitment espoused by Meyer and Allen (1991)? Also, the study attempted to determine if faculty trust in the principal, while controlled for SES, is a better predictor of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model (TCM) than Mowday et al.'s (1979) model of organizational commitment. School leaders are under increasing pressure to improve the educational process. Faculty trust and organizational commitment have both been related to improving schools. Determining a significant relationship between faculty trust and organizational commitment

could improve leadership in schools. Improved leadership might then increase overall school performance and achievement.

Very few studies have been conducted relating faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. The few studies correlating these two constructs are generally business related. Gaps in the educational research literature are large. In particular, there is very little literature relating faculty trust in the principal with organizational commitment. The constructs of faculty trust and organizational commitment have both been shown to improve school effectiveness. The likelihood of a connection between faculty trust and organizational commitment exists. Connecting faculty trust with organizational commitment will permit researchers to test an explanation of how faculty trust affects organizational commitment. Thus, a study relating faculty trust and organizational commitment is important because it can possibly impact the performance of schools.

Significance of the Study

The theoretical significance of this study is that it will address gaps in the literature relating faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. Also, this study may demonstrate faculty trust in the principal, while controlled for SES, is a better predictor of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three- Component Model than the model of organizational commitment developed by Mowday et al. (1979). This study also adds to the body of theory associated with faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment.

Practical significance is that administrators can incorporate dimensions of faculty trust and organizational commitment into their schools. Faculty trust and organizational commitment have both been shown to improve schools. Hopefully, correlating the constructs of trust and commitment will result in a further understanding of their meaningfulness in school

environments. And, most importantly, the functioning and achievement of schools might eventually improve.

Definition of Concepts

Faculty Trust (conceptual definition)—An individual or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

1. *Benevolence*- Being considerate for the needs of others as well as being willing to promote their individual interests.
2. *Reliability* – Being consistent and predictable with positive behavior.
3. *Competency* – Having the skill and ability to complete assigned tasks.
4. *Honesty* – Being committed to trust and promises that have been made.
5. *Openness* – Sharing control and dispensing information with factual and timely communication.

Faculty Trust (operational definition)—Faculty trust is measured by the Omnibus T-Scale (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003). The Omnibus T-Scale is a trust scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999). The instrument contains 26 items and measures three subscales of trust. The subscales of trust include the following: trust in the principal, trust in the faculty, and trust in the client. The client refers to the trust teachers have for parents and students, respectively. The subscale of faculty trust in the principal will be the only scale used. Factor analytic studies support the validity and reliability of the three faculty trust subtests. Norms for the Omnibus T-Scales are based on a sample of 97 Ohio high schools, 66 Virginia middle schools, and 146 Ohio elementary schools. The three dimensions of trust had high Cronbach's alpha coefficients (consistently ranging .90). They are as follows: Trust in Principal,

$\alpha = .98$; Trust in Colleagues, $\alpha = .93$; Trust in Clients, $\alpha = .94$. Responses are elicited on a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 6 = Strongly Agree to 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Organizational commitment (conceptual definition)—According to Mowday et al., (1979) organizational commitment is characterized by three factors: “... (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; (3) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership” (p. 226).

Organizational commitment (operational definition)—The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was developed to measure levels of organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1979). The OCQ is also one of the most frequently used measures of commitment. The OCQ has 15 items which use a 7-point Likert-type scale. The scale ranges from 7 = Strongly Agree to 1 = Strongly Disagree. Mean levels of commitment range from a low of 4.0 to a high of 6.1. The standard deviations suggested a satisfactory distribution of responses within the samples. Predictive, discriminant, and convergent validity were at an acceptable levels. Alpha coefficients ranged from .82 to .93, with a median of .90.

Organizational commitment (conceptual definition)—A psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

1. *Affective Commitment* – An employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization.
2. *Continuance Commitment* – An awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization.
3. *Normative Commitment* – A feeling of obligation to continue employment.

Organizational commitment (operational definition)—The TCM Employee Commitment Survey was originally developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) revised the original instrument from 24 items to 18 for use in educational research. Three forms of employee commitment to the organization are measured with this instrument: affective commitment (desire based), normative commitment (obligation based), and continuance commitment (continuance based). There are three scales used in the measure: the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS), and the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS). The ACS ($\alpha = .82$), NCS ($\alpha = .83$), and CCS ($\alpha = .74$) have been shown to have consistent reliability estimates (Cronbach's alphas). Predictive, discriminant, and convergent validity were at acceptable levels. Item responses are made on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between faculty trust in the principal, organizational commitment as defined by Mowday et al. (1979) and organizational commitment as defined by Meyer and Allen (1991); and
2. Is faculty trust in the principal a better predictor of the Three-Component Model (TCM) than the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire?

Hypotheses

H_1 : The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment and faculty trust in the principal as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale will positively covary.

H₂: While controlling for socio-economic status (SES), faculty trust in the principal is a better predictor of the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment than the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ).

Limitations

The following study addressed a convenience sample involving sixty public elementary schools in Northwest Alabama. Threats to internal and external validity contribute limitations to this study. Internal validity could be threatened due to an instrumentation change (instrumentality) in Meyer and Allen's (1991) TCM of Organizational Commitment. The word "organization" in the three subscales will be changed to "schools" since the unit of analysis in this study is the 60 Northwest Alabama elementary schools. Also, validity could have been influenced by respondents not answering the questions truthfully. The participants in this study were shaped by differences in culture, norms, and beliefs. Internal validity may also be affected since only public, elementary school teachers will be studied. There were no study participants from parochial or private schools.

External validity could be threatened by generalizability across the study participants to other teachers across the United States. Also, since this was a cross-sectional study the chance of non-responses on the survey instrument could result in bias of the outcome measures. Since the study sample was not random, external validity remained a concern.

Summary

Schools face increasing pressure to improve their performance and effectiveness. Faculty trust and organizational commitment have both been significant components of improving school effectiveness. However, little research has been conducted which relates faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. Likewise, there is very little, if any, research relating

whether faculty trust in the principal, while controlled for SES, is a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ. This study attempted to close these gaps in the educational literature.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections: conceptual framework, theoretical framework, and hypotheses. The conceptual framework section defines faculty trust and organizational commitment and gives a detailed research history of each concept. A theoretical explanation of how the concepts interact is also provided. Finally, hypotheses testing the theoretical framework are also provided.

Conceptual Framework

Faculty Trust

History of trust scholarship. The empirical study of trust and mistrust emerged during the late 1950s and early 1960s. According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), the conceptualization of trust occurred to some extent because of the rising tensions associated with the Cold War. Deutsch (1958) was one of the first researchers attempting to define trust and investigate it experimentally. Trust research was based on social learning theory. Deutsch (1958) wrote, “It is possible to capture in the laboratory the phenomena of ‘trust’ and to study experimentally some of the variables which influence the tendency to engage in ‘trusting’ and ‘responsible’ behavior” (p. 264). As a result, expectations that social sciences could uncover a solution to the dangerous arms race emerged (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Inevitably, trust scholarship evolved.

The late 1960s was characterized by young people who had become disillusioned with existing institutions and authorities. Rebelling and questioning of societal norms became common. As a result, researchers understanding of trust became conceptualized as a generalized

personality trait (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Rotter (1967) defined trust as the expectancy held by someone that the word, promise, or written statement of someone could be relied upon. He created the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS) to measure this new definition of trust. Internal consistency, test-retest reliability, construct validity and discriminant validity were all satisfactory for the ITS. Finally, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) wrote that trust scholarship eventually progressed to interpersonal relationships in the 1980s and emerged as a subject of study in sociology, organizational science, and economics during the 1990s.

Trust in schools. One of the main focuses of this study was trust as it relates to schools. Thus, the following section of the literature review will pertain to faculty trust in the educational setting. Blumberg et al. (1978) were some of the first researchers that examined trust in schools. They conducted a study surveying 85 teachers. The study samples were asked to explain the meaning of the following statement: “I trust my principal (Blumberg et al., 1978, p. 3).” One hundred seventy-nine total responses were received. The authors then developed categories by a Q-sort. They identified ten different categories. The identified categories are as follows: a) personal warmth, b) fairness, c) interpersonal openness, d) professional openness, e) technical competence, f) confidentiality, g) follow-through, h) credibility, i) participative decision-making, and j) support. The authors realized their study was ground-breaking and flawed. They actually wrote that “...we are standing on shaky theoretical and empirical ground. But, it may be precisely that sort of ground that is necessary in order to generate further research” (Blumberg et al., 1978, p. 12). Overall, though, their final findings revealed most of the meaningful trust between principals and teachers was concerned with the conditions and environment of the workplace rather than the actual work the principal produced. In other words, the teachers felt the

principals relationship with them (how he treated them) was more important than his professional abilities.

T-scales. Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) continued the research on faculty trust. They defined trust as "...a generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promise, and written or oral statement of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon...and that the trusted person will act in one's best interest"(Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985, p. 2). They also developed the Trust Scales (T-Scales). The T-Scales was a 21-item instrument. Three subscales were developed with seven items per scale. The subscales are as follows: a) faculty trust in the principal, b) faculty trust in the colleagues, c) and faculty trust in the school district. The author's concluded all of the trust subscales were related to one another and collectively. According to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) creation of the T-Scales was the starting point for a measure of trust that fit their proposed conceptual framework of trust.

Omnibus T-scale. Creation of the Omnibus T-Scale (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 1999) was in direct response to Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) T-Scale. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) found that the original T-Scales did not include items measuring competency or openness. Also, there were no items for faculty trust in students and faculty trust in parents. These items were added to the original T-Scales so that each facet of trust could be measured for each respective group. The first revision of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1999) new Trust Survey included forty-eight items. The authors kept the original format of the T-Scales. The original format was a six-point Likert type survey with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The development of their revised instrument then went through four phases: a) a panel of experts reacted to the items, b) a preliminary version was field tested by teachers, c) a pilot

study was conducted in a small number of schools to determine factor structure, reliability, and validity, and d) a large scale study was conducted where the psychometric properties could be examined. After several revisions the final version of the Omnibus T-Scale included 26 items that measured the following: a) faculty trust in the principal, b) faculty trust in colleagues, and c) faculty trust in clients. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) made the following statement concerning the results of their study, “As predicted, the three dimensions of trust were moderately correlated with each other. Trust in the principal was related to trust in colleagues ($r = .37, p < .01$) and trust in clients ($r = .42, p < .01$). Further, trust in colleagues was correlated with trust in clients ($r = .35, p < .01$) (p.203).”

A new definition of trust was also developed. According to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), “Trust is an individual’s or group’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open” (p. 189). These facets of trust are consistent with what are found throughout the literature (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschanen-Moran, 2001; Hoy & Tschanen-Moran, 2003). Benevolence is the confidence that one will not be harmed by a trusted party. In other words, one will not be exploited for their vulnerabilities. Benevolence infers that one can count on the good will of another person to act in their best interest. Reliability is the confidence that others will be consistent in their actions. Trust is enhanced when someone expects an outcome will be forthcoming and positive. Competence is the ability to perform as expected and/or with an ability to meet the standard appropriate for the task. Honesty is also an important component of trust. Honest people are committed to the truth and to promises made. Honesty is composed of the character, integrity, and authenticity of someone. Likewise, accepting responsibility for one’s actions and not shifting blame is another component of honesty. The next facet of trust is

openness. Openness is the extent to which relevant information is shared. Openness is also the process where individuals make themselves vulnerable by sharing information with others.

Openness implies the confidence information shared will not be used in a negative way. In essence, people who withhold information breed distrust because others become suspicious of what they are hiding. Finally, openness also includes transparency in decisions and sharing of control (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Trust and school effectiveness. Trust can influence the overall effectiveness of schools. Hoy et al. (1992) found a positive relationship between faculty trust in colleagues and school effectiveness. They sampled 44 elementary schools in New Jersey. Eight hundred and forty-two teachers responded to the surveys. Instruments used were the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire-RE (OCDQ-RE), Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) T-Scales, and an eight-item instrument of perceived effectiveness. The authors found that supportive leadership contributed to a culture of trust. But, they were surprised a culture of trust is not what influences school effectiveness. Instead, they found that only faculty trust in colleagues relates to school effectiveness. A replication of this study uncovered different results, though. Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy (1995) studied 87 middle schools in New Jersey. They found that faculty trust in the principal was related to school effectiveness. Relationship between faculty trust in colleagues, collegial behavior, and school effectiveness were found. Finally, faculty trust in the principal, school effectiveness, and supportive leadership were also related.

Uline et al. (1998) also reviewed school effectiveness. They used Miskel, Fevrly and Stewart's (1979) revision of Paul Mott's (1972) Index of Perceived Organizational Effectiveness model. Measures used were the Organizational Health Inventory for Middle Schools (OID-RM) and two trust scales developed by Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) which assess faculty trust in the

principal and faculty trust in colleagues; 2,777 teachers participated in the study. Uline et al.'s (1998) research examined instrumental and expressive dimensions of organizational functions. Instrumental activities include student achievement in reading, math, and writing. Expressive dimensions include teacher trust in colleagues and the principal as well as school health. They found a correlation between all instrumental and expressive variables and effectiveness while teacher trust in the principal had the lowest correlation. Teacher trust in colleagues had the highest correlation with effectiveness.

Trust and collaboration. Collaboration between the principal and stakeholders of schools has been related to trust. Tschannen-Moran (2001) surveyed 45 schools in a large, urban district in a Midwestern state. Eight hundred ninety-eight total surveys were used in the study. Survey instruments were a modified, 35-item Trust Scale (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985) and a collaboration survey instrument that was developed for the study. Tschannen-Moran (2001) wrote schools with high levels of collaboration relate to trust between the faculty and principal, trust in clients, and trust in colleagues. Colleague collaboration was also significantly related to trust in the principal and collaboration with parents. Finally, collaboration with parents was related to trust in the principal as well as trust in colleagues. School policies and instructional practice can improve as teachers share their skills with one another and support each other. In essence, as trust levels in school increase, it is more likely for collaboration to occur between the principal and faculty, among the faculty, and with parents on school decisions.

Trust and school mindfulness. Hoy et al. (2006) linked faculty trust and school mindfulness. Seventy-five middle schools in Ohio were surveyed. Approximately 2,600 usable surveys were returned to the researchers. The researchers used two instruments. Instruments used were the School Mindfulness Scale (M-Scale) and the Omnibus T-Scale. The M-Scale is a

20-item, Likert-type scale, which measures all five elements of school mindfulness. The five elements of school mindfulness are as follows: a) focus on mistakes, b) reluctance to simplify, c) sensitivity to teaching and learning, d) commitment to resilience, and e) deference to expertise in problem solving. The Omnibus T-Scale is a measure of faculty trust containing 26 items. There are three subtests of the Omnibus T-Scale: faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (students and parents). School mindfulness was defined as the organizations' ability to identify problems in the organization as well as take risks on unconventional problems. Faculty trust in clients, faculty trust in the principal, and faculty trust in colleagues were all related to mindfulness. Two strong predictors of principal mindfulness was faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues. Findings of their study explained mindfulness depends on trust to create a school environment where the staff feels safe to make errors. Also, in said school environments, errors can be addressed as learning opportunities and not conflicts. Principals in mindful schools must also trust teachers to experiment with different strategies, shape resilience, have a reluctance to simplify, be open to new information, and work collaboratively with one another.

Trust and principal authenticity. Principal authenticity is also related to trust. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998) conducted a study in which 2,741 teachers from 86 middle schools were surveyed. Four measures were used for the study. Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) T-Scales was used to measure trust, the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI-M) was used to measure the health of middle school climate, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ-RM) was used to measure the openness of middle school climate, and a shortened version of Hoy and Henderson's (1983) Leader Authenticity Scale (LAS) was used to measure teacher authenticity. According to the authors, authentic behavior consists of three

categories. They are accountability, non-manipulation, and salience of self over role.

Accountability is the willingness to take personal and organizational responsibility for mistakes and negative outcomes. Non-manipulation is the perception school leaders and colleagues will avoid exploiting them. Salience of self over role refers to the ability to not adhere with role expectations and stereotyping. Not surprisingly, authenticity of principal behavior has a strong relationship with faculty trust in the principal. Authenticity of teacher behavior also made a significant contribution to teachers' trust in their colleagues.

Trust and collective efficacy. Trust has also been related to collective efficacy.

Collective teacher efficacy is, "...the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on students" (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2000, p. 480). According to Sweetland and Hoy (2000), collective efficacy gives teachers purpose and emboldens them to take responsibility for student achievement. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) found trust in the principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in clients were positively related to teacher efficacy. Lastly, Angelle, Nixon, Norton, and Niles (2011) found a significant relationship between trust and collective efficacy.

Goddard et al. (2000) conducted a study in 47 elementary schools. Four hundred fifty-two teachers completed surveys. Student data for 7,016 students was provided by the school district. Student data included the following: test scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), gender, race, free and reduced lunch status, and school size. The researchers used a 16-item Gibson and Dembo (1984) teacher efficacy instrument, a powerlessness scale (Zielinski & Hoy, 1983), an individual teacher efficacy scale (Bandura, 2000) and Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) measure of teacher trust in colleagues to create their survey. Goddard et al. (2000) found a positive correlation between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement with trust. A

significant relationship between collective efficacy and trust in colleagues was also revealed. Collective efficacy was also associated with higher student achievement in math and reading. Using their full model, collective efficacy explained 53.27% of the variance in mathematics scores and 69.64% of the variance in reading scores between schools.

Trust and organizational citizenship behavior. Relationships between organizational citizenship behavior and teacher trust have also been found. Tschannen-Moran (2003) reviewed the role of trust in cultivating organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational citizenship behavior reviews the motivations, which inspire staff to do more than the minimum requirements of their job descriptions. In other words, what prompts people to perform non-mandatory tasks with no expectation of recognition or compensation? Results revealed trust in the principal had a moderate but significant relationship to the citizenship behavior of teacher. Staff perception of principal transformational behaviors and trust of the principal was the strongest connection found in the study. This provides additional evidence of the importance of trust in leadership.

Trust and organizational climate. Another study positively linked faculty trust to the organizational climate of schools (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2003). Ninety-seven schools agreed to participate in this study. Analyses were performed on school means rather than individual teacher scores. Components of several instruments were combined to create the survey developed in the study. Thirty items from both the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and the Organizational Health Inventory (OCI) were selected. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1999) Faculty Trust Survey, which is a 35-item Likert instrument, was also used. Study results found faculty trust in colleagues was related to the following aspects of school climate: collegial leadership, professional teacher behavior, and achievement press. A major goal of this study was to develop a parsimonious climate instrument. Also, the authors

intended to examine relationships between high school climate and trust. They accomplished both. The new, 27-item Likert instrument they developed was called Organizational Climate Index (OCI) for High Schools.

Trust and organizational justice. Organizational justice, which is individuals' perceptions of fairness in an organization, has also been related to trust. Hoy & Tarter (2004) surveyed 75 Ohio middle schools with approximately 2600 teachers participating in the survey. Organizational justice, faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, collegial leadership of the principal, and professional teacher behavior were measured in their research. Instruments used included the following: the Organizational Justice Index (OJI) which measured organizational justice, the Omnibus T-Scale which measured trust, subtests from Hoy, Smith and Sweetland's (2003) Organizational Climate Index (OCI) which measured teacher and principal behaviors, and another subtest form the OCI which measured teacher professional behavior. Study results found faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues had significant relationships with organizational justice. The principal of a school is the most important person in creating organizational justice in the school. Also, principals who create a climate with high morale and teacher professionalism can facilitate a growth of trust in teachers. According to the authors, "The data demonstrated that trust and justice are inextricably linked; you cannot have one without the other" (Hoy & Tarter, 2004, p. 257).

Trust and enabling bureaucracy. School bureaucracies with high levels of trust can be created to increase collaboration and reduce role conflict. This type of bureaucratic system is called an enabling bureaucracy. On the contrary, hindering bureaucracies are characterized by teacher powerlessness, role conflict, and coercive rules (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). According to Hoy and Sweetland (2000, 2001), an enabling school structure is one in which the perception in

leadership fosters collaboration, innovation, and trust among members. Likewise, an enabling bureaucracy's rules and procedures promote problem-solving and are flexible. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) surveyed teachers of 97 high schools in Ohio. The number of survey participants was not provided. Measures used for the surveys include the following: a) a 12-item, Likert-type survey developed by the authors of the study to measure enabling structure, b) a subtest of the Faculty Trust Survey (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) which measured trust in the principal, c) a truth-spinning index developed by Sweetland and Hoy (in press), and d) a role conflict scale developed by Rizzo, House and Lirtzman (1970) which was used to measure inconsistent behavior. Study results suggested an enabling bureaucracy would foster trust among teachers. Accordingly, teachers' trust in colleagues would then contribute to the enabling structure of the school. Results of their study also found higher levels of enabling bureaucracy fostered more trust in the principal. As a result of this, authentic, frank communication was easier because enabling bureaucracies promoted trust between teachers and the principal.

Trust and openness of school climate. Faculty trust has also been linked to the openness of the school climate (Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994). Open organizational behavior is categorized by supportive and non-directive principal behavior as well as engaged and un-frustrated teacher behavior. Tarter et al. (1989) collected data from 1,083 teachers in 72 New Jersey schools. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, Rutgers Secondary (OCDQ-RS) was used to measure school climate, and the faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues subscales of Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) T-Scales. Study results related the openness of principals' leadership behavior with trust in the principal and trust in colleagues. Also, supportive principal behaviors were positively related to teacher trust in the principal. Constructive criticism and good work habits set an example and lead to an

increase in faculty trust. Faculty trust in colleagues had a significant relationship with faculty trust in the principal. Finally, principals whom protect teachers from unreasonable outside demands foster teacher trust.

Trust and collegial principal leadership. Hoy et al. (1992) wrote that supportive leadership influences collegiality and faculty trust in the principal. Tschanen-Moran and Hoy (1998) found a relationship between collegial leadership and faculty trust in the principal. Hoy et al. (2003) similarly found a link between collegial principal leadership and faculty trust in clients as well as collegial leadership and faculty trust in the principal. Finally, Hoy and Tarter (2004) published a study on trust and organizational justice, which linked collegial leadership with trust in the principal.

Trust and organizational health. Tarter and Hoy (1988) surveyed 1,083 teachers and principals at 75 secondary schools in New Jersey. Survey instruments used were the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) and two of Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) trust scales. The trust scales used were faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues. Tarter and Hoy (1988) hypothesized organizational health and trust were related. Healthy organizations cope with evolving problems while focusing their energies on major objectives. Organizational health has seven interaction patterns. They are institutional integrity, principal influence, consideration, initiating structure, resource support, morale, and academic emphasis. These variables were correlated with trust in the principal and trust in colleagues. Trust in the principal was positively related to institutional integrity, consideration, initiating structure and morale. Faculty trust in colleagues was positively related to institutional integrity, principal influence, consideration, morale, and academic emphasis. Additionally, as school health increased, faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues also increased.

Obstacles to trust in schools. There are also many obstacles to faculty trust. For example, Hoy and Sweetland (2001) determined that blaming behaviors and strict rules and regulations harm the formation of trusting relationships. Tarter et al. (1989) linked directive leadership, which is rigid and domineering leadership behavior, with a significant, negative relationship to faculty trust in the principal. Maele and Houtte (2009) found teachers at public schools have lower trust in colleagues than teachers in private schools. They proposed shared values among the teachers could be the contributing factor in more trusting relationships in private schools. Houtte (2006) found students in vocational schools are also trusted less than those in general schools. Standardized testing has also been linked to lower levels of trust. The standardized testing movement infers that schools cannot be trusted to educate their students without government supervision. Minorities are likewise under the impression that standardized tests are biased against them (Meier, 2002). Hoy et al. (2003) found institutional vulnerability, which is the extent to which schools are susceptible to a few vocal parents and citizen groups, was negatively associated with faculty trust in colleagues. Also, as institutional vulnerability rises faculty trust in the principal declines.

Gender can also play a role in trust. Maele and Houtte (2009) found schools with higher proportions of female students have higher levels of faculty trust in students. Girls' academic orientation is likely the cause of this. Following are some examples of higher female academic orientation. Girls have more perseverance in schoolwork, spend more time doing homework than boys, are less disruptive than boys, and being more in line with teachers' academic demands. Low SES had the greatest negative impact on levels of faculty trust in students based on school size. The authors argued a low SES student body does not meet the normative and academic expectations of their teachers. Likewise, trust in colleagues was shown to be

diminished in low SES schools. A likely explanation is that teachers believe their colleagues are not teaching effectively. Tschannen-Moran (2004) also found that schools with higher levels of SES were more likely to have less principal trust in students and parents. Tschannen-Moran (2004) also correlated high levels of SES with lower faculty trust in clients and colleagues. Transience, which occurs when students only stay in a particular school for a brief period of time, makes it hard to develop trust. Likewise, increasing diversity seems to hamper trust (Meier, 2002). Finally, lack of parental involvement and resources can negatively impact faculty trust if teachers feel their expectations are not being met (Maele & Houtte, 2009).

Summary of trust. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) wrote trust is a vital element in well-functioning organizations. Schools, which are the organizations this study analyzed, are generally led by principals. Thus, the possibility exists that high levels of trust in the principal are found in well-functioning schools. The following school specific examples have been related with increased levels of trust in the principal: school effectiveness, collaboration, mindfulness, principal authenticity, collective efficacy, organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational climate, organizational justice, enabling school structures, open school climate, collegial principal leadership and organizational health. As the aforementioned examples have shown, trust in the principal has a positive impact on schools. In conclusion, the following section of this literature review will deal with organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment

An extensive list of definitions on organizational commitment can be found in the literature. For example, Kanter (1968) stated commitment is the inclination of people to give their loyalty and energy to social systems. She also wrote about the profits associated with continued participation in a group along with the costs associated with leaving. Similarly,

organizational commitment has been defined as the process by which the goals of the organization and its members become increasingly unified or compatible (Hall, Schneider & Nygren, 1970). Organizational commitment can also have three key components. They are as follows: a) identification – pride in the organization, b) involvement – psychological absorption in one's role in the organization, and c) loyalty – affection for and attachment to an organization (Buchanan, 1974). Also, commitment has been described as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in an organization (Mowday et al., 1979). Wiener (1982) wrote organizational commitment is the sum of internal normative pressures that compel group members to behave in accordance with organizational goals and interests. Finally, commitment has been defined as a psychological state binding an employee to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Side-bet theory. Becker's (1960) conception of organizational commitment is called the side-bet theory. According to WeiBo, Kaur, and Jun (2010), Becker's work was one of the first attempts to study organizational commitment as a conceptual framework from the perspective of an individual's relationship with an organization. Side-bet theory maintains a committed person "...acted in such a way as to involve other interests of his, originally extraneous to the action he is engaged in, directly in that action" (Becker, 1960, p. 35). The side-bet theory establishes a relationship between employees and organizations based on economic exchange behavior. In essence, employees are committed because they have hidden side-bets they have made to remain in the organization. Upon leaving the organization, the side-bets would potentially be lost (WeiBo et al., 2010). According to Becker (1960), certain events can change one's employment status. Inevitably, this increases the likelihood of one losing their side-bets. Once this occurs, one begins to compute the potential losses he will incur if he changes his employment in the

organization. Situations may also transpire where a person's involvement in an organization make side-bets for him. And, as a result, one's future actions are limited. Becker (1960) provided several examples of how this can occur. They are as follows: 1) generalized cultural expectations; 2) impersonal bureaucratic arrangements; 3) individual adjustment to social positions; 4) and face-to-face interactions. Generalized cultural expectations are those expectations within a culture that value responsibility and loyalty. An impersonal bureaucratic arrangement refers to organizational policies that serve as incentives for retaining employment. For example, if one left his current position in an organization he is likely to lose his established pension fund. The individual's adjustment to social positions explains an organizational member altering his actions so much to retain his current job that he renders himself unemployable for higher, more lucrative positions with additional responsibilities. In other words, he changes his actions and habits so much that he cannot "climb the ladder" of employment success. Finally, face-to-face interactions refers to individuals altering their image of themselves so much to other organizational members that they may or may not be able to live up to the image they have created.

From side-bet theory to psychological attachment. Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) conducted a study examining constructs related to turnover, job satisfaction, and measures of attitudinal changes over time as they affected job turnover. They found that employee attitude is predictive of turnover behavior. Not surprisingly, individuals with less favorable attitudes ultimately leave the organization. Also, they found that general attitudes towards the organization are more important than specific attitudes towards one's job. WeiBo et al. (2010) stated that this was a shift from side-bet theory to a theory of psychological attachment to the organization. According to Porter et al. (1974), attitudes held by individual's working in

an organization were predictive of turnover behavior. Not surprisingly, individuals who left the organization had less favorable attitudes than those that stayed. Finally, the authors state general attitudes towards the organization could be more related to turnover than individual attitudes toward their particular job. In essence, the attachment theory maintains retention of employees' is not simply based on economic factors as Becker (1960) had maintained. As an alternative, affective influence and attitudes of workers potentially played a larger role in employee retention (WeiBo et al., 2010).

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Subsequent studies expanded this rationale. One of the more prominent was by Mowday et al. (1979). The authors developed and validated an instrument called the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). This measure was intended to relate organizational commitment to work organizations. According to Mowday et al. (1979), organizational commitment was characterized by three factors: "... (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; (3) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership" (p. 226). Commitment was moderately related to job satisfaction. The percentage of common variance shared by commitment and job satisfaction rarely exceeded 25%, though. Also, organizational commitment was related to job performance. Finally, a significant relationship between organizational commitment and absenteeism was found.

Theoretical shift to a Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment theory continued to evolve. Meyer and Allen (1984) argued previous efforts evaluating the side-bet theory were inappropriate. Side-bet theory as it pertains to commitment was re-labeled continuance commitment. The definition developed for continuance commitment is that it is commitment to continue a certain line of action. Porter et

al. (1974) had previously conceptualized commitment as an affective orientation to an organization. Meyer and Allen (1984) tested correlations among continuance and affective commitment using five scales. They are as follows: 1) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); 2) Ritzer-Trice Scale (R-TS); 3) Hrebiniak-Alutto Scale (H-AS); 4) Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS); and 5) Affective Commitment Scale (ACS). The R-TS and H-AS were commonly used to test the strength of Becker's side-bet theory. The CCS and ACS were developed by the authors. Results indicated the OCQ, R-TS, and H-AS correlated significantly with each other and with the ACS ($p < .01$). Interestingly, the CCS and ACS did not correlate significantly. Instead, they found the R-TS, H-AS and OCQ measured affective commitment while excluding continuance commitment. As a result, continuance and affective commitment were conceptualized as being independent from one another. Finally, Meyer and Allen (1984) argued Becker's side-bet theory measured affective commitment more than continuance commitment. They suggested an improvement for measuring side-bets. Including the use of measures which directly assess individuals' perceptions regarding the number and magnitude of side-bets was suggested. In essence, the measures used for side-bet theory did not measure the theory appropriately. As a result, the continuance dimension was a better representation of Becker's side-bet theory (WeiBo et al., 2010).

Further research led to the inclusion of yet another dimension to commitment. This dimension was called normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). According to WeiBo (2010), the leading approach to studying organizational commitment for the next twenty plus years was the three-dimensional scales (affective, normative, continuance) developed by Meyer and Allen (1984, 1991; Meyer et al., 1990). Commitment was defined as a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, (b) has implications for

the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization, and (c) reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

The three-component framework argued the nature of psychological states in an organization differ (Meyer & Allen, 1991). In order to measure their new framework, Allen and Meyer (1990) developed The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. Affective commitment refers to “...the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (p. 67). Employees having strong affective commitment remain in an organization because they *want* to. Continuance commitment is “...an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization” (p. 67). Employees with high levels of continuance commitment remain because they *need* to do so. Finally, normative commitment is a “...feeling of obligation to continue employment” (p. 67). Employees with high levels of normative commitment have feelings that they *ought* to remain with the organization. In conclusion, Meyer and Allen (1991) found it necessary to consider affective, continuance, and normative commitment as components, rather than types, of commitment.

Commitment and efficacy. Although most research on organizational commitment has centered on business and corporate entities, there are a multitude of studies linking commitment with education. Many individual variables have been correlated as predictors of organizational commitment. For example, Kushman (1992) wrote personal efficacy and to a lesser extent teaching efficacy related to commitment. According to Bogler and Somech (2004), self-efficacy predicted organizational commitment and professional commitment. They also wrote that self-efficacy is a teachers’ perception of their competence and ability to act. Chan et al. (2008) also related teacher efficacy and years of teaching experience as significant predictors of teacher commitment. Teacher efficacy was defined as a teacher’s belief in their ability to produce

desired student outcomes. Finally, Ware and Kitsantas (2011) confirmed a relationship between organizational commitment and efficacy when the following scenarios occur: teachers are allowed to enlist administrative support, teachers are included in decision making, and teachers are allowed to control certain aspects of their classroom operations.

Commitment and professional growth. Professional growth has also been shown to be a predictor of organizational commitment. Professional growth occurs when one believes they work in a supportive environment encouraging professional growth and development. Basically, as teachers perceive they have more opportunities for professional growth they will be more committed to the organization (Bogler & Somech, 2004).

Commitment and organizational climate. Additional research relates organizational health and organizational climate with organizational commitment (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). The following organizational health variables were significantly related to organizational commitment: institutional integrity, resource allocation, principal influence, initiating structure, consideration, academic emphasis, and morale. Also, variables of organizational climate were related to organizational commitment. These include the following: supportive behavior of the principal, engagement, and intimacy. Similarly, Riehl and Sipple (1996) associated school climate with commitment. They found teachers who receive support from the principal, are protected from classroom intrusions, and are provided with resources tend to be more highly committed to the goals and values of the school. Firestone and Pennell (1993) stated resources are the materials and institutional means through which teachers accomplish their tasks. Collie, Shapka and Perry (2011) also correlated resource attainment with commitment. Finally, teacher collegiality, positive student behavior, and professional influence foster greater teacher commitment in their respective schools (Riehl & Sipple, 1996).

Further research correlates job satisfaction (Howell & Dorfman, 1986; Kushman, 1992; Fresko, Kfir & Nasser, 1997), teacher satisfaction (Kushman, 1992), participation in school-level decisions (Kushman, 1992), collaboration (Kushman, 1992; Firestone & Pennell, 1993), feedback (Firestone & Pennell, 1993), and teacher inclusion in decision making, controlled for SES (Kushman, 1992) with organizational commitment. Learning opportunities, which are the opportunities to learn subject content and instructional techniques to improve classroom effectiveness, is also related to commitment (Rosenholtz, 1989; Firestone & Pennell, 1993). Administrative support has been related to commitment, as well (Hoy et al., 1990, Firestone & Pennell, 1993). Moreover, Howell and Dorfman (1986) found that organizational rewards also have a strong relationship with commitment. Finally, teacher expectations of their students completing high school and college correlated with commitment. In other words, as more teachers believe their students will graduate high school and college their commitment to the school will increase.

Another study found effective principals can foster a faculty committed to their school (Sinden, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2004). Riehl and Sipple (1996) also wrote high levels of administrative support can foster greater teacher commitment. Howell and Dorfman (1986) similarly found a correlation between supportive leadership behavior and commitment. According to Sinden et al. (2004), some of the foremost responsibilities of the principal are the administration and structure of the school. Using their power to design structures that facilitate teaching and learning enables principals to help teachers. This study found there was a modest relationship between collegial leadership and organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was also related to enabling school structure. An enabling school structure fosters professional judgment, flexibility, collaboration, and problem solving. The authors suggested

that enabling structures might be unsuccessful unless the faculty is committed to the organization and the principal is collegial (Sinden et al., 2004).

Riehl and Sipple (1996) related several variables with school commitment. For example, teachers working in an orderly school had higher levels of professional commitment. Firestone and Pennell (1993) also related an orderly school to commitment. Rosenholtz (1989) found that autonomy was the best predictor of commitment. According to Riehl and Sipple (1996), classroom autonomy, which is allowing teachers some decision making in their classroom management and curriculum, was related to professional commitment. Finally, Bogler and Somech (2004) correlated a relationship between classroom autonomy and commitment.

Several variables have been negatively related to organizational commitment. Hoy et al. (1990) found that directive principal behaviors and frustration of teachers had a detrimental effect on organizational commitment. Fresko et al. (1997) found that the longer someone taught, teaching lower grade levels, and female teachers were also negatively correlated with commitment. Chan et al. (2008) negatively related perceived organizational politics with commitment. Finally, principals' belief in their influence regarding setting discipline and fiscal policies had a direct negative correlation with teacher commitment (Ware & Kitsantas, 2011).

In conclusion, many variables have been related with increased levels of organizational commitment in schools. They are as follows: personal efficacy, self-efficacy, organizational health, organizational climate, job satisfaction, administrative support, effective principals, supportive leadership behaviors of principals, collegial leadership of principals, enabling school structures, and orderly schools. The following section of this literature review will review articles that have related trust with organizational commitment.

Theoretical Framework

As stated earlier, there are very few, if any, studies relating faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment in the United States. Yet, there are several studies relating trust and organizational commitment in the international business community. There are mixed results relating trust and organizational commitment, though. Folger and Konovsky (1989) found strong correlations between employee trust in leadership and organizational commitment. Likewise, Whitener (2001) wrote employee trust in management was related to organizational commitment. There have been other studies finding no correlation between trust and organizational commitment (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). More research should be conducted relating trust and organizational commitment. There are simply not many studies available in the literature. In particular, there is a very clear literature gap relating faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment.

A study by Cook and Wall (1980) was conducted which related trust and organizational commitment. They conducted two studies of blue-collar, male workers employed in manufacturing industries located in Great Britain. The sample sizes were 390 and 270, respectively. The first study was begun in 1977 and the second study began in 1978. The authors generated the three scales used in the study. Questionnaires were administered in survey participants' homes by female interviewers from National Opinion Polls Market Research Limited of London. The scales were presented with a questionnaire packet. The three scales were reduced in length after analysis revealed items with the lowest item-whole scale correlations were dropped to keep the best scaling three or four items on each subscale. Scoring of the scales was an un-weighted sum of the responses of each item in the scale or subscale. Response scale ranges were 1-7 in trust and organizational commitment measures. Correlated t

tests of the two principal scales of trust and organizational commitment had acceptable levels of association. Study results likewise showed that all of the trust subscales substantially correlated with all of the organizational commitment subscales. The trust subscales were a) faith in intentions of peer and management, and b) confidence in actions of peers and management. The organizational commitment subscales were as follows: a) organizational identification, b) organizational involvement, and c) organizational loyalty.

Yilmaz (2008) conducted a study that attempted to define the relationship between organizational trust levels with organizational commitment. The study sample was 120 primary school teachers in Kutahya, Turkey. The two scales used for the study were an organizational trust scale developed by Yilmaz (2006) and an organizational commitment scale developed by Altunkese (2002). The organizational trust scale had 22 items and three sub-scales. The subscales were a) trust in administrators, b) trust in colleagues, and c) trust in shareholders. The reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.92. Responses on the organizational trust scale used 5-point, Likert type items with 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = always. The organizational commitment scale consisted of two sub-scales. The two sub-scales were affective commitment and continuance commitment. Twenty-five Likert type items were in the organizational commitment scale. Amount of points accrued on the survey defined the amount of organizational commitment the teacher had. For example, teachers with higher point totals had more organizational commitment than teachers with lower point totals. Survey responses used for the scale were 1 = completely disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = moderately agree, 4 = agree, and 5 = completely agree. The study found a significant relationship between teachers' organizational trust and their perceptions of organizational commitment. Also, there was a significant relationship between the level of teachers' trust in administration and the perceptions of

organizational commitment along with affective and continuance commitment. A significant relationship was also found with teachers' trust in colleagues and their perception of organizational commitment along with affective and continuance commitment. Finally, there was a significant relationship between teachers' trust in shareholders and their perception of organizational commitment along with affective and continuance commitment.

Cho and Park (2011) studied trust, satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the field of business management. They were interested in whether trust affected satisfaction and organizational commitment by mediating management practices. They used data from the 2003 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Employee Attitude Survey. Statements used to measure trust on the survey are as follows: a) I trust my immediate supervisor, b) I trust my coworkers, c) and I trust FAA management. The survey questions were based on a 5-point, Likert scale where one is the lowest score and five is the highest score. The FAA mailed 48,900 surveys to all of its employees, and 22,800 surveys were returned. Only 19,849 surveys were used because many contained missing data. Study results found a relationship between trust in management, trust in supervisors, and trust in co-workers with job satisfaction and commitment. They found that all three types of trust were all significantly and positively correlated with commitment. Yet, the effects were minimal. According to the authors, the main driver for organizational commitment was trust in management.

Demir (2011) investigated the effects of organizational justice, trust and commitment on the deviant behavior of employees. The sample for this study was drawn from 750 employees of five star hotels located in Turkey. 554 usable questionnaires were returned which is a response rate of 73.9%. Organizational trust was measured with a six-item measure with a five-point response scale. The organizational trust scale was adapted from Hubbell and Chory-Assad's

(2005) Managerial Trustworthy Behaviors scale and a study by Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.92. The organizational commitment scale was developed by translating Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model (TCM) of Organizational Commitment into the Turkish language. The TCM consists of twelve Likert-type items with 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Affective, continuous, and normative commitment are measured with this scale. Study results found that organizational trust is positively correlated with affective commitment, continuous commitment, and normative commitment. Likewise, the study suggests the importance of organizational trust to increase motivation in employees. Providing support to employees may also increase their commitment to the organization. Finally, Demir (2011) wrote that if high levels of trust exist in a workplace, employees have positive expectations regarding employer motives, employees will remain with the organization, and employees will commit to the organization.

A study by Mohamed, Kader, and Anisa (2012) studied the relationship between organizational commitment, trust, and job satisfaction in two Indian banking organizations. The survey instrument used was developed based on reviews of the extant literature. The questionnaire had two parts. Part one had questions seeking information such as age, educational qualifications, experience and income. Part two had questions seeking information about job satisfaction, organizational trust, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Most of the survey questions required participants to assign a score rating based on a five-point, Likert scale. Survey responses were garnered from a sample of 101 employees. The authors found a positive correlation between trust and normative, affective, and continuance commitment. Conclusions drawn were that organizational leaders who intend to improve productivity and sustainability should emphasize trust and organizational commitment.

Zeinabadi and Salehi (2011) examined the relationship between justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in public primary schools located in Tehran, Iran. The sample included 131 male principals and 652 teachers and 54% of the teachers were female and 46% of the teachers were male. Five questionnaires were used to measure the variables. All of the questionnaires were translated into Persian from their original English versions. The items of the scale were rated ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The first scale used was the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCBS) developed by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) which was modified to measure principal's beliefs about teacher organizational citizenship behavior. The OCBS is a 12-item scale used to measure the degree teachers engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. Organizational justice was measured using Colquitt's (2001) scale to measure data for teacher perceptions of procedural justice. The scale had four subscales that included distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. But, for this study, only the 7-item procedural justice subscale was used. The Omnibus T-Scale developed by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) was used to measure teacher trust. The subscale of faculty trust in the principal, which contained eight items, was the only scale used to measure trust for this study. Teacher job satisfaction was measured with twenty items from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) that was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Loftquist (1967). Lastly, organizational commitment was measured using nine items from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday et al. (1979). The authors found a non-significant direct effect of trust on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In other words, trust may not necessarily translate into greater organizational commitment. This finding is similar to Pillai et al. (1999) who found that trust does not necessarily translate into greater organizational commitment.

Finally, Mahan, Bishop, and Scott (2012) published a study relating trust in management, management communication with employees, employee involvement, and organizational commitment. The samples for the study were from a trucking company based in the southern United States; 484 truck drivers completed a survey while on company time. Survey items were measured using a six-point scale. Responses ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. The researchers created a survey pool of 19 items using selected items from existing scales. The newly formulated instrument was developed to measure trust in top management, top management communication, and employee involvement. Items were selected from the following scales: a) six positively worded items from the (Mowday et al., 1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, b) five items from a study by Scott (1980), and c) four items specifically designed for this study. Study results found that trust in management was significantly related to organizational commitment. Study findings suggest that as organizational attachment develops it is partly as a result of employee faith in top management.

In conclusion, there is limited research relating trust in the principal and organizational commitment. The gaps in the literature are large. Yet, trust in management and trust in supervisors has been related to commitment (Mahan et al., 2012). Also, trust was related with normative, affective, and continuance commitment (Demir, 2011; Mohamed et al., 2012). Some studies (Cook & Wall, 1980; Cho & Park, 2011) found that trust was related to organizational commitment. There was also a significant relationship found linking trust with organizational commitment in schools (Yilmaz, 2008). Despite this, there are other studies showing that trust and commitment do not have a significant relationship (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011; Pillai et al., 1999). Based on these studies, a possibility exists that trust in the principal is related to

organizational commitment. Yet, there is not enough theoretical evidence to prove this conclusively.

Rationale for Hypotheses

The review of literature argues that faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment should be related. Trust is a key component of organizational behavior (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1984). Trust is also important in developing interpersonal relationships in schools (Hoy et al., 1992). As levels of teacher trust towards school administrators increases, so does their organizational commitment levels increase (Yilmaz, 2008). This argument is based on the body of professional research on these two concepts. The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between faculty trust and levels of organizational commitment in northern Alabama elementary schools. Increased levels of faculty trust and organizational commitment have been shown to impact the functioning of schools. There are gaps in the literature relating faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. The intent of this paper is to reduce some of these gaps. The study hypothesizes there is a direct relationship between faculty trust in the principal and the dimensions of organizational commitment. Likewise, it hypothesizes while controlling for SES, faculty trust in the principal is a better predictor of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model than the commitment model of Mowday et al. (1979). It tested two hypotheses based on survey results from elementary teachers in Northwest Alabama. They are as follows:

H₁: The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment and faculty trust in the principal as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale will positively covary.

H₂: While controlling for socio-economic status (SES), faculty trust in the principal is a better

predictor of the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment than the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ).

CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section provides a description of the sample, selection methods, and the rationale for the selection. Section two explains data collection procedures as well as how and where data were collected. The third section describes the variables which comprised the study. The fourth section details the instruments used in the study and reports on their reliability and validity. The fifth section describes the statistical analysis performed to test the hypotheses. The sixth section summarizes the whole chapter.

Sample

Teachers of sixty North Alabama elementary schools (Grades K-6) comprised the study sample. This was a sample of convenience. Participation was anonymous and voluntary. Schools chosen were based on their willingness to participate. The sample spanned several school districts with a diverse assortment of schools. Socioeconomic diversity of the schools was evidenced by the percentage of free and reduced students at the schools. The percentage of free and reduced lunch students was obtained from the Alabama State Department of Education. Approximately 84% of the participating schools were Title I schools. Schools are labeled as Title I by the United States Department of Education. Schools qualify to become a Title I school if 50% or more of the student population qualify for free and reduced lunches. Teachers, as opposed to administration, were selected because their levels of trust and organizational commitment are the focus of the study. Teacher participation was completely voluntary. All reasonable attempts were made to ensure teacher anonymity.

Data Collection

The research conducted used three instruments. The Omnibus T-Scale was used to collect information on faculty trust in the principal. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) and the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey was used to test the organizational commitment within the schools of the participating teachers. The surveys were distributed in regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Survey respondents were instructed not to provide any identifying information so anonymity and confidentiality could be maintained. Participation was voluntary. The atmosphere during survey administration and collection was non-threatening. Data were collected in a cross-sectional manner as opposed to longitudinally.

Variables

The independent variable in this study was trust in the principal (x) as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale. The dependent variables in this study were organizational commitment as measured by (y_1) the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and (y_2) the Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. The analysis was controlled for socioeconomic status (SES). SES was operationalized by using free and reduced lunch data which was obtained by accessing the Alabama State Department of Education website. Free and reduced lunch data was used as a proxy of SES.

Measures

Three instruments were combined to create a survey for collecting the quantitative data for this study. Select scales from the instruments were used to create the aforementioned survey. The instruments used were as follows: a) Omnibus T-Scale (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999); b) Mowday et al.'s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ); and c) Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model (TCM) of Organizational Commitment. Permission was

granted by the instrument developers to use the instruments. See Table 1 for instruments used in this study. Scales used in this study are explained in the following paragraphs.

Table 1

Instrumentation Used for This Study

Instrumentation	All Instrument Scales	Scales Used in This Study
Omnibus T-Scale	Trust in the Principal Trust in Colleagues Trust in Clients	Trust in the Principal
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	All	All
Three Component Model of Organizational Commitment(TCM)	Affective Commitment Normative Commitment Continuance Commitment	Affective Commitment Normative Commitment Continuance Commitment

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's (1999) Omnibus T-Scale was used to measure faculty trust. It is a 26-item, Likert-type scale that measures three subscales of trust. The subscales of trust include the following: trust in the principal, trust in the faculty, and trust in the client. The client refers to the trust teachers have for parents and students, respectively. The subscale of faculty trust in the principal will be the only scale used, though. There are nine items used to measure faculty trust in the principal. Trust was defined as an individual or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open. Factor analytic studies support the validity and reliability of the faculty trust in the principal subscale. Norms for the Omnibus T-Scales are based on a sample of 97 Ohio high schools, 66 Virginia middle schools, and Ohio elementary schools. The faculty trust in principals scale had a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Trust in Principal, $\alpha = .98$). A

copy of the Omnibus T-Scale with the items listed for the faculty trust in principal subscale is found in Appendix A.

Mowday et al.'s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure teacher levels of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was defined as a belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to work hard on behalf of the organization, and a desire to maintain organizational membership. The OCQ has 15 items, which use a 7-point, Likert-type scale. The scale ranges from 7 = *strongly agree* to 1 = *strongly disagree*. Mean levels of commitment range from a low of 4.0 to a high of 6.1. The standard deviations suggested a satisfactory distribution of responses within the samples. Predictive, discriminant, and convergent validity were at acceptable levels. Alpha coefficients ranged from .82 to .93, with a median of .90. A copy of the OCQ with the items listed is found in Appendix B.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) TCM Employee Commitment Survey was also used to measure teacher levels of organizational commitment. Commitment was defined as a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization, (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organization, and (c) reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Item responses are made on a 7-point, Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. Three forms of employee commitment to the organization are measured with this instrument: affective commitment (desire based), normative commitment (obligation based), and continuance commitment (continuance based). There are three scales used in the measure: the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS), and the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS). The ACS ($\alpha = .82$), NCS ($\alpha = .83$), and CCS ($\alpha = .74$)

have been shown to have consistent reliability estimates (Cronbach's alphas). Predictive, discriminant, and convergent validity were at acceptable levels. A copy of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey with the items listed for each subscale is found in Appendix C.

Statistical Treatment

Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, range) were used in analyzing characteristics of the sample and respondents. Inferential statistics, in particular bivariate correlation and block regressions, were used to test hypotheses. Finally, Cronbach's alpha was run on all measures to ensure reliability.

Summary

Sixty elementary schools were surveyed to test the relationship of faculty trust to teachers' organizational commitment to the school. The school was the unit of analysis. The sample was drawn from elementary schools in Northwest Alabama. Socioeconomic status (SES) data in the form of statistics for free and reduced lunch were collected to control the relationship of the variables. Free and reduced lunch data was used as a proxy of SES. The independent variable in this study was faculty trust in the principal (x) as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale. The dependent variables were organizational commitment as measured by (y_1) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and (y_2) Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey. The variables were measured using the Omnibus T-Scale, Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and the Three Component Model Employment Commitment Survey. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the sample. Inferential statistics tested the hypotheses of the study.

CHAPTER IV:

RESULTS

This chapter reports the findings relating faculty trust in the principal, the TCM Employee Commitment Measure, and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The chapter includes the following: descriptives, reliabilities, correlations, hypotheses tested, and un-hypothesized findings. Free and reduced lunch data were used as a proxy for SES.

Descriptive Statistics

Seventy-seven elementary schools in Northwest Alabama were solicited for participation in this study. Sixty elementary schools agreed to participate in the study, which consisted of a 78% participation rate. A total of 1,665 teachers completed surveys. Of Alabama's 1,619 schools, 60.8% of them are labeled Title I. This means approximately 40% of Alabama's school population qualifies for free and reduced lunches. Data used in this study revealed there were 744,621 students in Alabama at the time that this study was conducted. The state free and reduced lunch mean was 57.4%. The research sample free and reduced mean for this study was 57%. Fifteen surveys were the minimum requirement to count schools in the sample. Survey instruments were administered during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Surveys were completed on a strictly voluntary basis. All reasonable measures to ensure anonymity were taken. Schools were the unit of analysis for this study. All participating schools were assigned a seven digit identifying code, which was used for comparative analysis. Table 2 details the descriptive characteristics of the measures used. These include the range, mean, and standard deviation for all variables used in the study. These variables include the following: Faculty trust in the principal as measured by the Omnibus T-Scale, OCQ, TCM, and SES.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of the Measures

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Trust in Principal	60	3.98	5.95	5.13	.49
OCQ	60	4.86	6.65	5.75	.41
TCM	60	4.33	5.80	5.14	.32
SES	60	.10	.92	.43	.18

Reliability

The three surveys used in this study were the Omnibus T-Scale, the OCQ, and the TCM. Faculty Trust is measured by the Omnibus T-Scale. The instrument contains 26 items and measures three subscales of trust. The subscales are trust in the principal, trust in the faculty, and trust in the client. The subscale of faculty trust in the principal was the only scale used. There are nine items used to measure faculty trust in the principal. Sample items from the faculty trust in the principal sub-scale follow: a) Teachers in this school trust the principal, b) The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal, and c) The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of the teachers. Responses are elicited on a 6-point, Likert scale, ranging from 6 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree. Mowday et al.'s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure teacher levels of organizational commitment. Following are sample items from this scale: a) I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful, b) I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for, c) I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar. The OCQ has 15 items that use a 7-point, Likert-type scale. The scale ranges from 7 = *strongly agree* to 1 = *strongly disagree*. The Three-Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey is an 18-item scale, which measures

affective, continuance, and normative commitment subscales (Meyer & Allen, 1991). It was also used to measure teacher levels of organizational commitment. The affective subscale consisted of six items (e.g., I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization). The continuance subscale also consisted of six items (e.g., Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire). Lastly, the normative subscale consisted of six items (e.g., I would feel guilty if I left my organization now). Item responses were made on a 7-point, Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated for faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM to test for internal reliability. Trust in the principal had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .95, the OCQ had a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .91, and the TCM had a Cronbach alpha of .80. Table 3 reveals the Cronbach's alphas for the variables as well as the number of items measured in the respective instruments (Omnibus T-Scale, OCQ, and TCM).

Table 3

Cronbach's Alpha for Study Variables

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Questions	Instrument Used
Trust in Principal	.95	8	Omnibus T-Scale
OCQ	.91	15	OCQ
TCM	.80	18	TCM

Correlations

Table 4 shows correlations among the three variables examined in this study. A significant, positive correlation at the .01 level was found for several variables. As predicted, correlations were found between trust in the principal and the OCQ ($r = .45^{**}, p < .01$) and between trust in the principal and the TCM ($r = .43^{**}, p < .01$). In other words, as levels of

faculty trust in the principal increases, the amount of organizational commitment in the school also increases. Likewise, there was a correlation between the OCQ and the TCM ($r = .34^{**}, p < .01$). Two negative, non-significant correlations were found. Trust in the principal and the TCM were negatively correlated to SES ($r = -.13, p > .05$).

Table 4

Correlations (Pearson) Among Study Variables

Variable	Trust in Principal	OCQ	TCM	SES
Trust in Principal	1	.451**	.432**	-.13
OCQ		1	.335**	.04
TCM			1	-.01
SES				1

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

Note. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), Three-Component Model of Employee Commitment (TCM), Socio-Economic Status (SES)

Test of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis, which states that faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM will positively covary, was moderately supported. Table 3 reveals a moderate and significant relationship between trust in the principal and the OCQ ($r = .45^{**}, p < .01$). Also, trust in the principal and the TCM had a moderate and significant relationship ($r = .43^{**}, p < .01$). Finally, the OCQ and TCM had a moderate, significant relationship ($r = .34^{**}, p < .01$). SES did not have a significant relationship with any of the other variables.

The second hypothesis states that while controlling for SES, faculty trust in the principal is a better predictor of the Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment than the OCQ. This hypothesis was not supported. Two block entry regression analyses were performed to determine the effect of trust in the principal on OCQ and TCM.

The first block entry regression analysis was performed with faculty trust in the principal entered as the independent variable while controlling for SES. SES was entered in Step 1 and trust in the principal was entered in Step 2. The OCQ was entered as the dependent variable. SES did not make a significant contribution on the explanation of OCQ ($\beta = .104, p = .385$). Trust in the principal had a positive effect on the OCQ ($\beta = .465, p < .001$). Faculty trust in the principal, while controlling for SES, explained 19% of the variance in the OCQ (adjusted $R^2 = .186, p < .01$). Table 5 includes beta weights (standardized regression coefficients), β (unstandardized regression coefficients), standard error, t , and significance.

Table 5

Regression Coefficients Examining the OCQ on Faculty Trust in the Principal

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	5.714	.141		40.515	.000
SES	.097	.302	.042	.322	.749
<i>R = .042, R² = .002, Adj R² = -.015.</i>					
Step 2					
(constant)	3.679	.534		6.889	.000
SES	.239	.273	.104	.875	.385
Trust in Principal	.385	.098	.465	3.923	.000
<i>R = .463, R² = .214, Adj R² = .186.</i>					

Note. Significant at $p < .001$

The second analysis was concerned with the prediction of faculty trust in the principal on the TCM. A block entry regression analysis was performed with faculty trust in the principal as the independent variable while controlling for SES. The TCM was entered as the dependent variable. SES was entered in Step 1 and trust in the principal was entered in Step 2. SES did not make a significant contribution to the explanation of TCM ($\beta = .046, p = .705$). Trust in the principal had a positive effect on the TCM ($\beta = .438, p < .01$). Faculty trust in the principal,

while controlling for SES, explained 16% of the variance in the TCM (adjusted $R^2 = .16$, $p < .01$).

Table 6 includes beta weights (standardized regression coefficients), β (unstandardized regression coefficients), standard error, t , and significance.

Table 6

Regression Coefficients Examining the TCM on Faculty Trust in the Principal

Predictor Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.
Step 1					
(constant)	5.149	.111		46.241	.000
SES	-.022	.238	-.012	-.093	.927
$R = .012$, $R^2 = .000$, Adj $R^2 = -.017$.					
Step 2					
(constant)	3.636	.428		8.495	.000
SES	.083	.219	.046	.380	.705
Trust in Principal	.286	.079	.438	3.640	.001
$R = .434$, $R^2 = .189$, Adj $R^2 = .160$.					

Note. Significant at $p < .01$

Conclusion

In this chapter, a statistical test of the relationship between faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM was conducted. Correlation and regression data were used to examine the relationships. The correlation data indicated there was a relationship between faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM. A negative, non-significant correlation was found between trust in the principal and SES as well as between the TCM and SES.

The second hypothesis stated trust in the principal would be a better predictor of TCM than of the OCQ, while controlling for SES. Two block entry regression analyses were conducted to determine if faculty trust in the principal, while controlled for SES, was a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ. However, the analysis showed trust in the principal explained 19% ($\beta = .39$, $p < .01$) of the variance in OCQ while explaining only 16% ($\beta = .29$, $p <$

.01) of the variance in TCM. Thus, it would appear trust in the principal is a better predictor of OCQ than TCM.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V will discuss the results of the current study. The first section of this chapter will provide an introduction of the study along with the theoretical problems addressed by the study. The second section of this chapter will provide a summary of the findings. The third section will contain the theoretical implications of the study. Practical implications will be addressed in the fourth section of this chapter. Recommendations for future research, limitations of the study and a conclusion will comprise the final three sections of this chapter.

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, it attempted to examine the relationship between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment towards elementary schools in Northwest Alabama. Also, this study attempted to determine if faculty trust in the principal was a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ while controlling for SES. The literature review indicated there was potential for a relationship between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment. The data supported this correlation.

Summary of Findings

1. Trust in the principal and the OCQ are positively correlated.
2. Trust in the principal and the TCM are positively correlated.
3. The OCQ and the TCM are positively correlated.
4. SES did not have a positive correlation with trust in the principal, the OCQ, or the TCM.
5. Faculty trust in the principal is not a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ while controlling for SES.

Theoretical Implications

Faculty Trust in the Principal, the OCQ, and the TCM

The literature review in Chapter II indicated that there would be a positive relationship between trust in the principal and organizational commitment (Yilmaz, 2008). This correlation was postulated by Hypothesis 1. A moderate, positive correlation was confirmed between faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ and the TCM. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) wrote that trustworthy people are benevolent, reliable, competent, honest and open. Principals with high levels of trust tend to exhibit these personality traits on a consistent basis. Trust in the principal has been correlated with improving school effectiveness, higher levels of collaboration, school mindfulness, authentic principal behaviors, teacher efficacy, organizational citizenship behaviors, improving school climate, organizational justice, collegial leadership, and enabling bureaucracy (Hoy et al., 1992; Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Hoy et al., 2006; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Hoy et al., 2003; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Allen and Meyer (1990) wrote organizational commitment is when employees want to, need to, or ought to remain with an organization. Organizational commitment as it pertains to schools has been correlated with personal and teaching efficacy, collaboration, organizational health and climate, teacher collegiality, effective principals and enabling school structures (Kushman, 1992; Bogler & Somech, 2004; Hoy et al., 1990; Riehl & Sipple, 1996; Sinden et al., 2004). Given that a positive correlation exists between faculty trust in the principal, the OCQ and the TCM, when faculty trust in the principal is high, teachers' organizational commitment to the school should also be high. This indicates trusted principals lead schools in which teachers

have higher belief in the schools' goals and values, the teachers will work harder for the school, and teachers have a strong desire to remain employed at their respective school.

Faculty Trust as a Predictor of the TCM rather than the OCQ, controlled for SES

The second hypothesis stated that faculty trust in the principal would be a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ, while controlling for SES. This hypothesis was not supported. The literature review in Chapter 2 did not fully support the second hypothesis. A similar study was simply not found in the literature. Instead, the second hypothesis was postulated because the TCM provides a more thorough explanation of organizational commitment theory than does the OCQ. Due to this, faculty trust in the principal was expected to be a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ, while controlling for SES.

Previous commitment research had been multi-faceted. The side-bet theory, later relabeled continuance commitment by Meyer and Allen (1984), had been espoused by Becker (1960). Commitment research evolved from the side-bet theory towards a psychological attachment to an organization (Porter et al., 1974). This psychological attachment was eventually renamed the affective theory. As a result of this research, Mowday et al. (1979) expanded this rationale and developed the OCQ. Allen and Meyer later added another commitment component, which they named normative commitment. Likewise, they developed the TCM of organizational commitment, which measured affective, continuance, and normative commitment (1990). Meyer and Allen (1991) later wrote that affective, continuance, and normative commitment were components of commitment rather than types of commitment. Since the OCQ only measured affective and continuance commitment, it was theorized that faculty trust would be a better predictor of the TCM because the TCM measured affective, continuance, and normative commitment. However, this was not the case.

Practical Implications

Faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment have been shown to correlate. As faculty trust in the principal increases, commitment to the school should also increase (Yilmaz, 2008). Principals should thus foster a more trusting environment. Behaving in a trustworthy manner should increase school stakeholders' commitment to their school. Principals who are benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open have been shown to have a positive impact on overall school effectiveness (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Since effective schools could potentially foster higher student achievement, it is almost imperative principals should develop more trustworthy behaviors so organizational commitment can increase.

Principals should strive to be more trustworthy. Trusted principals tend to have more collaborative schools. They encourage different instructional strategies and innovative ideas. Growth, not stagnation, should be the hallmark of a trusted principals' leadership practice. They actually desire input from stakeholders (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Trusted principals are perceived as being authentic. They are accountable for their own actions and are open enough to admit when they make mistakes. Principals who exhibit trusting behaviors also should involve teachers in decision making. This process, called teacher empowerment, has been linked to student achievement (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000).

Trusted principals also foster organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and organizational health (Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Tarter & Hoy, 1998). In other words, trusted principals actually have employees that do more than their job description requires (without complaint), they manage what are perceived as fair schools, and have the ability to deal with daily problems while maintaining focus on major educational objectives. In

essence, trusted principals exhibit supportive behaviors that do not hinder their teachers and students. They simply lead in a caring, firm, non-directive manner which has a multitude of benefits to their respective schools.

An increase in the organizational commitment should likewise improve schools. Teachers that want to be a part of a school tend to work harder, are willing to stay longer, and feel a desire to remain a part of the school. Supportive principals that include teachers in decision making have been correlated with higher levels of organizational commitment (Ware & Kitsantas, 2011). Likewise, other studies have correlated supportive principal behaviors with organizational commitment (Hoy et al., 1990; Riehl & Sipple, 1996). Teachers want and need the support of their principal. Principals that do not support the social, professional, and emotional needs of teachers tend to quickly alienate the teachers. Teacher job satisfaction will decrease if their commitment to the school is low. Thus, schools with effective principals have high levels of organizational commitment (Sinden et al., 2004).

Principals should have an open-door policy with their faculties. No problem should be so trivial that it isn't addressed. Open, frank communication should not only be allowed, it should be encouraged (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Likewise, teacher collaboration between and among the faculty should be encouraged. This can include the following: grade and/or subject level meetings, after-hours social events, participation in extracurricular activities, etc. Team building should be an important part of every principal's agenda. Fair, trustworthy leadership practices should encourage more committed behaviors among the faculty. The results of this study support this. As stated earlier, increasing trust in the principal should likely improve teacher commitment to the school. And, hopefully, this will improve the overall function of the school.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study is the first known study that attempted to explore the relationship between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment in elementary schools located in the United States. The gaps in the theory behind this study are quite large. This study should be replicated because of the lack of other research on these variables. Also, this study could be conducted in middle and/or high schools in order to discover if these results can be transferred to other levels of schooling. Likewise, the second hypothesis should also be examined in other studies to determine if the TCM is actually a more complete model of organizational commitment than the OCQ.

This study also dealt with a high proportion of students with low SES. Replication of this study in areas that are more affluent could potentially alter the results. In other words, would organizational commitment and faculty trust in the principal have higher correlations in schools with higher SES? Do schools with higher SES have higher levels of organizational commitment? Also, do schools with higher levels of SES have greater trust in their principals? Finally, would faculty trust in the principal be a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ in school districts and/or states with higher SES?

Limitations of the Study

As stated earlier, there were no known studies, which measured faculty trust as a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ. The theoretical framework was based on a comprehensive review of organizational commitment theory (Becker, 1960; Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1979; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). The aforementioned review led this researcher to hypothesize faculty trust in the principal would be a better predictor of the TCM than the OCQ. Simply put, the TCM has more theoretical components than does the OCQ.

Based on this, there was an assumption that the TCM would provide a more comprehensive theoretical model than did the OCQ. This assumption was proven false.

Secondly, trust and commitment scholarship has focused mostly on the business world. For example, trust was related to commitment in several studies (Cook & Wall, 1980; Fogler & Konovsky, 1989; Mahan et al., 2012). Trust and commitment were also found to have no significant correlation in other studies (Pillai et al., 1999; Zeinabadi & Salichi, 2011). Only two studies were found relating trust and commitment in schools. One study correlating trust and commitment in schools was held in Kutahya, Turkey (Yilmaz, 2008). Another study was conducted in primary schools located in Tehran, Iran. No significant correlation between trust and commitment was found in these primary schools (Zeinabadi & Salehi, 2011). Thus, there are few, if any, studies relating trust and organizational commitment in elementary schools in the United States.

The unit of analysis in this study was schools. In particular, the research sample was composed of elementary schools. Further study examining these variables in high schools would be of interest. Elementary schools are different than high schools. Elementary schools tend to exhibit more staff collaboration. Elementary teachers also experience more supportive leadership styles. Conversely, high school teachers generally have higher levels of teacher control over decision making (Miller & Rowan, 2003). Classroom autonomy and including teachers in decision making potentially could have altered this study. There exists a possibility that study results may have been different had this study been conducted in a high school setting.

Thirdly, SES was controlled in the analysis of the three variables. Several school related variables have been shown to positively influence student achievement despite low SES of the students. These include the following: teacher trust in clients, academic press, academic

optimism, and teacher efficacy, (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy et al., 1990; Smith & Sweetland, 2003; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The overall SES of the study population was quite low. Fifty-seven percent of the sample mean for this study qualified for free and reduced lunch. As Table 1 shows, the mean SES for the population was .43 with a minimum SES of .10 and a maximum SES of .92. The standard deviation for SES was .18. In other words, 68% of the study population had an SES between .25 and .61. This study found no correlations between SES trust in the principal, the OCQ, and the TCM. Faculty trust has shown a positive influence on achievement when controlled for SES (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Is there a reasonable explanation regarding how low SES contributed to study results? The possibility may exist. Further research would need to be conducted using these variables. The current study found no such relationship.

Finally, the sample size of this study is small ($N=60$) and the descriptive data was averaged at the school level. This is referred to as restriction of range. If a research sample has a restricted range of scores the correlation will be reduced. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), N should ideally be $104 + (k)$ when testing individual predictors (k is the number of independent variables). Since faculty trust in the principal was the only predictor variable in this study, the minimum sample size should have been 104.

Conclusion

Research contained in this study correlated a moderate, significant link between faculty trust in the principal and organizational commitment to schools. Hypothesis 1 was confirmed. Hypothesis 2 was not supported. SES did not have a significant effect on any of the three variables. Study results can be used by practicing district and school level administrators as a guide to increase faculty trust in the principal as well as commitment to schools.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Altunkese, T.N. (2002). *Study of relationship between psychological climate, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in a public organization*. (Masters of Science Thesis). Osmangazi University, Turkey.
- Angelle, P. S., Nixon, T. J., Norton, E. M., & Niles, C. A. (November, 2011). Increasing organizational effectiveness: An examination of teacher leadership, collective efficacy, and trust in schools. Paper presented at *University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA Convention '11)*.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 75-78.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
- Blumberg, A., Greenfield, W. D., & Nason, D. (1978). The substance of trust between teachers and principals. *NAASP Bulletin*, 62(9), 76-88.
- Bogler, R. & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 277-289.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Chan, W., Lau, S., Nie, Y., Lim, S., & Hogan, D. (2008). Organizational and personal predictors of teacher commitment: The mediating role of teacher efficacy and identification with school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), 597-630.
- Cho, Y. J., & Park, H. (2011). Exploring the relationships among trust, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Public Management Review*, 13(4), 551-573.
- Collie, R. J., Shapka, J. D., & Perry, N. E. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment: The impact of school climate and social-emotional learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(10), 1034 – 1048).
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measure of trust, organizational commitment and

- personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52.
- Demir, Mahmut. (2011). Effects of organizational justice, trust and commitment on employees' deviant behavior. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 22(2), 204-221.
- DiPaola, M.F., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447.
- Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(4), 265 – 279.
- Firestone, W. A., & Pennell, J. R. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(4), 489-525.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice to reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Fresko, B., Kfir, D., & Nasser, F. (1997). Predicting teacher commitment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13(4), 429-438.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M.H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 59-74.
- Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multi-level examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in urban elementary schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 102, 3-17.
- Hall, J. W. (1972). *Organizations: Structure and process*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hall, D.T., Schneider, B., and Nygren, H.T. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 176-190.
- Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., Bliss, I., & Hoy, W. K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4, 484-501.
- Houtte, M. V. (2006). Tracking and teacher satisfaction: Role of study culture and trust. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 247-254.
- Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (1986). Leadership and substitutes for leadership among professional and nonprofessional workers. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 22, 29-46.

- Hoy, W. K., Gage, C. G., III., & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School mindfulness and faculty trust: Necessary conditions for each other? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(2), 236-255.
- Hoy, W. K., & Henderson, J. E. (1983). Pupil authenticity, school climate, and pupil-control orientation. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 123-30.
- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faulty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 5, 1-10.
- Hoy, W. K. & Kupersmith, W. J. (1984). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. *Planning and Change*, 15, 81-88.
- Hoy, W. K., Sabo, D., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: A view from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Education Quarterly*, 21-39.
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., Sweetland, S. R. (2003). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49.
- Hoy, W. K. & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Designing better schools. The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 296-321.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2000). School bureaucracies that work: Enabling, not coercive. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, 525-541.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 250-259.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J.R. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25, 260-279.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26(1), 38-45.
- Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-scale. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 184-208.
- Hubbell, A.P., & Chory-Assad, R.M. (2005). Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies*, 56, 47-70.

- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4), 499-517.
- 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.
- Maele, D. M., & Houtte, M. V. (2009). Faculty trust and organizational school characteristics: An exploration across secondary schools in Flanders. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(4), 556-589.
- Mahajan, A., Bishop, J. W., & Scott, D. (2012). Does trust in top management mediate top management communication, employee involvement and organizational commitment relationships? *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 24(2), 173-190.
- Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710-720.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the “side-bet theory” of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, J. P., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: *Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Miller, R. J. & Rowan, B. (2003). Sources and consequences of organic management in elementary and secondary schools. In W. Hoy & C. Miskel. (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 51-89). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Miskel, C., Fevurly, R., & Stewart, J. (1979). Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5, 97-118.
- Mohamed, M. S., Kader, M. A., & Anisa, H. (2012). Relationship among organizational commitment, trust, and job satisfaction: An empirical study in banking industry. *Research Journal of Management Sciences*, 1(2), 1-7.
- Motts, P.E. (1972). *The 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(2), 224-247.

- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25, 87-933.
- 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(5), 603-609.
- Riehl, C., & Sipple, J. W. (1996). Making the most of time and talent: Secondary school organizational climates, teaching task environments, and teacher commitment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33, 873-901.
- Rizzo, J.R., House, R.J., & Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150-163.
- Rosenholtz, S. J (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 89(4), 420-439.
- Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35(4), 651-655.
- Scott, K. D. (1980). Trust differences between men and women in superior and subordinate relationships. *Group & Organizational Studies*, 8(3), 319-336.
- Sinden, J., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2004). Enabling school structures: Principal leadership and organizational commitment of teachers. *Journal of Educational Research*, 14(3), 195-209.
- Smith, P., Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 135-151.
- 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(5), 703-729.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(3), 294-308.
- Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, W. K. (1988). The context of trust: Teachers and the principal. *High School Journal*, 72, 17-24.

- Tarter, C. J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W.K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust and effectiveness: a path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 41-49.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004, November). *What's trust got to do with it? The role of faculty and principal trust in fostering student achievement*. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration, Kansas City, MO.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). Fostering organizational citizenship in schools. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 157-159). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 334-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 547-593.
- Uline, C. L., Miller, D. M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimensions. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 462-483.
- Ware, H. W., & Kitsantas, A. (2011). Predicting teacher commitment using principal and teacher efficacy variables: An HLM approach. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 104, 183-193.
- WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Jun, Wei. (2010). New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), 12-20.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Whitener, E. M. (2001). Do 'high commitment' human resource practices affect employee commitment? A cross-level analysis using hierarchical linear modeling. *Journal of Management*, 27(5), 515-535.
- Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, M.A., & Werner, J.M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 513-530.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
- Yilmaz, K. (2006). Validity and reliability of the trust scale. *Sakarya University Journal of Education Faculty*, 11, 69-80.

- Yilmaz, K. (2008). The relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 8(12), 2293-2299.
- Zeinabadi, H., & Salehi, K. (2011). Role of procedural justice, trust, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers: Proposing a modified social exchange model. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1472-1481.
- Zelinski, A.E., & Hoy, W.K. (1983). Isolation and alienation in elementary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19(2), 27-45.

APPENDIX A

Omnibus T-Scale

Directions: Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your school from **strongly disagree** to **strongly agree**. Your answers are confidential.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Teachers in this school trust the principal.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2. Teachers in this school trust each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
3. Teachers in this school trust their students.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
4. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
5. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
6. Teachers in this school trust the parents.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
7. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
8. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
9. The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
10. Students in this school care about each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
11. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
12. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
13. Teachers in this school do their jobs well.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
14. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
15. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
16. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
17. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
18. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
19. The teachers in this school are open with each other.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
20. Teachers can count on parental support.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
21. When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
22. Teachers here believe students are competent learners.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
23. The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
24. Teachers think that most of the parents do a good job.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
25. Teachers can believe what parents tell them.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
26. Students here are secretive.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

(Copyright© Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2003)

APPENDIX B
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979)

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization. (R)
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.
7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar. (R)
8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization. (R)
10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely. (R)
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees. (R)
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.
14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part. (R)

Note: Responses to each item are measured on a 7-point scale with scale point anchors labelled: (1) strongly disagree: (2) moderately disagree: (3) slightly disagree: (4) neither disagree nor agree: (5) slightly agree: (6) moderately agree: (7) strongly agree. An "R" denotes a negatively phrased and reverse scored item.

APPENDIX C
THREE-COMPONENT MODEL OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE

Revised Version (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993)

Affective Commitment Scale

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. (R)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (R)
5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (R)
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment Scale

1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.
6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

Normative Commitment Scale

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
4. This organization deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to my organization.

Note. (R) indicates a reverse-keyed item. Scores on these items should be reflected (i.e., 1 = 7, 2 = 6, 3 = 5, 4 = 4, 5 = 3, 6 = 2, 7 = 1) before computing scale scores.

APPENDIX D

March 20, 2014

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

Jon Bret Smith
ELPTS
College of Education
The University of Alabama



Re: IRB # EX-14-CM-040 "An Investigation of School Characteristics in Northwest Alabama"

Dear Mr. Smith:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your protocol has been given exempt approval according to 45 CFR part 46.101(b)(2) as outlined below:

- (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
(ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your application will expire on March 19, 2015. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing Review and Closure.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

Carlynn L. Myers, M.S., CCRP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

APPENDIX E

INVITATION SCRIPT FOR PRINCIPALS

Principal Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 3-20-14
Expiration date: 3-19-15

APPENDIX F

INVITATION SCRIPT FOR TEACHERS

Teacher Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of school culture in Northwest Alabama. This study will be conducted by Jon Bret Smith or another member of the research team investigating these school characteristics. All of these researchers are doctoral students at the University of Alabama and this research is a part of his/her dissertation.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete a questionnaire about the effects of school culture.

Participation in this study will involve approximately 15 minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research. Although you will receive no direct benefits, this research may help the investigator to understand effects of positive school culture in Northwest Alabama.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained. You will not be asked to record any identifying information on the survey forms. Surveys will be collected by the researcher or one of his colleagues at a staff meeting in the absence of the principal. Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate simply by not completing the survey. If there is anything about this study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, or if you have questions or wish to report a research related problem, you may contact Jon Bret Smith at 256-905-2420 or jbsmith@lawrenceal.org or at East Lawrence Middle School, 99 County Road 370, Trinity, AL 35673.

If you have questions about your rights as a person taking part in a research study, or if you would like to make suggestions or file complaints and concerns, you may call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University at (205)-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. You may email us at participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

Agreement to Participate

By completing the survey you are consenting to participate in this research study.

This is your copy of the consent document to keep for your own personal records.

UA IRB Approved Document
Approval date: 3-20-14
Expiration date: 3-19-15