

ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE AND ENABLING SCHOOL STRUCTURE
AS PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL
CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

by

JEREMY BRANDON TURNER

ROXANNE MITCHELL, COMMITTEE CHAIR
C. JOHN TARTER, COMMITTEE CO-CHAIR

JULIANNE COLEMAN
JINGPING SUN
PHILIP WESTBROOK

A DISSERTATION

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

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2018

Copyright Jeremy Brandon Turner 2018
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Research suggests that teachers who exhibit organizational citizenship behaviors positively affect student achievement. Additionally, leaders can influence school climate by establishing perceptions of justice and a school structure that is enabling. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling structures in schools. Data were collected at the school level using reliable and valid surveys that individually measure citizenship behavior, perceptions of justice, and the extent that school structure is enabling. The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCB), Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), and the Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) were utilized to survey licensed teachers for their responses. Data were analyzed from 781 teachers in 58 public elementary schools and 50 public secondary schools in Alabama. Correlational analyses were conducted to determine the relationships among the variables. Findings indicated that organizational citizenship did not have a significant relationship with organizational justice or enabling school structures. However, a significant positive correlation was found between organizational justice and enabling school structures. Additionally, a regression analysis indicated neither organizational justice nor an enabling school structure predicted organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. SES was not correlated with, or a predictor of, any other variable. This study, by examining the relationships among these variables, provided new insight into the theoretical knowledge of organizational dynamics, and practically as a guide to school administrators.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Ashley. Throughout this process, she has been patient, kind, and supportive even as I have often been absent as both a husband and a father. I could not have completed this degree without her unconditional support and this is truly as much her accomplishment as mine. I am now looking forward to spending more time with my beautiful wife and family!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

God has blessed me with many people who have contributed greatly to achieving this degree.

I would like to thank each member of my committee: Drs. C. John Tarter, Roxanne Mitchell, Julianne Coleman, Jingping Sun, and Philip Westbrook. Your professionalism and insight throughout this process has been invaluable, and I will be forever grateful. Also, Dr. Daisy Arredondo-Rucinski was instrumental in my growth as a graduate student. Her guidance helped develop my capacity as a writer to complete a quality dissertation.

I was raised by wonderful parents that instilled values that continue to shape my life. I would like to thank my father, Douglas Turner, for his consistent wisdom, support, and encouragement. I regret that my mother, Verna Turner, did not live to see the completion of my graduate studies. She would be very proud. I hold on to the hope that she knows of and is able to take joy in this accomplishment.

My uncle, Larry Turner, has been a beacon of encouragement to chase my dreams throughout my life. In him, I have seen that possibilities are endless and that no goal is unattainable.

Britney Schneider has been a great encourager and colleague throughout our graduate studies. I will always be grateful for her friendship. We made it!

Most importantly, I thank my wife, Ashley, and my sons, Carter and Deacon. They mean the world to me.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background of the Study	1
Need and Purpose	3
Research Questions and Hypotheses	4
Definition of Concepts.....	5
Limitations	6
Summary.....	6
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Organizational Citizenship Behavior.....	8
Developing the Construct	8
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research	11
Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research in Schools	12
Organizational Justice.....	19
Distributive Justice.....	20
Procedural Justice	21
Interactional Justice	22

Organizational Justice in Schools	22
Enabling School Structures.....	25
Formalization and Centralization.....	29
Enabling Structures in Schools	31
Rationale and Hypotheses.....	36
Summary.....	40
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	42
Sample.....	42
Data Collection	42
Measures	43
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	43
Organizational Justice.....	44
Enabling School Structure	45
Socioeconomic Status (SES) and School Level.....	45
Research Questions and Hypotheses	46
Data Analysis.....	47
Summary.....	47
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	48
Introduction.....	48
School Configuration and Classification	49
School Information	51
Descriptive Statistics.....	52
Reliability.....	55

Hypothesis Testing.....	56
Correlational Analyses.....	56
Multiple Regression Analysis.....	58
Summary.....	60
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	61
Summary of Research.....	61
Findings.....	61
Theoretical Implications.....	62
Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Justice, and Enabling School Structure.....	64
Organizational Justice and Enabling School Structure.....	66
Implications for Practice.....	67
Recommendations for Future Research.....	69
Summary.....	71
REFERENCES.....	72
APPENDIX A: ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR SCALE.....	78
APPENDIX B: ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE.....	79
APPENDIX C: ENABLING SCHOOL STRUCTURE FORM.....	80
APPENDIX D: SCRIPT READ TO TEACHERS BEFORE SURVEY DISTRIBUTION.....	81
APPENDIX E: TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	82
APPENDIX F: IRB APPROVAL LETTER.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of School Configurations.....	51
2. Summary of School Information based on Configuration	52
3. Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for All Schools (N=108).....	53
4. Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for Elementary (N=58).....	53
5. Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for Secondary (N=50).....	53
6. Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for All Schools (N=108)	54
7. Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for Elementary (N=58)	54
8. Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for Secondary (N=50).....	54
9. Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for All Schools (N=108).....	55
10. Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for Elementary (N=58).....	55
11. Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for Secondary (N=50).....	55
12. Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for All Schools	57
13. Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for Elementary.....	57
14. Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for Secondary	57
15. Correlational Analysis with Socioeconomic Status (SES) as a Control Variable.....	58

16. Correlational Analysis with School Level as a Control Variable	58
17. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for All Schools.....	59
18. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for Elementary	59
19. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for Secondary.....	59

CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Teachers arguably play the most critical role in whether schools succeed or fail. Indeed, in compiled meta-analyses, teachers and teaching methods were significantly represented as influences relating to student achievement (Hattie, 2009). The nature of the job is quite demanding, and when done effectively, often requires a level of service that extends beyond normal routines. Organizational citizenship behavior helps describe employee behaviors that demonstrate willingness to go above minimum expectations to complete organizational tasks (Organ, 1988). Our purpose was to define and examine organizational citizenship behavior in schools as it relates to concepts predicated on leadership, specifically organizational justice and an enabling school structure. In this chapter, I will provide a background to the study, explain the purpose, define concepts, state research questions and hypotheses, and describe the limitations.

Background of the Study

DiPaola and Hoy (2005a) described organizational citizenship behaviors in schools as teachers who voluntarily go out of their way to help their students, colleagues, and others as they engage in the work of teaching and learning. Such behaviors are important to school success because of their impact on student achievement (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b). Organizational citizenship behaviors are also positively linked with multiple elements of school climate including collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), faculty trust in colleagues (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a), and academic

optimism; which is comprised of collective efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust in students and parents (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006; Wagner & DiPaola, 2011). The question then arises, what factors can facilitate an environment conducive to organizational citizenship behaviors? This study investigated whether leadership can provide the path.

Two concepts directly linked to leadership behavior and actions are organizational justice and enabling school structures. Organizational justice is a concept that is almost entirely focused on leadership qualities and behaviors. Leaders exhibit and facilitate the principles of equity, perception of fairness, participation in decision making, respectful treatment of employees, consistent leadership, egalitarianism, correction of poor decisions, decisions based on accuracy, decisions representing interests of concerned parties, and ethics (Greenberg & Lind, 2000; Leventhal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980). Organizational justice is also important to school climate and has been positively linked with faculty trust in colleagues and the principal (Hoy & Tarter, 2004), and collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, and academic press (DiPaola & Guy, 2009).

Another concept that can influence the school environment, and potentially organizational citizenship behaviors, is enabling school structure. In schools, as in most any organizational structure, a hierarchical order along with established rules and procedures are necessary. However, these bureaucratic structures need not be negative in perception and nature. In fact, organizations can be facilitated to increase worker satisfaction and positive workplace behaviors. Adler and Borys (1996) described hierarchical and formalized procedures as enabling when they include two-way communication, view problems as opportunities, seek mutual solutions, support differences, practice openness, embrace the unexpected, and correct mistakes. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) also described the differences and characteristics of school structures

that are enabling or hindering. An enabling school structure is one that helps rather than hinders, provides rules that guide problem solving, and uses hierarchy regulations to enable teachers to do their job. Conversely, hindering school structures impede progress and employ coercive rules and regulations in an effort to elicit compliance and gain conformity (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). In sum, Sweetland (2001) described the prototype for an enabling school as a hierarchical authority structure that helps along with a system of rules and regulations that guides problem solving. An enabling school structure is linked to school climate as well and has been shown to correlate with faculty trust among teachers and trust in the principal (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; 2001).

Need and Purpose

Teachers displaying organizational citizenship behaviors help student achievement (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b). Leaders are responsible for perceptions of organizational justice and for establishing a school structure that is enabling, which impacts measures of school climate (DiPaola & Guy, 2009; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; 2001). What, then, are the implications for leadership behavior on increasing organizational citizenship behaviors within schools?

The literature suggests that leadership behavior that affects structure and justice can influence organizational citizenship. In that perspective, the role of the leader is to develop a structure that enables teachers to achieve goals while simultaneously establishing a culture that is seen by teachers as just. These two forces, structural and cultural, should predict teacher behavior that is neither specified by contract nor compensated. Hence, the role of leaders in facilitating organizational justice and enabling school structures may be posited to help facilitate organizational citizenship behaviors in an effort to further provide context to the importance of

leadership behaviors and actions on school climate. This is also significant as it potentially can lend evidence that leadership behavior in schools is linked to student achievement. Additionally, I investigated the possibility that organizational justice and enabling school structures are positively correlated to provide evidence that where one construct exists, so likely will the other. Finally, I examined whether organizational justice or enabling school contribute more significantly to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions for this research study were as follows:

1. What is the relationship of organizational justice, enabling school structures, and organizational citizenship behaviors; and
2. Does organizational justice or enabling school structures contribute more significantly to organizational citizenship behaviors?

The hypotheses for this research study were as follows:

1. The greater the degree of organizational justice in schools, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers;
2. The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers;
3. The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational justice; and
4. Organizational justice makes a greater contribution to organizational citizenship behaviors than enabling school structures.

Definition of Concepts

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in schools describes teacher behaviors that voluntarily go beyond formal requirements in order to help students and colleagues succeed. Operationally, organizational citizenship behaviors is defined by the OCB Scale (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005).

Organizational Justice: Organizational justice describes employee perceptions of fairness contingent on organizational outcomes, procedures for outcome distribution, and supervisor interactions with subordinates impacting employee treatment (Greenberg, 1996). Hoy and Tarter (2004) listed ten major principles of organizational justice that include equity regarding contributions, individual perception of fairness, participation in decision making, interpersonal treatment of employees, consistent leadership behavior, egalitarian decision making, the leader's ability to correct poor decisions, leadership decisions based on accurate information, decisions representing relevant parties, and a focus on prevailing moral and ethical standards (Greenberg & Lind, 2000; Leventhal et al., 1980; Hoy & Tarter, 2004). Organizational justice is measured operationally by the Organizational Justice Scale (OJS) (Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

Enabling School Structure: An enabling school structure is constitutively defined as a school structure that helps, rather than hinders, by utilizing a hierarchy of authority and a system of rules and regulations that enhances the teaching-learning mission of the school. In facilitating such an environment, leaders help strengthen collaboration, innovation, and trust among teachers. The Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) is used to measure the construct operationally (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; 2001).

Limitations

The scope of the research focused on public schools in north and central Alabama. Due to varying demographics, the sample may not be generalizable to other states or other regions of Alabama. Socioeconomic status (SES) of students could be a limiting factor in data analysis but is listed as a control variable. However, as with most any research attempt, there are existing limitations beyond a researcher's control. The examined variables were examined using only teachers as a resource in the completion of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCBS), Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), and ESS Form. Consequently, individual bias can affect the results as personal opinions possibly alter scale responses. Also, filling out rating scales can potentially lead to consistent answers as opposed to actual ones. That is, respondents can maintain a consistent answer pattern instead of noting extremes, even when extremes are legitimate answers. Additionally, perceptions of supervisors are absent from the research, thus solely relying on teachers to self-report, especially on organizational citizenship behaviors which forces teachers to report on themselves positively or negatively. This could be particularly significant as schools are becoming increasingly scrutinized to the point of impacting perceptions of teachers. Thus, teachers may be reluctant to be completely honest, particularly if they feel their answers may reflect on the school negatively.

Summary

In the current educational climate that is increasingly defined by high stakes testing, organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers represent a significant construct due to its impact on student achievement (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b). Consequently, examining the constructs of organizational justice and enabling school structures are important by providing evidence into what leadership behaviors may also facilitate organizational citizenship behaviors.

In this chapter, the purpose and reasoning of the study were discussed. Additionally, relevant concepts were defined in relation to the research questions and hypotheses.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides the research history and literature review of organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. These concepts will then be developed into a theoretical framework that examines how they relate. Hypotheses testing the theoretical framework are included.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

The ways and manners in which employees behave can play a major part in workplace success. Organizational citizenship behaviors address this concept. While it originally was identified as a business application, this research focused on its relationship to schools. Organizational citizenship behaviors are important to the school environment because they describe behaviors that establishes the professional identity of teachers as one that consistently goes above and beyond to help students and colleagues as part of routine behaviors (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Thus, in this research, organizational citizenship behavior is defined as teacher behaviors that voluntarily go beyond formal requirements in order to help students and colleagues succeed (DiPaola et al., 2005).

Developing the Construct

Barnard (1938) began the research on what is now referenced as organizational citizenship behaviors in his work describing organizational effectiveness in the context of social relationships between workers and supervisors. Describing the Acceptance Theory of Authority, he proposed that authority is ultimately determined by subordinates in organizations based on

their actual acceptance of authority. Hence, he argued that authority is not achieved simply by titles and official directives, but instead resides more in whether employees legitimately follow the issued directives. Expanding further, Barnard (1938) described a “zone of indifference” scale measuring compliance of employees relating to an organization’s mission. Here, he explains that employees accept orders more freely and without questioning authority when organizations provide incentives that outweigh burdens. Barnard (1938) argued that recognized authority and task acceptance from employees depended heavily on employee understanding of the communicated task, belief it is consistent with the organization’s purpose, compatibility with personal interests, and the worker’s ability to mentally and physically complete the directive (Barnard, 1938).

Katz (1964) described three critical employee behaviors necessary to organizational success: dependability to task accomplishment, commitment to the company, and worker actions going beyond expected formal responsibilities. Katz and Kahn (1966) argued that it is within the informal roles of employees that organizations are truly effective. Here, extra-role behaviors that employees display beyond formal functions lead to organizations that excel at high levels.

The common thread found in early conceptions of OCB is in the importance of worker behaviors and the impact those behaviors have on organizations. Further research developed a more concrete idea of organizational citizenship behaviors. Bateman and Organ (1983) examined the relationship of citizenship behaviors, job satisfaction, and supervision. Here, research supported that job satisfaction of employees was related positively to citizenship behaviors. From this research, Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) conceptualized organizational citizenship behaviors using the dimensions of altruism and generalized compliance, which, when consistently practiced, are advantageous to organizations. Altruism among employees involves

exhibiting helping behaviors towards fellow employees and working to enhance colleagues' performance in a way that effectively contributes to group efficiency (Smith et al., 1983). Generalized compliance suggests an impersonal conscientiousness that focuses on an employee's desire to work towards completing organizational goals by going beyond typical expectations and exceeding minimum standards for success (Smith et al., 1983).

Organ (1988) also expanded on organizational citizenship behaviors to further describe pertinent attributes related to the concept. First, he emphasized that behavior must be discretionary, concentrating on personal choice as opposed to formal responsibilities. Next, employee actions based on rewards are not indicative of organizational citizenship behaviors, but instead are a result of formal reward systems that ebb and flow with organizations' ability to offer them. Last, organizational citizenship behaviors among employees demonstrate effectiveness over a period of time, instead of quick contributions to organizational effectiveness. Organ (1988) also emphasized five categories of employee behavior that help improve workplace efficiency: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. In addition to the already established definition of altruism that focuses on helping others, the remaining four categories seek to break down the individual concept of generalized compliance. Conscientiousness is characterized by an efficient use of time and going beyond minimum expectations of adherence to rules, regulations, and procedures of the organization. Next, sportsmanship notes the avoidance of complaining and whining in order to improve time spent on constructive organizational endeavors, essentially allowing for a "roll with the punches" mentality. Courtesy helps prevent problems through politeness and consideration of others by giving advance notices, reminders, and communicating appropriate information. Last, the concept of civic virtue promotes genuine deep concern and a healthy active interest in the

organization that serves organizational purposes by serving on committees, voluntarily attending functions, and defending policies and practices (Organ, 1988; Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research

Most initial research has concentrated on organizations in the business sector, revealing many concepts that relate positively to organizational citizenship behaviors. Essentially, the most significant concepts can be grouped in two large categories. The first category represents behaviors exhibited by workers, including job satisfaction, commitment, and performance. Job satisfaction is strongly correlated to organizational citizenship behaviors (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ, 1988; McNeely & Meglino, 1994; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994). Indeed, Organ (1988) found that job satisfaction is potentially more significant to organizational citizenship behaviors among employees than most any other factor. Organizational commitment, which strongly depends on the depth and strength to which employees identify and involve themselves with an organization, also correlates significantly to organizational citizenship behaviors (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Schappe, 1998). Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994) found that organizational citizenship behaviors have a significant effect on individual and group job performance, hence, contributing to the overall effectiveness of an organization. In further research, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) also listed organizational citizenship behaviors as a significant influence on productivity among coworkers and managers, which ultimately increased the availability of resources to more complex and efficient tasks. In addition to performance, organizational citizenship behaviors among employees are conducive to loyalty, as evidenced by fewer incidences of turnover, job searching, and absenteeism (Chen, Hui, & Sego, 1998).

The second category of concepts relating to OCB concentrates on leadership behaviors, which particularly involve worker perceptions of fairness. While employee behaviors and perceptions are often the primary focus, leadership behaviors are also significant relating to the extent of subordinates' organizational citizenship behaviors. Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) argued that leadership is an important influence on organizational citizenship behaviors based on the facilitation of employee self-efficacy and encouragement of commitment to supervisor. In doing so, they emphasized the significance in servant leadership for the purposes of increasing positive climates that help foster organizational citizenship behaviors among employees. There is also a strong correlation between supervisor fairness and organizational citizenship behaviors in that organizations where worker perception of fairness and trust are low have lower incidences of organizational citizenship behaviors as well (Deluga, 1994; Moore & Love, 2005; Williams, Pitre, & Zainbuba, 2002).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Research in Schools

In order to place organizational citizenship behaviors in the context of schools, DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) examined the construct as it relates to school climate. The research differed greatly from previous concepts in the number of dimensions present in organizational citizenship behaviors. Instead of five (Organ, 1988), four (Moorman & Blakely, 1995), or even the two-factor dimensions of organization and interpersonal behaviors (Skarlicki & Latham, 1995), they identified organizational citizenship behaviors as having a single dimension. Here, the number of dimensions was simplified, suggesting that behaviors helpful to the organization and the individuals within it both combined into a single construct (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). They hypothesized that *the more positive the school climate, the greater the incidents of organizational citizenship behaviors would exist*. Here, the independent

variable was school climate. Conceptually, school climate involves four dimensions: collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community pressure. First, Collegial leadership characterizes principal behavior as supportive and egalitarian. Teacher professionalism is exhibited by a commitment to students and engagement in the task of teaching while also interacting professionally with colleagues. An emphasis on excellence drives academic, or sometimes referred to as achievement, press that includes an environment concentrated on academics and setting high and achievable goals for students. Last, community pressure involves the efforts of parents and community to influence school policy and functioning (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Operationally, school climate was measured using the School Climate Index (SCI) developed by Hoy, Hannum, and Tschannen-Moran (1998). The SCI measured the four dimensions of school climate using a 24 item, 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from “rarely occurs” to “very frequently occurs”. The dependent variable is organizational citizenship behavior. In the DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran 2001 study, organizational citizenship behavior was defined using a two-dimension construct that focuses on citizenship behaviors directed toward helping individuals (OCBI) and citizenship behaviors that provide service to the organization as a whole (OCBO). The operational measure was the Organizational Citizenship Behavior in Schools Scale (OCBSS), which was a 15 item, 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from “rarely occurs to very frequently occurs” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Their unit of analysis was the school, and data were collected in two study samples. The first involved 664 teachers in 42 public schools in Virginia and Ohio that ranged from elementary to secondary and represented the socioeconomic spectrum across rural, suburban, and urban schools. The second sample encompassed 1210 teachers in 97 public schools in Ohio that represented the state in socioeconomic status (SES), urban-rural context,

and size. Results indicated that organizational citizenship was indeed related to school climate in both samples with the only non-positive relationship involving community pressure in sample two. In further analysis, this is potentially due to the typical diminished parental involvement in the high school context. Consequently, the study pointed to only one dimension of organizational citizenship behaviors in the context of public schools because ultimately, even the individual items in the measures work toward the achievement of overall school goals (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Somech and Bogler (2002) also linked organizational citizenship behaviors with teacher professionalism and organizational commitment in schools. Here, professional commitment was related positively to teacher organizational citizenship behaviors towards students. Additionally, organizational commitment was related positively to the student, the collective staff of teachers, and the school as a whole (Somech & Bogler, 2002).

DiPaola and Hoy (2005a) continued the examination of organizational citizenship behaviors in schools. Their hypothesis stated that *collegial leadership, teacher trust, and achievement press together form a linear composite that is positively related to organizational citizenship behavior of teachers*. The independent variables are continuous and involved the concepts of collegial principal leadership, faculty trust, and achievement, or academic, press. Conceptually, collegial principal leadership and achievement press were described in DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran's 2001 study. The conceptual definition for faculty trust is described as the general willingness of teachers to be vulnerable to their colleagues based on their confidence that their colleagues are benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Operationally, collegial principal leadership behavior was measured using a 7-item subscale of the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). The OCI contains 4-point, Likert items that range from "rarely occurs" to "very frequently occurs" with a

reliability coefficient of .96. Faculty trust in colleagues was measured using an 8-question subscale of the Omnibus T-Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). The T-scale has a 6-point Likert response set that ranges from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” and has a reliability of .93. Achievement press also uses the OCI. For this definition, an 8-item subscale was used with a reliability of .96. Organizational citizenship behavior is the dependent variable, which is conceptually defined as having teachers who voluntarily go out of their way to help their students, colleagues, and others as they engage in the work of teaching and learning (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Operationally, organizational citizenship behavior was measured using the organizational citizenship scale (OCS), which was a shortened version of the OCBSS developed by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001). The OCS is a 12-item, 6-point Likert-type scale where responses range from strongly disagree to strongly agree with a reliability of .93 (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). A control variable of SES was also used in the regression analysis. In this instance, the focus was on the proportion of students receiving a free and reduced lunch, with a greater population of these students indicating a lower socioeconomic status. The unit of analysis was the school and involved a diverse sample of 43 participating middle schools and approximately 1300 teachers that represented urban, suburban, and rural schools. Results supported the hypothesis that positive correlations exist between collegial leadership, faculty trust, and achievement press and the level of organizational citizenship behaviors in schools. No relationship was found between any of these factors and SES. Ultimately, the findings support that all three independent variables collectively and individually help provide an environment that enhances organizational citizenship behaviors regardless of the SES of the school (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a).

In the two previous studies, we have established that collegial leadership, faculty trust, teacher professionalism, and achievement press all work to enhance organizational citizenship behaviors in schools (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Another relevant question addresses how organizational citizenship behaviors can actually impact students and their achievement results. DiPaola and Hoy (2005b) conducted a study that addresses the impact of teacher organizational citizenship behaviors on student achievement in mathematics and reading. Specifically, they hypothesized that *faculty organizational citizenship behavior is positively associated with student achievement in both mathematics and reading*. In this instance, the independent variable is organizational citizenship behavior, conceptually defined using the definition found in the previous study (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Operationally, organizational citizenship behavior was measured using the OCBSS, a 15 Likert-item, 4-point scale with responses ranging from “rarely occurs” to “very frequently occurs” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). For this particular study, the reliability coefficient was .87. Student achievement is the dependent variable, specifically focusing on mathematics and reading. The measure involved the Ohio Department of Education’s 12th-grade proficiency test and focused on the percentage of students that passed the exams. Reliabilities for the test ranged from .91 to .92 in the five years leading up to the study. In addition to student achievement, SES information from the Ohio Department of Education was also used as a control variable to analyze along with collected organizational citizenship behaviors and achievement data. As the unit of analysis was the school, 97 high schools in Ohio were utilized representing the entire range of SES and included urban, suburban and rural schools. Results indicated two key findings. First, data supported the hypothesis that organizational citizenship behaviors are an important factor in student achievement. Second, and perhaps more important, was that the presence of teacher

organizational citizenship behaviors makes a difference beyond SES. Thus, not only do organizational citizenship behaviors contribute positively to achievement in schools, but can also be a negating factor to schools that struggle and who place those struggles squarely at the feet of SES (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b).

Wagner and DiPaola (2011) sought to bring in the concept of academic optimism as part of an influence of organizational citizenship behaviors. In this study, three hypotheses were developed; two build upon previous described research and one develops a new rationale. Here, we examine the new rationale that directly addresses organizational citizenship behaviors. This hypothesis states that *academic optimism is an independent construct that correlates positively and directly with the prevalence of OCBs in schools*. The independent variable is academic optimism. Hoy et al. (2006) define this construct as combining the elements of collective teacher efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust. Simply described, collective efficacy characterizes the shared belief among faculty members that they can influence student learning; academic emphasis is the extent that a school is driven by academic excellence; and faculty trust allows members to have confidence in students and parents to be benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open (Hoy et al., 2006). Operationally, collective teacher efficacy was measured with a 12-item, 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” with a reliability of .96 (Goddard, 2002). Academic emphasis used an 8-item, 4-point Likert-type scale originating from the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) (Hoy & Tarter, 1997) which ranges from “very frequently occurs” to “rarely occurs” with a reliability of .83. Finally, faculty trust used a subscale of the Omnibus T-scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003) which involved a 10-item, 6-point, Likert-type scale that ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” with a reliability of .93. Building on the constitutive definition established by DiPaola

and Hoy (2005a), organizational citizenship behavior was operationalized using the OCBSS (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). This survey was shortened to include 12 items along a 6-point, Likert-type scale that ranges from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” with a reliability ranging from .96 to .87. Data were collected using 1,218 surveys collected from 36 public high schools in Virginia serving grades 9-12. The sample was representative in terms of enrollment, geographic distribution, poverty, and ethnicity. In Wagner and DiPaola’s (2011) research, the findings of Hoy, et al. (2006) were supported in regards to academic optimism’s manifestation through collective teacher efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust in students and parents as well as in academic optimism’s positive correlation to student achievement. Pertaining to academic optimism and organizational citizenship behaviors, a positive correlation was supported by the findings. It also supported previous research (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a, 2005b) that organizational citizenship behaviors played a significant role neutralizing any negative effects of SES. The key here is that organizational citizenship behaviors are linked with other positive factors (i.e. the dimensions of the academic optimism construct) that directly affect student achievement (Wagner & DiPaola, 2011).

Burns and DiPaola (2013) build on factors that influence organizational citizenship behaviors in their examination of organizational justice. As part of their study, they examined three research questions that focused on the potential relationship between organizational justice, organizational citizenship behaviors, SES, and student achievement. However, we focus on the question regarding organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors. As there is no developed hypothesis, only research questions, we examine the two variables constitutively and operationally as they were measured. Organizational citizenship behavior is conceptually defined according to DiPaola and Hoy’s (2005a) earlier definition. Operationally, it is measured

using the OCBS; a 12-item, 6-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Organizational justice in the context of schools relates to teacher perceptions of fairness related to interactions with school leaders (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). The operational measure used here is the Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), which is a 10-item, 6-point, Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” with a reliability of .97 (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). The unit of analysis was the school and data was gathered using surveys from 34 Virginia high schools. Results revealed a positive correlation between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior, indicating that organizational justice enhances organizational citizenship behaviors (Burns & DiPaola, 2013). Here, research suggests that yet another factor (organizational justice) influences organizational citizenship behaviors which we also know, through previous research, impacts student achievement (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; Wagner & DiPaola, 2011).

Organizational Justice

While a relatively new construct, organizational justice has its basis in equity theory, as it concentrates on workers’ perceptions of how fairly they are treated in comparison to others and how workers compare inputs to outputs received (Adams, 1963). Greenberg (1987) detailed the construct as the study of how employees judge an organization’s behavior and their resulting attitudes and behavior in response. Thus, essentially, perceptions of justice enable employees to function more capably within an organization when their interests and well-being are valued and the individual is given his or her proper due (Bies, 2001). Consequently, it is important for organizations to achieve balance between individual worker needs and organizational goals to preserve effectiveness (Leventhal et al., 1980). To neglect such a balance can lead to poor attitudes and negative behaviors among employees (Greenberg, 1993).

At its essence, organizational justice is about worker perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Greenberg, 1996). Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp (2001) emphasized the importance of fairness perceptions of workers as meeting three critical needs. First, perceptions of fairness provide long-range outcomes for people by allowing them to predict and control the process. Next, fairness strengthens positive social relationships and interpersonal standing among significant groups. Last, fairness is important in an ethical context that ultimately strengthens a worker's moral compass (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Each of these perceptions points to a sense of workplace satisfaction that can lead to a suitable climate (Cropanzano et al., 2001; Cranshaw, Cropanzano, Bell, & Nadisic, 2013).

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice was originally defined simply as a balance of rewards and costs between individuals. Here, individuals make determinations based on whether costs yielded equal returns and whether rewards were given fairly when compared to other individuals (Homans, 1961). It is important to note that such determinations are based wholly on perception, and can thus be influenced by backgrounds and other specific factors unique to individuals. Consequently, Homans (1961) argued that organizations must take worker perceptions of distribution into account to mitigate potential negative behaviors. Adams (1965) examined distributive justice from the standpoint of equity theory, which describes transactional situations that involve how outcomes such as pay, promotion, and performance feedback are distributed and/or exchanged. Such transactions are often compared among workers and when they lack congruence, negative employee behaviors can result (Chory & Kingsley-Westerman, 2009). Here, the perception of fairness in the decision-making process is related to the consequences

and outcomes experienced as a result. Thus, if outcomes match worker input, a sense of equity is likely to occur (Greenberg, 1996).

Procedural Justice

Procedural justice examines individual perceptions of fairness involved in the process of distributing resources, particularly as it pertains to the formal procedures in the decision-making process (Leventhal et al., 1980; Greenberg, 1996). Additionally, workers are more likely to believe outcomes as just, when perceptions guiding the outcomes were fairly viewed (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Procedural justice is often facilitated through workers having a voice in the decision-making process. In doing so, trust, mutual respect, and professionalism are better established (Bies, 1987; Bies & Shapiro, 1988; Earley and Lind, 1987). Leventhal (1980) identified six rules that impact procedural fairness perceptions: consistency, accuracy, bias-suppression, correctability, representativeness, and ethicality. The element of consistency requires procedures to maintain stability in processes determining outcomes. He also argued that decision-making must be based on accurate information and free from bias. Here, the implication is that decisions are viewed fairly when they are made after careful and thorough research has been done, combined with a lack of self-interest and/or prejudice from decision-makers. Also important is that decisions must be corrected when necessary. Correctability addresses such concerns through allowing for procedures that help identify problems, and following through when information informs changes that require necessitating, hence allowing for increased voice in a representative capacity among employees. Finally, ethicality is perceived when processes align with moral and ethical values of employees, which often coincides with treatment defined by dignity and respect. This is particularly important because even basic elements of polite behavior from supervisors can represent worker perceptions of

value or exclusion when considering their organizational role and their fairness in treatment (Leventhal, 1980).

Interactional Justice

Ultimately Bies and Moag (1986) developed the concept of interactional justice to go beyond the examination of resources and the processes of distribution, and instead bring increased focus to treatment of people. Thus, interactional justice described individual concerns regarding treatment from others that encompassed formal workplace events as well as more common workplace encounters (Bies, 2001). Interpersonal justice examines the extent to which organizations or supervisors treated employees with the tenants of politeness, dignity, and respect. Consequently, when employees do not perceive actions consistent with the aforementioned tenants, they can feel disregarded in a way that indicates an environment rife with self-interest and lack of concern for others (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). In addition to interpersonal considerations, a concentration on adequately describing, and justifying, explanations is also necessary (Greenberg, 1994). Informational justice concentrates on how decision making is explained regarding distributive and procedural measures (Greenberg 1990, 1993), and can lead to better acceptance of negative outcomes among workers (Greenberg, 1990). Hence, informational justice is assisted by honesty in decision-making explanations, when delivered sincerely and adequately (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Bies & Shapiro, 1987).

Organizational Justice in Schools

Hoy and Tarter (2004) sought to examine organizational justice in the context of schools. Citing the unique environment found in schools, they linked organizational justice with faculty trust in colleagues and the principal, principal collegial leadership, and professional teacher behavior. In doing so, ten major principles of organizational justice for school leaders were

listed that include equity regarding contributions, individual perception of fairness, participation in decision making, interpersonal treatment of employees, consistent leadership behavior, egalitarian decision making, the leader's ability to correct poor decisions, leadership decisions based on accurate information, decisions representing relevant parties, and a focus on prevailing moral and ethical standards (Greenberg and Lind, 2000; Leventhal et al. 1980).

In the study, Hoy and Tarter (2004) developed a model that states three basic hypotheses in describing organizational justice and the factors that influence its development. The first hypothesis asserts that *professional teacher behavior directly influences faculty trust in colleagues*. The constitutive variable is the influence of professional teacher behavior, which is described as having the characteristics of competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgment, and respect for colleagues (Smith et al., 2001). Teacher behavior is measured using a Likert item subtest of the Organizational Climate Index (OCI). It includes seven items that measure the level of faculty engagement in the characteristics of professional teacher behavior (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). The reliability is strong, with an alpha coefficient of 0.98. The next hypothesis asserts that *principal collegial leadership influences the level of faculty trust in the principal*. Collegial leadership in principals is characterized by warm, supportive, expressive behavior combined with setting clear teacher expectations and standards of performance (Geist & Hoy, 2003; Smith et al., 2001). This concept is also measured using a seven-item Likert subtest of the OCI. This particular set of questions measures the extent to which the principal exhibits the characteristics of collegial leadership in dealing with teachers. The alpha coefficient for this subtest is 0.96. The third hypothesis asserts that *the faculty trust in colleagues and the principal that is independently generated by professional teacher behavior and principal collegial leadership, directly influences a sense of organizational justice*. Also, essentially, the

relationship between faculty trust and organizational justice is reciprocal with each concept reinforcing the other. Thus, constitutively and operationally, both faculty trust and organizational justice require defining. Faculty trust is defined by the presence of interdependence, benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. In this particular study, this type of trust is measured both in reference to colleagues and the principal. Trust in the principal was measured using a ten Likert-item subtest of the Omnibus t-scale. The alpha reliability coefficient for this subtest was 0.98. Trust in colleagues also used the Omnibus T-scale, but with a separate eight Likert-item subtest with an alpha reliability coefficient of 0.94. Organizational justice is essentially defined by the presence of equity, fairness perception, participation in decision making, respectful treatment, consistent leadership behavior, egalitarianism, correction of poor decisions, accurate decisions, representative decision making for concerned parties, and following ethical standards (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). This concept is measured using the Organizational Justice Index (OCI), which is a ten question, seven-point Likert-type scale that measures the teacher perception of the principals of organizational justice. The construct validity of organizational justice was supported by the alpha coefficient reliability of 0.97.

Data was collected from approximately 2600 surveys from 75 middle schools in Ohio that accurately represented urban, suburban, and rural school settings. The study supported the assertions of the hypotheses. It concluded that indeed, professional teacher behavior strengthens faculty trust in colleagues, principal collegial leadership strengthened faculty trust in the principal, and that these two types of trust independently influence organizational justice. It also concluded that trust and justice are strongly linked, and reinforce each other. Perhaps the greatest value lies in the strong fashion in which faculty trust in the principal is linked to

organizational justice. In essence, the evidence shows that school leaders play a critical role in faculty perception of justice and have an equally important role in fostering a culture that promotes high levels of trust. This is crucial in the sense that whereas many factors can potentially contribute to the culture and climate of schools, the educational leader is paramount to these referents perhaps above all else (Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

Strengthening this research, DiPaola and Guy (2009) noted a positive correlation between organizational justice and each school climate dimension: collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic press, and community engagement. Their analysis revealed a positive relationship between organizational justice and the faculty trust dimensions of trust in the principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in clients. Most significantly, however, is that collegial leadership and faculty trust in the principal demonstrated the strongest effects on organizational justice when compared to the other constructs (DiPaola & Guy, 2009). Additionally, Bostanci (2013) found that as school administrators were more supportive, a higher degree of perceived distributive justice and organizational support was noted from teachers. Burns and DiPaola (2013) positively linked organizational citizenship behaviors with organizational justice as well as providing evidence of both concepts impacting school achievement.

Enabling School Structures

Just as leaders play an important role in the presence of organizational justice, they are also actively involved in establishing organizational structures, which are often based in part on bureaucratic ideals. Weber (1947) described bureaucracies as organizations that achieve effectiveness by having defined levels of employment and a clear hierarchy of authority that oversees production and enforces rules and procedures. In his ideal model, employee roles are specifically defined and organized based on worker competencies held together through rules,

laws, or administrative regulations. In doing so, worker feelings and job performance were separated through the more impersonal orientations of division of labor, an established hierarchy, and specialization (Weber, 1947). Weber's assessment continues to have merit as most all organizations, including schools, contain a portion of these characteristics (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). However, Gouldner (1954) argued that Weber left out important considerations in his models of bureaucracies causing them to be overwhelmingly cold, rigid, and impersonal, particularly in regards to employee feelings and emotions. When failing to take into account employee perceptions, boredom, lack of morale, communication blocks, rigidity and goal displacement, and conflicts between achievement and seniority can manifest, and are all impacts as to the overall effectiveness of how an organization can function (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Another important consideration lacking in Weber's (1947) model is the informal organization. Though the informal organization is not defined by specific rules and procedures, it develops employee behaviors through interactions and communications among employees, and also in their relationship with supervisors. Such is the importance that informal organizational impacts can include development of shared beliefs and values, workplace cliques, and lines of communication that operate beyond the bounds of the formal organizational structure (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Hoy & Miskel, 1996). In schools, informal organizations flourish in faculty gathering places, such as lounges, workrooms, lunch tables, and everyday interactions. Consequently, the school organization can be shaped positively or negatively through the types and intents of political maneuvers, motives, and agendas that take place (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Mintzberg (1979) described organizations as having five primary components: the operating core, strategic apex, middle line, technostructure, and support staff. The operating core functions as the base, which relates to activities that produce essential services and products.

Teachers represent the operating core in schools, as they produce the teaching and learning as necessary outcomes (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). The administrative structural components are situated above the base, and in various capacities, implement standards and procedures for the work process. Here, the strategic apex is represented by the top level of administrators that are primarily focused on the task of insuring the organization's adherence to its mission.

Administrators connecting the strategic apex to the operating core are described as the middle line. The technostructure administrative component is responsible for analyzing, planning, and ultimately standardizing the work necessary to fulfill the organization's mission. Hence, in a school-based example, the strategic apex would include superintendents and his or her assistants, the middle line are the building-level principals, and the technostructure involves curriculum coordinators and other instructional supervisors. The fifth and final component is the support staff, composed of specialists that support the organization. Examples in schools would comprise personnel that research pertinent issues, provide legal counsel, support maintenance efforts, work in finance, and coordinate the child nutrition program (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Mintzberg, 1979).

While the descriptions of Mintzberg's (1979) basic organizational components are simple, they can be applied in various ways in different organizations. Hoy and Miskel (2013) described the three configurations most likely to be present in schools. A simple structure is described as being highly centralized, having a high degree of direct supervision, a small strategic apex, and an insignificant middle line. In this instance, organizations are very top-heavy and are led by autocratic or charismatic leaders, in which most all decision-making rests. Employees are often divided in that they either enjoy receiving dictated orders due to the simplicity, or feel constricted through an autocratic regime (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

A machine bureaucracy is highly-centralized, integrated, regulated, and relies on work processes and procedures to be standardized and routine. It is characterized by an extensive administrative structure, a vast middle line, and a many-faceted technostructure. Here, the technostructure has considerable influence because it is the analysts and experts within it that set the methods of standardization and formalization for which employees should follow. The machine bureaucracy is most like the Weberian model in that it creates an organizational structure predicated towards employee control and maximum efficiency (Mintzberg, 1979; Hoy & Miskel, 2013). As a result, Mintzberg (1979) notes that the atmosphere is not open, but instead is tightly controlled to maintain function and order regardless of employee issues or concerns.

Many schools operate as simple bureaucracies, which mixes characteristics of simple structures and machine bureaucracies. This often results in top-down authority that is backed by high degrees of formalization. In schools, however, neither a simple structure, a machine bureaucracy, nor any mixture of the two is optimal (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Schools are more unique and are quite different from factories or even white collar corporations. Teachers are more independent and function in classrooms that are often not instantly visible to colleagues and administrators. As such, teachers, which make up the operating core, are a critical component to school success. For schools, then, the ideal organizational structure is a professional bureaucracy (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Mintzberg, 1979). In this model, the administration provides structure, but relies on the skills and knowledge of teachers to function effectively in an autonomous fashion. This is necessary due to the complex nature of teaching. In its ideal form, schools acting as professional bureaucracies are characterized by “a skilled operating core, standardized work skills, professional norms and autonomy, professional associations, structural looseness, and a flat administrative structure” (Hoy & Miskel, 2013

p.125). Teachers in such structures are then given the necessary autonomy to do their jobs as they work in their individual classrooms. However, to be truly effective requires emphases on teamwork and collaboration, with a strong focus on shared instructional responsibility and leadership among colleagues (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Formalization and Centralization

Two important components of bureaucratic organizations are formalization and centralization. Formalization describes the extent of written rules, regulations, procedures and policies present in an organization (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Gouldner (1954) defined bureaucratic rules as mock, representative, and punishment centered. Mock rules are those that contain no direct interest from any group in the organization, and were consequently rarely enforced and often violated. Representative rules are developed, implemented, and sustained by employees and supervisors and are founded upon joint and invested support, allowing for consistent acceptance and strong enforcement. Punishment centered rules are used by employees or supervisors to enforce compliance on others through coercion, leading to negative feelings, tension and conflict. Unfortunately, it is punishment-centered rules that are more typically aligned with bureaucratic characteristics. As a result, due largely to a lack of joint support, punishment-centered rules can lead to dysfunction, conflict, and dissatisfaction throughout the organization (Gouldner, 1954; Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

Adler and Borys (1996) described bureaucratic formalization as either enabling or coercive. Enabling formalization provides employees with necessary guidance and clarified responsibilities so that tasks can be completed more efficiently, with less stress, and a stronger sense of workplace value. Thus, enabling formalization is represented through flexibility and cooperation which ultimately encourages collaboration and works to increase productivity (Adler

& Borys, 1996). Coercive formalization is characterized by forced compliance of rigid rules and procedures that punish subordinates, alienates and encourages hostility among employees, and impedes productivity. Here, the more restrictive the rules, the more hindering they are to workplace efficiency, creativity, motivation, and worker satisfaction. Forced obedience to rules in this manner results in decreased problem solving, fear in the unexpected, autocratic leadership, and mistrust (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Thus, when workers are empowered to use their individual skills and resources, their value to the organization increases by encouraging best practices through flexible guidelines (Adler & Borys, 1996), invites interactive dialogue, views problems opportunistically, fosters trust, values differences, capitalizes and learns from mistakes, and embraces unexpected occurrences in the facilitation of problem-solving (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Enabling and coercive policies are also applied to centralization. Centralization is essentially defined by employee opportunities to participate in decision making (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; 2001). When centralization is on the high end of the spectrum, decisions are limited to only a few, while low centralization is characterized by shared decision making among many employees (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Organizations that are highly centralized are found to be more hindering and coercive in that they are prohibitive to problem solving, obstructive to innovation, and overbearing in control and discipline measures. Here, authoritative decision-making bodies are represented by a small group that makes top-down decisions with little to no input from others. In schools, teachers can become hostile towards administrators acting in such a capacity as established rules and procedures lack their input, which limits collaborative efforts and can leave teachers feeling unrepresented in decision making. Enabling centralization, however, facilitates problem solving by allowing for appropriate boundaries, but with a penchant

for greater subordinate decision making, cooperation, and collaboration (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Thus, teachers are more confident that they are trusted as professionals to participate meaningfully in organizational decisions. In allowing for enabling centralization, school leaders use their authority to empower teachers to use their professional capacity to provide innovative solutions to school issues and problems.

Enabling Structures in Schools

While schools are characterized as unique working environments, the basic structure is akin to that of bureaucratic organizations. Katz and Kahn (1966) noted that schools reflect such organizational functions in that they have observable requirements of situations generating environmental pressures, shared values and expectations, and the enforcement of rules and regulations. Additionally, schools have the function of creating knowledge and developing more complex problem-solving skills found in adaptive organizations. As such, the authority can take either a supportive or unsupportive tone that lacks empathy in the consideration of individuals (Katz & Kahn, 1966). This is supported by Kensler (2010), who postulates that democratic processes in schools should be continuously improving in efforts to balance the recognition of individual needs and the good of the whole organization. Miskel, Feverly, and Stewart (1979) related school processes to organizational structures. They argued that teachers perceive schools to be more effective when characterized by participative organizational processes, shared decision making, more formalized general rules, and more complex professional activity.

Hoy and Miskel (2013) linked professionalism (technical competence, specialization) to bureaucratic structure (hierarchy of authority, rules for incumbents, procedural specifications, and impersonality). In doing so, they described four types of bureaucratic structures that describe the ideal school based on these organizational patterns. The first type of school created

is one that is chaotic, which is low both in professionalism and bureaucracy. In this example, workers are not doing their jobs and there is very little structure to hold the school together. Next, a school can be authoritarian by having high levels of bureaucratic influence and low levels of professionalism. Here, workers are not skilled enough to be granted autonomy, but are held together by strong management. This school would likely be organized and rigid, but with little effectiveness in regards to teaching and learning.

High levels of bureaucracy and professionalism would be optimum in some organizations, but not in schools. It creates a Weberian model of an organization with such characteristics as a specialized division of labor, an impersonal focus on facts and the bottom line, an employee sense of career orientation to move up the ladder, and a highly efficient form of output. These aspects are not inherently bad, but do not fit in a school. Schools are unique because of the informal organizations that exist and the relationships that must be cultivated between faculty, students, and parents. These factors, among others, complicate the Weberian model to the point of ineffectiveness in a school environment. Consequently, the optimum type of school according to Hoy and Miskel (2013) is represented with low levels of bureaucracy and high levels of professionalism, thus creating a professional bureaucracy. These schools are characterized by a largely decentralized enabling school structure that grants teachers a great deal of autonomy. Thus, the operating core of the school is quite large with help from the technostructure and support staff. School leaders provide a hierarchy, rules, and procedures that enable teachers to move through bureaucratic necessities smoothly, and then leave a great deal of autonomy in teacher decision making. This is important because effective teachers are highly skilled and their classroom experiences are not easily defined. As a result, these teachers need the freedom to operate in their respective environments in the best possible way that is ultimately

decided by them. The real key to this type of school, however, is in the high levels of teacher professionalism. Without that, school leaders would find it difficult to grant such autonomy. However, when teacher professionalism is present in high levels, leaders can begin to cultivate a learning environment that can be highly successful (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Hoy and Sweetland (2000; 2001) explored the consequences of positive and negative bureaucratic structures as they pertain to schools, and found that schools are akin to organizations in the manner through which they function like bureaucracies, in that they operate with defined rules and regulations and a hierarchy of authority. However, such rules and hierarchy can be supportive to teachers and not just a way to maintain administrative authority.

Hoy and Sweetland (2000) examined formalization and centralization in both enabling and coercive contexts. They created the Enabling School Structure (ESS) form by developing four sets of statements that indicate the degree of enabling formalization, coercive formalization, enabling centralization, and hindering centralization present in schools. Ultimately the measure included twenty-four, 5-point, Likert-type items that asked teachers to rate the described behaviors in their school in contexts ranging from *never* to *always occurs*. The questionnaire was given to 61 teachers in three educational administration courses at the Ohio State University. The teachers were all from different schools ranging in diversity regarding urban, rural, or suburban settings. A principal-axis factor analysis was used to indicate the two independent factors of formalization and centralization. Results indicated that all enabling items encompassing formalization and centralization loaded positively and all coercive items encompassing formalization and centralization loaded negatively. Thus, results offered the two factors were related strongly to the extent that a one-factor solution was ultimately utilized. Using the single factor, all items loaded strongly, ranging from .40 to .81. Hoy and Sweetland

(2000) posited that school bureaucracies varied along a continuum with enabling bureaucracy at one end, and hindering bureaucracy at the other. Hence, enabling bureaucracy was a bipolar construct of a single dimension. Moving forward, a one factor solution was developed that formed a single scale of enabling bureaucracy. The alpha coefficient reliability was .94.

In a second study, Hoy and Sweetland (2000) sampled one teacher from 116 different schools representing a diverse range spanning five states. In the subsequent principal-axis factor analysis, items were loaded along a bipolar continuum that ranged from enabling to hindering. All items loaded strongly, with an alpha coefficient of reliability of .96, indicating the same factor structure as the initial study. Consequently, the enabling bureaucracy measurement was found to be reliable, stable, and with significant evidence of validity. Citing the research, Hoy and Sweetland (2000) speculated that a higher degree of enabling structure in schools would coincide with a greater degree of collegial trust among teachers and teacher trust in the principal, thus forming a reciprocal relationship. Thus, essentially, enabling structures enhance teacher trust in the principal and this trust ultimately serves to reinforce enabling bureaucracies. Additionally, they hypothesized that the greater degree of enabling bureaucracy present in schools, the less sense of powerlessness teachers would feel.

Hoy and Sweetland (2001) sought to further validate their earlier research by including multiple respondents for each school. The ESS Form was trimmed down to the 12 items with the strongest factor loadings, ensuring that items describing enabling and coercive formalization, and enabling and hindering centralization were adequately represented. In this study, 97 high school faculties with a minimum of 15 total members from urban, suburban, and rural areas were utilized. Data were collected at faculty meetings where teachers were given either the ESS form or a questionnaire on faculty trust. Results from a principal-axis factor analysis indicated that the

shorter, 12-item form was equally effective as the original 24-item version in its prediction of positive or negative feelings of teachers toward administration. Hoy and Sweetland's (2001) three hypotheses proposed that *the more enabling school bureaucratic structure: the greater the extent of faculty trust in the principal, the less the degree of truth spinning in the school, and the less the extent of role conflict in the school*. The results indicated that indeed, enabling school structures strengthen trust among teachers, and between teachers and the principal. Thus, enabling structures exhibit principal characteristics that include helping teachers problem solve, encourage an open school environment, and showing support for teachers as they do their jobs instead of creating an environment rampant with unnecessary concern and punishment (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Essentially, then, Hoy and Sweetland (2001) argued that, based on the research, bureaucracies can be perceived as negative or positive. Negatively, bureaucratic structures can lead to employees feeling alienated, dissatisfied, creatively hindered, and demoralized. Conversely, a positive view towards bureaucracy can guide behavior, clarify responsibility, reduce stress, and allow employees to feel more effective in organizations, including school structures (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). The leader is critically important to such perceptions.

Hoy (2003) described bureaucracies as necessary pathways to administrative efficiency. As to whether the school is operating in an enabling or coercive way, teacher perception is critical. Hierarchies of authority are necessary, but leaders who take into account the consideration of employees, and their abilities to be professionals, can promote enabling environments (Hoy, 2003). Consequently, administrators should concentrate on emphasizing professional autonomy among teachers instead of authority to achieve organizational goals (DiPaola & Hoy, 2001). Enabling structures are encouraged by principals' facilitation of teacher

problem solving, openness and transparency, and supporting teachers. Such an environment helps decrease teacher concern regarding conflict and punishment, and instead increases trust and collaborative teacher efforts in problem solving, which ultimately clear pathways for positively affecting student achievement (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Additionally, teachers follow leaders in terms of behavior towards other teachers and students. Hence, principal actions will likely be reciprocated by subordinates (Hoy, 2003; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001), and provide a genuine desire for teachers to trust principals while simultaneously increasing efforts to earn principal's trust. (Sinden, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2004)

Rationale and Hypotheses

Critical to this study is the examination of organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to leadership. Specifically, what leadership behaviors can have a positive impact on organizational citizenship behaviors in schools? The rationale behind such a question involves the idea that as leaders work to create a suitable environment, more organizational citizenship behaviors will be more likely to take place. Indeed, according to Hoy and Forsyth (1986), leaders must work to create environments that facilitate behaviors that move towards organizational citizenship behaviors.

I attempted to link the concepts so as to establish a correlation between organizational citizenship behaviors and the leadership aspects involved with organizational justice and enabling school structures. Examining the literature has led to several initial key conclusions. First, organizational citizenship behaviors contribute positively to student achievement, to the extent of overcoming SES (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b). Next, elements of school climate including collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press (DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and faculty trust in colleagues (DiPaola and Hoy, 2005a) correlate positively with both organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice (DiPaola & Guy, 2009).

Additionally, a positive correlation exists between organizational citizenship behaviors and academic optimism; which is comprised of collective efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust in students and parents (Hoy et al., 2006; Wagner and DiPaola, 2011). Finally, organizational citizenship behavior was linked positively to organizational justice (Burns and DiPaola, 2013). Thus, in summation, research shows that many factors that have direct and/or indirect influence on achievement can also contribute to organizational citizenship behaviors, which research indicates affects student achievement.

Many of these constructs and their links to organizational citizenship behaviors can certainly be built upon through further research. However, the most significant gap exists in the research involving organizational justice and enabling school structures. Here, the research needs to be more in-depth regarding size and validity to truly establish a positive correlation to a greater extent. In the examined studies, the most common conceptual definition of organizational citizenship behaviors pertaining to schools has been described as having teachers who voluntarily go out of their way to help their students, colleagues, and others as they engage in the work of teaching and learning (DiPaola, et al., 2005). An important key to this construct could be the environment provided to achieve such behaviors. Leaders can certainly play a role in the enhancement of organizational citizenship behaviors as evidenced by the literature linking the construct to collegial leadership, achievement press (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and academic emphasis (Wagner & DiPaola, 2011).

There is also evidence that leadership affects both organizational justice and enabling structures. Organizational justice expands on leadership emphasis by enhancing teachers' perceptions of fairness in the operation and administration of schools (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). As part of organizational justice, leaders exhibit and facilitate the principles of equity, perception of

fairness, participation in decision making, respectful treatment, consistent leadership, egalitarianism, correction of poor decisions, decisions based on accuracy, decisions representing interests of concerned parties, and ethics (Greenberg & Lind, 2000; Leventhal et al., 1980). In these principles that underlie organizational justice, each of them are directly affected by leadership decisions and actions. Indeed, they link two important aspects of leadership: the structural and the interpersonal. As organizational justice is described in schools (Hoy & Tarter, 2004), the structural aspects of decision making and leadership decisions are ultimately linked with employee treatment, which drives the perceptions of fairness among teachers. Consequently, in the examination of principal decision making that involves whether employees are treated respectfully, fairly, and ethically, justice is directly affected by the school leadership.

As with organizational justice, enabling school structure is significantly linked with leadership behavior and decisions. Tschannen-Moran (2009) argued that an enabling structure directly results from principal's orientation toward leadership. Here, she argued that principal behavior could essentially lean more toward a professional orientation that concentrates on building collegial relationships with teachers that promote professional behavior, or a bureaucratic disposition that relies on authority, rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and job specialization. Ultimately, she found that the degree of principal professional orientation toward leadership was positively correlated with, and a predictor of, professional behavior among teachers (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Also, enabling school structure was found to have a strong correlation with teacher feelings of power (Sweetland, 2001), and academic optimism (Mitchell & Tarter, 2016). Hence, the manner in which principals approach the structure of a school has direct effects on teacher perceptions and behavior, as well as student achievement.

An important link that strengthens justice and structure as influencing leadership is trust. Faculty trust in the principal was found to be significantly linked with organizational justice (Hoy & Tarter, 2004) and enabling school structures (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). This lends further evidence that as teachers view the school as fair or enabling, perceptions of trust among leadership is affected.

Organizational justice and enabling school structure are both influenced by leadership behavior and decisions as well as being significantly important to school climate. However, research is still light in so far as studying the relationship specifically between organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. The key question is whether organizational justice and enabling school structure, which research has shown impacts school climate, also impacts organizational citizenship behaviors. This is important because it strengthens the link between leadership behavior and decisions and teachers' willingness to go beyond normal expectations for the purpose of working towards school goals, including student achievement.

In testing these constructs, we could hope to enhance the understanding of the role in leadership for providing an environment that cultivates organizational citizenship behaviors. Thus, I hypothesize that (H1) the greater the degree of organizational justice in schools, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. Additionally, (H2) the more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers.

Examining the concepts of enabling school structure and organizational justice raise the question as to whether these concepts could also be related. As a result, I also hypothesize the following: (H3) the more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree

of organizational justice. Here, the focus is to examine a potential correlation between enabling school structure and organizational justice with the overriding logic being that schools that have enabling characteristics have leaders who exhibit qualities related to organizational justice. This can potentially offer evidence in two ways. First, as I proposed that enabling school structures and organizational justice are both linked to organizational citizenship behaviors, we can also question if these concepts are related to each other. If so, it leads to the second examination of research, which can shed light onto what type of leadership behaviors may correlate with enabling school structure. Hence, we may learn that leaders who possess organizational justice qualities are also prone to lead organizations with enabling structures.

It is also worthwhile to gain insight into whether organizational justice or enabling school structure may contribute more significantly to organizational citizenship behaviors. Although the research is not extensive, organizational justice has been positively linked with organizational citizenship behaviors (Burns & DiPaola, 2013). Thus, I proposed a regression hypothesis based upon the gap in the research relating organizational citizenship behaviors with enabling school structure. It was as follows: (H4) organizational justice makes a greater contribution to organizational citizenship behaviors than enabling school structures.

Summary

This chapter explored historical, conceptual, and theoretical underpinnings of organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structure culminating in the development of four hypotheses relating the constructs. The primary focus for each of these hypotheses is to gain a greater understanding of the leader's role in providing an environment that is linked positively with increased behaviors of organizational citizenship of teachers. In doing so, principals can establish themselves as being facilitators to teachers not

simply doing their jobs, but going above and beyond the call to excel at them, ultimately for the benefit of the school and students.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, characteristics of the sample population and data collection procedures are described. Constitutive and operational definitions of the study as well as comments on validity and reliability are given. A brief explanation of statistical procedures used to test hypothesized relationships is also provided.

Sample

To test the hypotheses of this study, data from 108 public schools in 15 school districts across north and central Alabama were collected and analyzed. Of the 108 schools, 58 were classified as elementary (grades K-6) and 50 secondary (schools with the highest grade as 7th or higher). The sample size ultimately was comprised of 781 certified teachers from the sample of public schools which represented schools containing combinations of grades K-12. The list of schools comprising the study was divided among a group of nine researchers for the purpose of obtaining data.

Data Collection

Certified teachers were specifically utilized because in the measurement of organizational citizenship behaviors, teachers are asked to offer opinions and assessments of themselves as well as perceptions of colleagues (DiPaola et al., 2005). Consequently, since teachers are the primary respondent for citizenship, they were used to measure justice and structure. Data were collected from teachers in the participating schools after receiving district permission from superintendents and local school permission from principals approving faculty participation in the completion of

surveys. Teachers were given instructions describing their consent to participate, the guarantee of confidentiality, and that participation was strictly on a voluntary basis.

This study was part of a larger effort to obtain data among a total of nine researchers. Schools were selected for participation based on the researchers' connection and proximity to the school districts. While researchers may have been known in their particular school or district, responses were kept confidential. Survey distribution and administration took place in meetings at the local school level. After survey distribution, researchers did not pick up envelopes containing surveys until faculty members responded or chose not to. In doing so, researchers were not privy as to which faculty members participated or not. Consequently, teacher respondents were anonymous and kept confidential. Surveys representing organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structure were placed along with other research instruments irrelevant to this study in a total of five different packets. Thus, different teachers responded to different surveys within the same schools. As the unit of analysis was the school, all data were aggregated to the school level.

Measures

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior was defined as a single dimension describing teachers who voluntarily go out of their way to help their students, colleagues, and others as they engage in the work of teaching and learning (DiPaola et al., 2005). Operationally, organizational citizenship behaviors were measured using a refinement of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCBS) developed by DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001). The OCB scale is a 12-item, 6-point, Likert-type scale that ranges from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* with a reliability ranging from .86 to .93. Sample items include *Teachers help students on their own*

time, Teachers voluntarily help new teachers, and Teacher committees in this school work productively (DiPaola et al., 2005). The construct validity was supported in three separate factor analyses (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a; 2005b). When calculated, a higher score correlates to a higher degree of organizational citizenship behaviors (DiPaola et al., 2005).

Organizational Justice

Conceptually, organizational justice is defined as employee perceptions of fairness contingent on organizational outcomes, procedures for outcome distribution, and supervisor interactions with subordinates impacting employee treatment (Greenberg, 1996). In context of schools, Hoy and Tarter (2004) listed ten major principles of organizational justice that include equity regarding contributions, individual perception of fairness, participation in decision making, interpersonal treatment of employees, consistent leadership behavior, egalitarian decision making, the leader's ability to correct poor decisions, leadership decisions based on accurate information, decisions representing relevant parties, and a focus on prevailing moral and ethical standards (Greenberg & Lind, 2000; Leventhal et al., 1980; Hoy & Tarter, 2004). Operationally, organizational justice was measured using the Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), which is a 10-item, 7-point, Likert-type scale that measures the degree to which school operations are fair with answers ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Sample items include *The principal's behavior is consistent*, *The principal treats everyone with respect and dignity*, and *The principal in this school is fair to everyone*. The reliability is .90 and when results are calculated, the higher the score yields the greater the extent of organizational justice in the school. The validity was supported by factor analyses of the individual scale items (Hoy & Tarter, 2004).

Enabling School Structure

The conceptual definition of enabling school structure describes an organization that utilizes a hierarchy of authority and system of rules and regulation that facilitates the teaching-learning mission of the school (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Operationally, enabling school structure was measured using the ESS Form; a 12-item, 5-point, Likert-type scale with answers ranging from *never to always*. Results inform as to whether the tested school structure is more enabling or hindering in nature. The statements in the ESS Form are descriptive relevant to the hierarchical structure in its ability to help or hinder teachers and in the rules and regulations propensity to guide problem solving as opposed to obstructing innovation and professional judgment. Sample items include *Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communication between teachers and administrators*, *The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their job*, and *Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures*. The reliability is .90 (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001), and when calculated, a higher score indicates a higher degree of enabling school structure. The construct validity was supported in multiple studies (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001).

Socioeconomic Status (SES) and School Level

Socioeconomic status (SES) is conceptually defined as the household income level of students (DiPaola & Hoy, 2007). In addition to the hypothesized variables, SES will serve as a control variable because of its frequent relation to school outcomes. SES levels were determined for each school using 2016-2017 State Department of Education Data that reported free and reduced lunch numbers as an operational definition. Hence, the greater the numbers of free and reduced lunch, the lower the SES (DiPaola & Hoy, 2007). In order to convert free and reduced lunch percentages to SES, the free and reduced lunch percentage is subtracted from 1. For

example, if a school had a free and reduced lunch percentage of .63, subtracting from 1 would equal .37, which would be the SES ($1 - .63 = .37$). In doing so, the relationship of SES to outcome variables is conducive to identifying whether SES relates in a significant manner to correlation and regression analyses.

School level was also used as a control variable. Each school was categorized as either elementary or secondary and included in the final analysis of data. Here, the grade level of the school is included to investigate whether elementary or secondary environments play a role in teacher perceptions involving organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, or enabling school structures.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions for this research study were as follows:

1. What is the relationship of organizational justice, enabling school structures, and organizational citizenship behaviors; and
2. Does organizational justice or enabling school structures contribute more significantly to organizational citizenship behaviors?

The hypotheses for this research study were as follows:

5. The greater the degree of organizational justice in schools, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers;
6. The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers;
7. The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational justice; and

8. Organizational justice makes a greater contribution to organizational citizenship behaviors than enabling school structures.

Data Analysis

The primary focus of this study was examining the relationship between organizational citizenship, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. The unit of analysis was the school. Research data were aggregated at the school level for organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. Survey responses were loaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which was utilized in all statistical analyses. After data was collected, statistical measures were conducted for all schools, secondary only, and elementary only. Correlational analyses were conducted to determine the first three hypothesized relationships. For H4, a regression was performed to determine whether organizational justice would make a greater contribution toward organizational citizenship behaviors than enabling school structure. SES and school level were both included as control variables.

Summary

In this chapter, I described the methodology for conducting this study involving the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. The selection of participants was detailed along with data collection. Additionally, measurements for each variable were discussed along with their method of analysis.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter contains five sections. The first section provides an introduction and overview of the research study. Section two presents descriptive statistics for each research variable. Correlations among the research variables are detailed in the third section, and the fourth presents the results of tested hypotheses. A brief summary of the data and findings is described in section five.

Introduction

This study investigated the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. It served to examine earlier findings of links between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice and enabling school structures. Organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers were hypothesized to be correlated with organizational justice and enabling school structures, and separately, organizational justice was hypothesized to correlate with enabling school structures. The Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (OCB), Organizational Justice Scale (OJS), and the Enabling School Structure Form (ESS) were utilized to measure the three primary constructs. The OCB, OJS, and ESS were administered by researchers at schools during meetings. Schools ranged significantly in size, socioeconomic status, and in rural/urban contexts. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Correlation and regression analyses were conducted to test the hypothesized relationships between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures.

School Configuration and Classification

Data were reported three fold for the schools participating in the study: all schools, elementary, and secondary. The study encompassed a large number of schools in north and central Alabama. For this study, schools are separated in elementary and secondary contexts. Table 1 shows the breakdown of participating schools in the study. Schools were organized according to the highest grade level in the school.

The differences between elementary and secondary environments are important to note because each type of school can affect climate perceptions of teachers. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) noted that secondary teachers often experience more distant direct relationships with principals and instead typically interact with assistant principals and department chairpersons. Also, secondary teachers are often highly specialized in content and can be more isolated in particular departments. In contrast, elementary teachers are more general in content and tend to concentrate more on total child development (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). There are also differences pertaining to bureaucratic structures in elementary and secondary schools. Herriott and Firestone (1984) emphasized that elementary schools typically aligned with a rational bureaucracy while secondary schools were marked by a loosely coupled system that demonstrates more autonomy and flexibility. Another significant difference exists in typical job requirements. Secondary teachers are more likely to be involved with advanced placement and other avenues of accelerated learning along with sponsoring various clubs or extracurricular activities. According to the state of Alabama, degrees are issued in elementary (K-6) and secondary (7-12) contexts. Thus, in this study, the highest grade reported in the school is the categorizing number. Reporting results in all three contexts will help analyze whether the overall type of school plays a role in the hypothesized relationships. In doing so, results for 58

elementary schools and 50 secondary schools will be reported along with the total number of 108.

It is also important to recognize three schools that are categorized as K-12 because they encompass all grade levels and presented a dilemma as to which category to include them. I placed them in the secondary category based upon my own prior experience. I have worked in schools of this nature and the teachers were quite cohesive regardless of the grade they instruct, in large part due to the typical small enrollment size of the schools and that they often serve more tightly knit communities. Additionally, faculty meetings often encompass all grade level teachers and some school functions such as athletic pep rallies often include the entire school. Consequently, the principal at such schools tended to view their role in a more secondary context and were more likely to exhibit such interactions with faculty and staff.

Table 1

Summary of School Configurations

Configuration	Total	Percentage of Total	
PK-K	1	<1	
PK-1	1	<1	
K-2	4	4	
1-2	2	2	
K-3	3	3	
2-3	1	<1	
K-4	8	7	
K-5	18	17	
3-5	6	6	
4-5	2	2	
K-6	8	7	
3-6	1	<1	
4-6	1	<1	
5-6	2	2	<i>Elementary N=58</i>
6-8	10	9	
7-8	6	6	
9	2	2	
K-12	3	3	
6-12	5	5	
7-12	6	6	
9-12	17	16	
10-12	1	<1	<i>Secondary N=50</i>
TOTAL	108	100	

School Information

For each school configuration, I have provided basic information that describes the average number of teachers in schools (Teacher Avg.), percentage of teachers who responded to surveys (Response %), average free and reduced lunch percentage (FRL %), and the average enrollment number (ENRL Avg.).

Table 2

Summary of School Information based on Configuration

Configuration	Teacher Avg.	Response %	FRL %	ENRL Avg.
PK-K	35	63	38.0	213
PK-1	35	80	77.0	373
K-2	31.8	25	59.5	458.5
1-2	35	27	37.5	211
K-3	28.3	18	30.3	717.3
2-3	38	63	73	358
K-4	25.8	41	54.8	436.5
K-5	31.5	47	50.8	534.1
3-5	35.8	37	41	680.6
4-5	31	11	45.5	530.5
K-6	27.8	30	65.3	422.3
3-6	24	67	93	320
4-6	35	63	47	592
5-6	25.5	41	70	551
<i>Elementary Total Avg. (N=58)</i>	<i>30.5</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>53.4</i>	<i>501</i>
6-8	27.9	52	47.4	574.7
7-8	25.8	34	50.6	479
9	31.5	49	41.5	484.5
K-12	46.6	45	63.3	906.3
6-12	43.8	43	46	962.2
7-12	28.1	57	55.1	462.3
9-12	41	29	38.6	841.8
10-12	82	11	59	1031
<i>Secondary Total Avg. (N=50)</i>	<i>35.5</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>46.4</i>	<i>701.4</i>
Total Averages (N=108)	32.8	39	50.	593.8

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for SES and enrollment numbers are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5, and include the number of sample schools (N), mean (M), standard deviation (SD), and range of scores from lowest to highest (Min & Max).

Table 3

Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for All Schools (N=108)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
SES	50	0.20	.11	.96
ENRL	593.84	294.53	136	1,558

Table 4

Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for Elementary (N=58)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
SES	.53	0.21	.11	.96
ENRL	501.07	218.68	165	1,103

Table 5

Descriptive Data for Free and Reduced Lunch Percentages (SES) and Enrollment Numbers (ENRL) for Secondary (N=50)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
SES	.46	.16	.11	.82
ENRL	701.	334.35	136	1,558

Here, SES statistics indicate a wide range of schools with a relatively low standard deviation, which is consistent across all grade levels. Enrollment numbers are much more scattered from the mean as indicated by a significantly higher standard deviation. This shows the number of schools represented vary greatly in terms of population. While the numbers are consistent across grade levels in terms of deviation, the secondary schools are much higher in

both the mean and standard deviation, which further strengthens the reasoning of classifying and reporting different grade levels.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 provide descriptive statistics for organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures. Data were aggregated at the school level and results were determined by averaging the scores for each item within each construct. The mean score for organizational citizenship behaviors was calculated by averaging the scores for all 12 organizational citizenship behavior items, organizational justice was determined by averaging the scores for all 10 justice items, and enabling school structure by averaging all 12 structure items. Descriptive data for the three variables indicates consistency across all grade levels in the mean, standard deviation, and spectrum of responses.

Table 6

Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for All Schools (N=108)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
OCB	4.64	0.48	3.29	6.00
OJ	4.85	0.88	1.80	6.00
ESS	4.14	0.52	2.46	4.94

Table 7

Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for Elementary (N=58)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
OCB	4.65	0.48	3.29	5.55
OJ	4.94	0.78	3.28	6.00
ESS	4.21	0.47	3.08	4.94

Table 8

Descriptive Data for Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structure (ESS) for Secondary (N=50)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max
OCB	4.62	0.49	3.56	6.00
OJ	4.75	0.97	1.80	6.00
ESS	4.08	0.57	2.46	4.83

Reliability

Each instrument was tested to examine reliability. Reliabilities for each measure were computed using the Cronbach's alpha method of evaluating internal consistency. As noted on Tables 9-11, all three variables attained a score of .70 or higher using the school as the unit of analysis, which indicates a high internal consistency of reliability (Muijs, 2004).

Table 9

Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for All Schools

Variable	Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N
OCB	OCB Scale	12	.86	108
OJ	OJS	10	.96	108
ESS	ESS Form	12	.89	108

Table 10

Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for Elementary

Variable	Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N
OCB	OCB Scale	12	.85	58
OJ	OJS	10	.96	58
ESS	ESS Form	12	.87	58

Table 11

Alpha Coefficients of Reliability Using the School as the Unit of Analysis for Secondary

Variable	Instrument	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N
OCB	OCB Scale	12	.87	50
OJ	OJS	10	.95	50
ESS	ESS Form	12	.91	50

Hypothesis Testing

Correlational Analyses

Pearson correlation coefficients were for all variables to investigate potential significant relationships. Correlational analyses were used to test the first three hypotheses. The dependent variable for the first hypothesis is organizational citizenship behavior and the independent variable is organizational justice.

H1: The greater the degree of organizational justice in schools, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. Correlational analysis did not support this hypothesis (See Tables 12-14). There was no significant relationship between OCB and OJ.

H2: The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational citizenship behaviors of teachers. The hypothesis was not supported (See Tables 11-13). No significant relationship was indicated between OCB and ESS.

H3: The more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the degree of organizational justice. The hypothesis was supported (all: $r = .37, p < .01$; elementary: $r = .39, p < .01$; secondary: $r = .36, p < .01$).

Table 12

Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for All Schools

	OCB	OJ	ESS
OCB	1	.14	.14
OJ	.14	1	.37**
ESS	.14	.37**	1

**p<.01

Table 13

Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for Elementary

	OCB	OJ	ESS
OCB	1	.17	.20
OJ	.17	1	.39**
ESS	.20	.39**	1

**p<.01

Table 14

Correlational Analysis of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Organizational Justice (OJ), and Enabling School Structures (ESS) for Secondary

	OCB	OJ	ESS
OCB	1	.11	.08
OJ	.11	1	.36**
ESS	.08	.36**	1

**p<.01

In addition to the correlational analyses of the variables, socioeconomic status (SES) was added as a control variable (see Table 15). No significant relationship was indicated between SES and OCB, OJ, and ESS at all levels.

Table 15

Correlational Analysis with Socioeconomic Status (SES) as a Control Variable

	OCB	OJ	ESS
SES All Schools	-.06	.05	-.13
SES Elementary	-.17	.08	-.27
SES Secondary	.10	-.17	-.05

School level categorization was also used as a control variable when examining all schools (see Table 16). No significant relationship was indicated between school level, and OCB, OJ, and ESS.

Table 16

Correlational Analysis with School Level as a Control Variable

	OCB	OJ	ESS
School Level: All Schools	-.06	-.12	-.11

Multiple Regression Analysis

A multiple regression was run to predict OCB from OJ and ESS in order to investigate hypothesis 4. OCB, as the dependent variable, was regressed on to the independent variables of OJ & ESS, along with the control variables of SES and School Level (for All Schools only).

H4: Organizational justice makes a greater contribution to organizational citizenship behaviors than enabling school structures. The hypothesis was not supported (see Tables 17-19).

Table 17

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for All Schools

Dependent variable: OCB	B	SE	β	Sig.
Predictor Variables				
OJ	.057	.064	.113	.376
ESS	.144	.127	.142	.261
SES	-.014	.313	-.006	.964
School Level	-.057	.109	-.065	.607

$R^2 = .074$ Adjusted $R^2 = .006$

Table 18

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for Elementary

Dependent variable: OCB	B	SE	β	Sig.
Predictor Variables				
OJ	.114	.095	.211	.239
ESS	.204	.156	.232	.198
SES	.064	.344	.033	.854

$R^2 = .131$ Adjusted $R^2 = .026$

Table 19

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variable Predicting OCB for Secondary

Dependent variable: OCB	B	SE	β	Sig.
Predictor Variables				
OJ	.030	.092	.062	.745
ESS	.027	.215	.024	.900
SES	-.144	.622	-.231	.819

$R^2 = .055$ Adjusted $R^2 = -.067$

Summary

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were investigated using correlational statistics for the collective group of schools studied, as well as at elementary and secondary schools. The Pearson Correlations Coefficient did not support Hypotheses 1 and 2, indicating no significant relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice or enabling school structures. Hypothesis 4 was also not supported. A multiple regression with SES added as a control variable indicated that neither organizational justice nor enabling school structure was a significant predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors. However, Hypothesis 3 was supported in that a significant and positive relationship was indicated between organizational justice and enabling school structure in the collective school group, and in the elementary and secondary levels.

CHAPTER V:

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this chapter, the purpose and findings of the study are summarized. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed along with recommendations for further research.

Summary of Research

Teachers' perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures were measured in a total of 108 public schools in Alabama, ranging from grades K-12. A total of 781 respondents completed at least one of the surveys, of which all results were aggregated to the school level. Variables were operationalized using the OCB scale (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005), the OJS (Hoy & Tarter, 2004), and the ESS form (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; 2001). SES, as measured by 2016 – 2017 free and reduced lunch percentages, was used as a control variable.

Correlations were computed for organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, enabling school structures, and SES. Multiple regressions tested the contributions of organizational justice, enabling school structures, and SES on organizational citizenship behaviors.

Findings

This study examined the relationships between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures. The hypothesized findings are listed as follows:

1. Organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice were not significantly correlated;
2. Organizational citizenship behaviors and enabling school structures were not significantly correlated;
3. Organizational justice is positively and significantly correlated to enabling school structures; and
4. The independent variables of organizational justice and enabling school structures, and the control variable of SES made no significant contribution to organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers.

Theoretical Implications

In the review of the literature, leadership was examined as a possible predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. This is important due primarily to the link of organizational citizenship behavior and increased student achievement, even to the extent of overcoming socioeconomic status of students (SES) (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b). In schools where organizational citizenship is found in a greater degree, teacher behaviors include voluntarily going beyond formal requirements in order to help both students and colleagues succeed (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005). Thus, a key question involves what factors can influence such behaviors among teachers. This study provides insight into the literature regarding organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers and its relationship to the leadership behaviors represented through the variables of organizational justice and enabling school structures.

As a construct, organizational justice essentially describes employee perceptions of fairness (Greenberg, 1996). Schools, however, are unique organizations and often differ from typical business organizational models. Consequently, Hoy and Tarter (2004) addressed

organizational justice in schools, listing ten major principles of organizational justice that include equity regarding contributions, individual perception of fairness, participation in decision making, interpersonal treatment of employees, consistent leadership behavior, egalitarian decision making, the leader's ability to correct poor decisions, leadership decisions based on accurate information, decisions representing relevant parties, and a focus on prevailing moral and ethical standards (Greenberg & Lind, 2000; Leventhal et al., 1980; Hoy & Tarter, 2004). An enabling school structure is another construct influenced by leader decisions. Enabling school structure is defined as a school structure that helps, rather than hinders, by utilizing a hierarchy of authority and a system of rules and regulations that enhances the teaching-learning mission of the school (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001).

The hypotheses involved in this study sought to provide context into how the variables of organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures may relate. The theoretical framework argued that organizational justice and enabling school structures would correlate with organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers in schools. Leadership behavior governs a significant part of perceptions in schools involving organizational justice and enabling school structures. School climate variables including collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and faculty trust in colleagues (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a) correlate positively with organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice (DiPaola & Guy, 2009). Additionally, organizational citizenship behavior was linked positively to organizational justice (Burns & DiPaola, 2013). Hence, research was indicative that many factors that have direct and/or indirect influence on achievement can also contribute to organizational citizenship behaviors, and consequently, student achievement. This study also examined whether organizational justice and enabling

school structures were correlated to show a link that where one construct exists, so likely will the other.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Justice, and Enabling School Structure

The research questions for this study asked whether a relationship existed between organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structures. A positive relationship was expected between these variables. The theoretical framework was based on the rationale that as leaders work to provide environments that are just and enabling, organizational citizenship behaviors would be more likely to exist. The results simply did not indicate the theoretical framework provided in the review of literature that linked the variables was accurate. Thus, essentially, a direct link between leadership behavior and decisions, and teachers' willingness to go beyond normal expectations for the benefit of the school was not found.

Regarding the first hypothesis, there was no significant correlation found between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice. Though the research was not extensive, there was evidence to support these variables would relate (Burns & DiPaola, 2013). This study's sample was much more extensive and displayed results from both elementary and secondary schools. When data were analyzed collectively and separately among elementary and secondary schools, no correlation was indicated.

For the second hypothesis, no significant relationship was indicated between organizational citizenship behavior and enabling school structure. Here, the research is new regarding the examination of these variables, as there is no current available literature investigating a direct relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and enabling school structure. For the fourth hypothesis, organizational justice was predicted to have a greater

effect on organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers than the presence of an enabling school structure. Results showed that neither variable made a significant contribution to OCB. Also, SES had no indicated effect as the control variable in the correlation or regression.

It is a significant finding that based on the results of this study, leadership behaviors as measured by organizational justice and through the provision of enabling school structures do not directly correlate or serve as predictors to organizational citizenship behavior. That is, as leaders contribute to fair and enabling environments, the research indicates that organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers exist separately. While I was unable to find adequate empirical evidence to explain the lack of correlation, as a lifelong educator, I can find some logic in why the variables did not correlate as predicted. Organizational justice promotes a culture of fairness and enabling structure essentially maintains an environment in which procedures and rules are helpful to teachers as they do their job. Organizational citizenship, however, is potentially more of an intrinsic quality possessed by teachers that leads to behaviors consistent with going above and beyond typical expectations of the job. Consequently, teachers who enjoy a culture of fairness and enabling procedures, may not necessarily exhibit the qualities of organizational citizenship in a significant capacity. Thus, organizational citizenship behavior is perhaps more of a personality disposition than a set of traits that inherently coincide with the basic role of teachers.

It is also important to examine that while a direct link was not found among citizenship, justice and structure, evidence suggests potential indirect paths. Sun and Leithwood (2015) discussed how leadership as examined through rational (knowledge and skill of staff members), emotional (feelings and dispositions of staff), organizational (structure of relationships and interactions among organizational members), and family (expectations for children, culture, and

support for students) pathways can affect organizational outcomes, including citizenship. Here, as leaders address these pathways in schools, a leadership model more transformational in nature can take shape. Specifically, through the rational and emotional pathways that involve elements of organizational citizenship behaviors, collective teacher efficacy, and teacher commitment leaders can promote behaviors that affect the school and student achievement (Sun & Leithwood, 2015). Another indirect link is found through examining faculty trust in the principal.

Organizational justice and enabling structures have both been significantly linked with faculty trust in the principal. (Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2004). Additionally, DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) correlated organizational citizenship behaviors in teachers with collegial leadership, which was directly linked with faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). Consequently, leadership may still affect citizenship behaviors, just not directly, particularly through more organizational constructs such as justice and structure.

Organizational Justice and Enabling School Structure

A significant correlation was found between organizational justice and enabling school structure, supporting the third hypothesis. The correlation between organizational justice and an enabling school structure is important in that as leaders foster environments that promote fairness, there is a strong likelihood of an enabling structure. This was also supported through a simple regression that indicated a significant and reciprocal relationship between organizational justice and enabling school structure. In essence, the importance of the findings is that the presence of organizational justice and an enabling structure in schools correlates to helpful elements. Research supports that organizational justice is significantly linked to climate measures such as collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, and achievement press (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Tarter, 2004). Faculty

trust in colleagues was linked to both organizational justice and enabling school structure (Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Consequently, while a correlation to organizational citizenship behaviors was not shown, a greater degree of organizational justice and an enabling structure in schools are beneficial not only in providing environments promoting a sense of fairness and a structure that enables teachers to do their jobs more effectively, but also lends itself to organizational climate dimensions and trust. If a comparative study that links these two variables exists, I was not able to find it. Thus, the research into these variables is minimal at best. Consequently, this study provides new information that can be used to guide further research linking organizational justice and enabling school structures with other variables that may indicate enhanced student achievement.

Implications for Practice

Behavior of teachers is an important aspect of school success. To be successful, much is needed beyond the basic requirements of the job. Organizational citizenship behaviors explains teacher actions that are significantly helpful to students and colleagues through giving extra time, initiative, and aspects of professionalism for the purpose of school effectiveness (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005). Additionally, school leaders are tasked with much more than simply managing a building. In modern educational practice, proper leadership involves multiple roles; including providing an acceptable school environment that is conducive to student achievement. Organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers have been linked to achievement and should be cultivated in schools (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b).

However, as the findings of this study suggest, simply providing a fair, just, and enabling environment is not enough to significantly influence organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. What this points to, is that principals must likely move beyond their own leadership

behavior, at least in regards to dimensions of organizational justice and enabling school structure, for organizational citizenship behaviors to flourish. That is, while organizational justice and an enabling school structure may lay a foundation of fairness and helpful rules and procedures, other factors may need to be present for an environment conducive to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Research indicates that school climate correlates positively with organizational citizenship behaviors in the constructs of collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, achievement press (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001), and faculty trust in colleagues (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Also, the academic optimism dimensions of collective efficacy, academic emphasis, and faculty trust in students and parents (Hoy, Tarter, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2006) correlate with organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. Hence, leaders can focus on these aspects that are related to organizational citizenship behavior to help foster them in schools.

Organizational justice and enabling school structure are also important variables to have in schools. The greater the degree of these constructs indicates school environments that are increasingly perceived both as fair and enabling among teachers. Additionally, prior research has indicated that these variables are related to environments that promote a healthy school climate and a setting of trust (DiPaola & Guy, 2009; Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Of particular note is the common thread of faculty trust in colleagues that is consistent with organizational justice, enabling school structures, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Hoy & Tarter, 2004; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Faculty trust is significant as teachers are more vulnerable to their colleagues based on their confidence that their colleagues are benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open. Also, faculty trust in colleagues is a

common dimension that exists with organizational justice, enabling school structures, and organizational citizenship behaviors (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Thus, while not directly correlated, through faculty trust in colleagues, organizational justice and enabling school structures may potentially be responsible indirectly for strengthening organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers in schools.

Recommendations for Future Research

First, as organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers was not correlated with organizational justice and enabling school structure, it potentially indicates that leadership behaviors promoting fairness and enabling structures do not necessarily affect the willingness of teachers to go above and beyond the call to help students and colleagues. This contributes to theory in that a question is raised as to the missing component(s) that can influence organizational citizenship behaviors. In this study, the researcher hypothesized that in linking these variables, a base of research could be established that organizational justice and enabling school structures can, in effect, contribute to organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. However, failure to do so provides opportunities to research what actually can be a precursor to organizational citizenship behavior. That is, is organizational citizenship a behavior that is based more on the intrinsic motivation of teachers themselves, or are there contributing factors that have not yet been considered?

One key for future research lies in what leaders can do to influence organizational citizenship behaviors beyond promoting environments conducive to organizational justice and enabling school structures. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) have already linked school climate with organizational citizenship behavior as the constructs of collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, and achievement (academic) press all significantly correlated with

organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. Additionally, DiPaola and Guy (2009) also found a significant correlation between organizational justice and the school climate dimensions of collegial leadership, teacher professionalism and achievement press. Consequently, there is reason to question that while organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational justice may not be directly correlated, an indirect relationship may exist through school climate. Thus, there may be further evidence of a broad spectrum of school characteristics that relate to organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers. Hoy, Tarter, and Kottkamp (1991) describe healthy schools as ones that have institutional, administrative, and teacher levels in harmony, while meeting functional needs as it copes with disruptive external forces and directs its energies toward its mission (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). Here, investigating the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational health may provide further insight into what elements can be a driving force toward organizational citizenship behaviors among teachers.

This study should also prompt further inquiry into the conditions that elicit citizenship behavior so that researchers can delve into its organizational origins. Consequently, the examination of the value of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations is important. Self-determination theory may shed some light on this question, as it focuses on the degree to which behavior among individuals is self-motivated and self-determined. Here, three innate needs are identified as being critical to intrinsic motivation: competence, relatedness, and autonomy. These needs allow individuals to control outcomes, interact and connect with others, and make individual decisions regarding completions of tasks (Ryan & Deci, 2002). One way to do this is through a qualitative study that identifies teachers who engage in citizenship behaviors and asks them what motivates them to do so. In doing so, one could determine if the needs associated with self-

determination theory are met, and through what means schools may cultivate these environments.

Another opportunity for research involves linking organizational justice and enabling school structures with other constructs. DiPaola and Guy (2009) found that organizational justice was correlated to aspects of organizational climate. In their study, each school climate dimension including collegial leadership, teacher professionalism, academic (achievement) press, and community engagement indicated a positive correlation to organizational justice (DiPaola & Guy, 2009). To strengthen the research among these variables, a possible study adding enabling school structures to organizational justice and school climate could investigate whether an enabling school structure was also correlated with, and a potential indicator, to school climate.

Summary

This chapter summarized the findings related to the relationship among the variables of organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational justice, and enabling school structure. While no findings of organizational citizenship behaviors being correlated to organizational justice and enabling school structure existed, organizational justice was found to correlate and exist as a predictor in a reciprocal relationship to enabling school structure. This study was the first available research I discovered linking organizational justice and enabling school structure. Further research can center on retesting potential correlations with organizational citizenship behavior, organizational justice, and enabling school structure, as well as providing extended evidence linking organizational justice and enabling school structure with other variables.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 433-436.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 61-89.
- Barnard, C.I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 587-595.
- Bies, R. J. (1987). Beyond "voice": The influence of decision-maker justification and sincerity on procedural fairness judgments. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 17*, 3-13.
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (In) justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations: Vol. 1* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich. CT: JAI Press Inc.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1987). Interactional fairness judgments: The influence of causal accounts. *Social Justice Research, 1*, 199-218.
- Bies, R. J., & Shapiro, D. L. (1988). Voice and justification: Their influence on procedural fairness judgments. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*, 676-685.
- Bostanci, A.B. (2013). The mediator role of perceived administrator support in the relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational justice and organizational support. *International Journal of Social Science & Education*. Vol. 3 Issue 3
- Burns, W.R.T. & DiPaola, M.F. (2013). A study of organizational justice, organizational citizenship behavior, and student achievement in high schools. *American Secondary Education, 42(1)* 4-23.
- Chen, X. P., Hui, C., & Sego, D. J. (1998). The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83* (6), 922-931.

- Chory, R. & Kingsley-Westerman, C. (2009). Feedback and fairness: The relationship between negative performance feedback and organizational justice. *Western Journal of Communication*, 73 (2), 157-181.
- Cranshaw, J.R., Cropanzano, R., Bell, C.M., & Nadisic, T. (2013). Organizational justice: New insights from behavioral ethics. *Human Relations* 66, 885-904
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z.S., Bobocel, D.R., & Rupp, D.E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58(2), 164-209
- Deluga, R. J. (1994), Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 315-326.
- DiPaola, M. & Guy, S. (2009). The impact of organizational justice on climate and trust in high schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19, 382-405
- DiPaola, M.F., & Hoy, W.K., (2001). Formalization, conflict, and change: Constructive and destructive consequences in schools. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(5), 238 - 244
- DiPaola, M.F. & Hoy, W.K. (2005a). School characteristics that foster organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of School Leadership*, 15, 391-410
- DiPaola, M.F. & Hoy, W.K. (2005b). Organizational citizenship of faculty and achievement of high school students. *The High School Journal*. Feb/Mar 2005, 35-44
- DiPaola, M, Tarter, C., & Hoy, W. K. (2005). Measuring organizational citizenship in schools: The OCB scale. In Wayne K. Hoy & Cecil Miskel (Eds.) *Leadership and Reform in American Public Schools*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- DiPaola, M. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in schools and its relationship to school climate. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 424-447
- Earley, P. C, & Lind, E. A. (1987). Procedural justice and participation in task selection: The role of control in mediating justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1148-1160.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Geist, J., & Hoy, W. K. (2004). Cultivating a culture of trust: Enabling school structure, teacher professionalism, and academic press. *Leading and Managing*, 10, 1-18.
- Goddard, R.D. (2002). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the measurement of collective efficacy: The development of a short form. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(1), 97-110

- Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). Reactions to procedural injustice in payment distributions: Do the means justify the ends? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 55-61.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 561-568.
- Greenberg, J. (1990a). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational justice. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a worksite smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 288-297.
- Greenberg, J. (1996). *The quest for justice on the job*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greenberg, J., & Lind, E.A. (2000). The pursuit of organizational justice: From conceptualization to implication to application. In C.L. Cooper & E.W. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Herriott, R.E., & Firestone, W. A. (1984). Two images of schools as organizations: A refinement and elaboration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20 (4), 41-57.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its elementary forms*. London: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Hoy, W. K. (2003). An analysis of enabling and mindful school structures. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(1), 87-107.
- Hoy, W. K., & Forsyth, P. (1986). *Effective supervision: Theory into practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hoy, W. K., Hannum, J., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). Organizational climate and student achievement: A parsimonious and longitudinal view. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(4), 336-359.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (1996). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice, 5th edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice, 9th edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A., & Sweetland, S.R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49
- Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2000). School bureaucracies that work: Enabling, not coercive. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, 525-541
- Hoy, W.K. & Sweetland, S.R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37, 29-321
- Hoy, W.K. & Tarter, C.J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Hoy, W.K. & Tarter, C.J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: No justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 18, 250-259.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425-446.
- 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.G. Miskel (Eds.), *Studies in leading and organizing schools* (pp. 181-208) Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Katz, D. (1964). Motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9, 131-146
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Kensler, L. A. W. (2010). Designing democratic community for social justice. *International Journal of Urban Educational Leadership*, 4, 1-21
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Leventhal, G.S., Karuza, J., & Fry, W.R. (1980). Beyond fairness: A theory of allocation of preferences. In G. Mikula (Ed.), *Justice and social interaction*. New York: Springer-Verlag Press
- McNeely, B.L. and Meglino, B.M. (1994). The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79 (6), 836-844.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The structuring of organizations: A synthesis of the research*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall

- Miskel, C.G., Feverly, P., & Stewart, J. (1979). Organizational structures and processes, perceived school effectiveness, loyalty, and job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15 (3), 97-118
- Mitchell, R.M., & Tarter, C.J. (2016). A path analysis of the effects of principal professional orientation towards leadership, professional teacher behavior, and school academic optimism on school reading achievement. *Societies*, 6 (5), 1-11
- Moore, J.E., & Love, M.S. (2005). IT professionals as organizational citizens. *Communications of the ACM*, 48(6), 88-93
- Moorman, R. H. & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16,127-142.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-227
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA
- Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (Eds.), (2002). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). Understanding employee job satisfaction: The importance of procedural and distributive justice. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 12 (4), 493-503.
- Sinden, J. E., Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2004). An analysis of enabling school structure: Theoretical, empirical, and research considerations. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 462-478.
- Skarlicki, D., & Latham, G. (1995). Organizational citizenship behavior and performance in a university setting. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 12,175-181.

- Smith, P.A., Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S.R. (2001), Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership, 11*, 135-151.
- Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.
- Somech, A., & Bogler, R. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of teacher organizational and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*, 555-577.
- Sun, J.-P. & Leithwood, K. (2015). Leadership for improving student learning: A school improvement framework. Invited chapter in Rice, R. (Ed.) *The Alabama Instructional Leadership Handbook*, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Sweetland, S.R. (2001). Authenticity and sense of power in enabling school structures: An empirical analysis. *Education, 121* (3)
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Education Administration Quarterly, 45*, 217–247.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 202-248.
- Wagner, C.A., & DiPaola, M.F. (2011). Academic optimism of high school teachers: Its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership, 21*, 893-926
- Walumbwa, F.O., Hartnell, C.A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 517-529.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. Henderson, A. M., and Parsons, T. (trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, S., Pitre, R., Zainuba, M. (2002). Justice and organizational citizenship behavior intentions: Fair rewards versus fair treatment. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(1), 33–44.

APPENDIX A:
ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR SCALE

OCB-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 help students on their own time	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers waste a lot of class time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Teachers volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Teachers give colleagues advanced notice of changes in schedule or routine.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busy work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Teacher committees in this school work productively.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(Copyright© DiPaola & Hoy, 2004)

APPENDIX B:
ORGANIZATIONAL JUSTICE SCALE

OJS

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. The principal's behavior is consistent.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Students in this school are treated fairly.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The principal does not play favorites.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. The principal treats everyone with respect and dignity.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. There is no preferential treatment in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. The principal is this school is fair to everyone.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Educators in this school follow courses of action that are generally free of self interest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. The principal adheres to high ethical standards.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Teachers are involved in decisions that affect them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Teachers are treated fairly in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(Copyright© Hoy, 2004)

APPENDIX C:
ENABLING SCHOOL STRUCTURE FORM

Form ESS

Directions: The following statements are descriptions of the way your school is structured. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes behavior in your school from **never** to **always**.

	Never	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly Often	Always
1. Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communication between teachers and administrators.	①	②	③	④	⑤
2. In this school red tape is problem.	①	②	③	④	⑤
3. The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their job.	①	②	③	④	⑤
4. The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement.	①	②	③	④	⑤
5. Administrative rules help rather than hinder.	①	②	③	④	⑤
6. The administrative hierarchy of this school facilitates the mission of this school.	①	②	③	④	⑤
7. Administrative rules in this school are used to punish teachers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
8. The administrative hierarchy of this school obstructs innovation.	①	②	③	④	⑤
9. Administrative rules in this school are substitutes for professional judgment.	①	②	③	④	⑤
10. Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures.	①	②	③	④	⑤
11. In this school the authority of the principal is used to undermine teachers.	①	②	③	④	⑤
12. The administrators in this school use their authority to enable teachers to do their job.	①	②	③	④	⑤

(Copyright© Hoy, 2003)

APPENDIX D:

SCRIPT READ TO TEACHERS BEFORE SURVEY DISTRIBUTION

SCRIPT TO BE READ TO TEACHERS

The University of Alabama is conducting research on the causes and consequences of school climate and school culture especially as related to children's success in school. This important work can help improve public schools in Alabama. Your school has been selected as one of the schools in this study. Your school system and principal have given us permission to seek your cooperation and we genuinely need your help. Participation will take only a few moments of your time. Participation is on a voluntary basis. I will hand you a consent form with contact information of the researchers and university personnel to contact in case you have questions. You will not be required to sign the consent form as a way of protecting your confidentiality. No one at the school will be shown your responses. When you are finished I will place your survey in an envelope. Please do not put your name on the survey. Thank you, most sincerely, for your help. We know you share our belief that Alabama's schools should be the best they can be.

APPENDIX E:

TEACHER INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Teacher Informed Consent Form

You have been invited to take part in a research study to learn more about the effects of trust and efficacy on student academic performance and identification with school. This study will be conducted by Dr. Roxanne Mitchell – Assistant Professor – Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Technology Studies at The University of Alabama as a part of her continued research.

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

1. Complete a survey on various aspects of your schools climate and 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 the causes and consequences of school trustworthiness on student academic performance and identification with school.

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 her 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 Dr. Roxanne Mitchell at 205-348-0348 or rmmitchell@ua.edu or at The University of Alabama, P.O Box 870302, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 35487.

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.

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA IRB
CONSENT FORM APPROVED: 5/11/11
EXPIRATION DATE: 5/30/12

APPENDIX F:
IRB APPROVAL LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA | Office of the Vice President for
Research & Economic Development
Office for Research Compliance

May 1, 2017

Roxanne Mitchell, Ed.D.
ELPTS
College of Education
Box 870302

Re: IRB#: 17-OR-157 "Rigatoni Study"

Dear Dr. Mitchell:

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

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies

Your application will expire on April 30, 2018. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Request for Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent form to obtain consent from your participants.

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

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,


Carpantano T. Myles, MSM, CIM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer

358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066