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ABSTRACT

Research suggests organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are related to principal trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Forsyth & Adams, 2010; Forsyth, Adams, & Hoy, 2011) and to collegial trust (Dipaola & Hoy 2005). Leader supportiveness is an antecedent of OCBs(Organ & Ryan, 1995). This study sought to connect a specific leader behavior, delegated decision making (DDM), to OCB.

This study tested the relationship of OCBs to principal trust and collegial trust, and DDM. Two research questions guided the study:

1. What is the relationship between OCB, principal trust, collegial trust, and DDM?
2. Do DDM, principal trust, and collegial trust individually and collectively explain OCB?

The data were collected via a convenience sample during regularly scheduled faculty meetings at 60 elementary schools in Northwest Alabama. FRL served as a proxy for SES. The unit of analysis was the school.

DDM and OCBs were not related ($r = .13, p < .01$). The Pearson correlation between DDM and trust in the principal and in colleagues was not statistically significant. Trust in the principal and trust in colleagues were related ($r = .50, p < .01$). Trust in the principal and OCBs were related ($r = .44, p < .01$), as well as trust in colleagues and OCBs ($r = .51, p < .01$). The relationship of SES to DDM was not significant.

OCB was regressed on DDM and trust in the principal and colleagues, while controlling for SES. The predictors explained 32% of the variance for DDM and trust in principal and trust in colleagues. Trust in the principal ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) and trust in colleagues ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) were both found to be good predictors of OCB. DDM ($\beta = .20, p = .08$) and SES ($\beta = .13, p = .26$) were not found to be good predictors for OCB.
The current study confirms prior research proposing a relationship between trust in the principal and colleagues, as well their relationship with OCB. DDM did not predict OCB in the study; however, a replication of the study may be worthwhile.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The current study examined three facets of school climate: the propensity of principals for delegated decision making and faculty trust as they jointly and individually contribute to an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviors. In this chapter, the background for the study is presented, the need and purpose clearly outlined, and key concepts and terms are defined. Finally, the research questions guiding this empirical study are stated and the limitations are specified.

Background of the Study

Schools are both formal and informal organizations. Organizations are formalized to the extent that rules governing behavior are precisely and explicitly formulated and also to the extent that roles and relations are prescribed independently of the personal attributes of the individuals occupying positions in the structure (Scott, 1992). This formalization is an attempt to make behavior more predictable by standardizing and regulating it. A formalized role system has rules that define the expected interdependent behavior. In these organizations, the rules are explicitly formulated and sanctions are employed to enforce these rules (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Routinized and regularized behavior and output is desirable in an industrial setting. In schools, routines and standards are necessary, but not sufficient for the organization to accomplish its primary mission of student learning.
The informal structure within school organization describes the way the people in the system interact, make decisions of their own, and cooperate among themselves (Katz & Kahn, 1966). Every organization develops its own pattern of communication, interaction, and informal norms to meet the needs of its members. According to Katz and Kahn (1966), a continuing problem for organizational theory and practice is how to direct the motivation and enthusiasm of informal groupings toward the core task of the organization. One possible resource for a solution may be found in the work of social exchange theory.

Emerson (1976) described the flow of valued behavior between individuals as inherently reciprocal. According to Emerson (1976), the basic conceptions of social exchange theory included the following ideas:

1. **Rewards** are virtually synonymous with positive reinforcement, but have the added connotation of being socially administered.
2. A **resource** is an ability, possession, or other attribute of a person that gives him the capacity to reward or punish another person.
3. **Value** is the magnitude of reinforcement affected by a unit of stimulus.

The frame of reference of social exchange theory describes the movement of valued things through social process. This study examined aspects of school culture and leadership to determine if there is a relationship between certain leadership traits of principals and the informal social norms of the school organization.

**Problem Statement and Purpose of the Study**

“Working to the rules” is not a recipe for success. The phrase paints a picture of the employee who measures action strictly by doing what is required. “Working to the rules” is mediocre, average, or even minimal. A better slogan might be “Do your part and a little more.”
This concept of extra effort is the basic premise behind the idea of organizational citizenship. Organ’s (1988) definition of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) described individual behavior that was discretionary, not directly or explicitly determined by the formal reward system, and that, ultimately, promoted the effective functioning of the organization. DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) stated,

> Teachers in well-functioning schools go well beyond the minimum expectations of formal job descriptions every day. School organizations count on teachers doing so and could not achieve their goals if teachers limited their contributions only to those specified in their job descriptions. (p. 433)

In the school setting, organizational citizenship behavior may be illustrated by experienced teachers staying beyond regular scheduled time to assist a novice teacher in planning or arranging her classroom. During times of economic decline, OCB may be evident in staff members who work to conserve school resources such as copy paper or custodial supplies.

It is likely that trust contributes to an atmosphere in which teachers feel extra work is recognized and valued. According to Forsyth et al. (2011), trust is the keystone of successful interpersonal relationships, leadership, cooperation, and effective organizations. Trust (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985) is the generalized expectancy that the word or statement of another person or group can be relied upon. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) elaborated on trust, describing it as a person’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other person is benevolent, reliable, competent, open, and honest. The latter definition of trust will be used in this study. Trust is built over time and may be positively related to OCB (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). It would appear that trust is related to OCB, because the two concepts share common antecedents. Supportive principal behavior has been shown to strengthen faculty trust (Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989) in the principal. Supportive leader
behavior has also demonstrated significant and positive relationship with OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

When administrators delegate decisions to teachers, they invite the teachers to expand their formal role and by the trust implicit in the invitation, they tell the teachers they are trusted. Trust relationships are based on interdependence. The goals of one party cannot be achieved without relying on another group or individual (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998).

Leaders’ actions demonstrate their support for teachers. Delegating decisions to teachers may be one way that principals exhibit supportive leader behavior. Leader supportiveness has been shown to affect OCB indirectly through its effect on job satisfaction (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). The act of delegation affirms the principal’s respect for the professional competence of the teacher, creating an interdependent relationship between the two parties. Over time, supportive principal leadership may influence faculty trust in the principal (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). Trust in the principal makes teacher cooperation more likely and it elicits citizenship behaviors from teachers (Forsyth et al., 2011). This study tested delegated decision making as an independent variable predicting organizational citizenship behaviors.

The purpose of the study was to fill in the gaps in the literature in order to determine if a relationship exists between the organizational characteristics of faculty trust in the principal and in colleagues, the propensity of leaders to delegate decisions and citizenship behaviors. The effect of delegated decision-making practices and trust on OCB is not known; however, this study proposed that organizational citizenship will be explained by delegated decision making and trust. If principals can grow organizational citizenship behaviors through delegating decisions to teachers or other practical means for building trust, both the principal and the school organization will benefit.
Definition of Concepts

*Shared decision-making practices:* a broad term often used to refer to some form of joint or consultative decision making or to the process of delegating specific decisions to subordinates (Hoy & Sousa, 1984).

*Delegated decision making:* the entrusting of authority to others; the administrator assigns specific decisions to other members of the organizations (Hoy & Sousa, 1984). Propensity to delegate will be operationalized using the 10 decision questions revised by Hoy and Sousa as adopted from the Aston approach developed by Pugh and Hickson (1976), and listed in their delegation study (Hoy & Sousa, 1984).

*Trust:* a person’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based upon the confidence that the other party is benevolent, reliable, competent, open, and honest (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Operationally, trust will be defined using the Omnibus Trust Scale.

*Faculty trust in the principal:* the faculty has confidence that the principal will keep his or her word and act in the best interests of the teachers (Forsyth et al., 2011). Operationally, faculty trust in the principal will be defined using the Omnibus Trust Scale.

*Faculty trust in colleagues:* the faculty believes teachers can depend on each other in difficult situations and rely on the integrity of their colleagues (Forsyth et al., 2011). Operationally, faculty trust in colleagues will be defined using the Omnibus Trust Scale.

*Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB):* Organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors that are directed toward helping others or toward achieving organizational goals (DiPaola & Tchannon-Moran, 2001). Organizational citizenship behavior will be operationalized using the OCB Scale (DiPaola & Hoy, 2004).
Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between organizational citizenship, trust in the principal, trust in colleagues, and delegated decision making?

2. Do delegated decision making, trust in the principal, and trust in colleagues individually and collectively explain organizational citizenship?

Limitations

Data for this study were collected through surveys administered to elementary school teachers in north Alabama. The survey instruments chosen for this investigation have shown in previous studies to be valid and reliable measures of the constructs to be tested. A potential limitation occurs if the measures are not reliable and valid for this sample. This study assumes that teachers will give honest responses to survey questions.

This study was limited to elementary schools in North Alabama that comprised at least Grades kindergarten through 6 for the purposes of obtaining common student achievement data. The schools in the sample were taken from a group of school districts that consented to participate in this study. The sample for this study was not random and caution should be used when generalizing the results.

Summary

It has been suggested that the leader’s supportive behaviors can indirectly affect OCB through its effect on job satisfaction (Smith et al., 1983). This study explored how a specific behavior (i.e., delegating decision making) is related to OCB within the school organization. If these behaviors contribute to building faculty trust in the principal, this study proposed the concepts of delegating decision making, trust, and OCB are related. This proposal was tested using a sample of Alabama elementary schools.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will present the research history of organizational citizenship behaviors, trust, and delegated decision making. A theory describing how these concepts work together will be proposed. Finally, hypotheses will be derived to test the theoretical explanation.

Conceptual Framework

This study examined three constructs, organizational citizenship behaviors, collective trust, and delegated decision-making practices. It is proposed that delegated decision-making practices of the principal, as well as faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues, will have a positive effect on the organizational citizenship practices of the teachers in the school.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Early research. The notion of citizenship behaviors evolved from the work of Chester Barnard (1938) and his concept of an employee’s “willingness to cooperate” in organizations. The chief gains attained by participating in cooperative situations are social, that is, the result of personal interactions (Barnard, 1938).

Over a half century ago, Katz (1964) identified three basic types of behavior necessary for a functioning organization: (1) People must be persuaded to enter and remain within the organization. (2) They must carry out specific roles in a dependable fashion. (3) There must be resourceful and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role requirements. Spontaneous response
and activity beyond role requirements is critical in organizations, but particularly in schools. “Working to rule” is a tactic sometimes employed by teacher unions to punish school districts when contract negotiations have come to an impasse. In such instances, teachers may strictly adhere to “time on the clock” and arrive and leave at the mandatory times. Most schools depend on teachers performing morning and afternoon duties, which are generally accepted by teachers as part of their jobs, even though these duties may not be specified in job contracts. Although an extreme measure, it quickly demonstrates how crucial goodwill and working beyond minimum specifications are to the well-being and smooth functioning of school organizations (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

Katz and Kahn (1966) described a contrast between object molding and “people molding.” Organizations concerned primarily with the manufacture of physical products must recognize additional considerations when processing “social objects.” There must be a considerable area of discretionary power within these system roles. Cooperation is also essential in successful social organizations. Smith et al. (1983), noted cooperation referred to acts that included the day-to-day spontaneous social gestures of individual accommodation to the work needs of others. Katz and Kahn (1966) argued that any organization in which cooperation is so restricted so that employees only perform prescribed duties is doomed to failure.

Dennis Organ. Organ (1983) was the first to use the phrase organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) to refer to behavior of employees that was beneficial to the organization and to others that was not prescribed but occurred freely to assist others in achieving the desired task. OCB includes any of the gestures that promote the smooth working of the organization, but are not inherent in the notion of task performance. These behaviors include helping a co-worker in a work-related problem, accepting orders without argument, tolerating temporary impositions
without complaint, keeping the work area clean and neat, making timely and positive statements about the work unit or its leader to outsiders, and protecting and conserving organizational resources (Bateman & Organ, 1983).

The first empirical studies of OCB were published in 1983 (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). Those two studies tested the prediction that there was a relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. Both studies confirmed the relationship. The statistical relationship between job satisfaction and citizenship behaviors were considerably stronger than those reported between satisfaction and job performance (Bateman & Organ, 1983). One explanation may be because the citizenship behaviors of interest in the research generally represent actions that are more under the control of the workers than traditional productivity measures. Bateman and Organ (1983) proposed that supportive supervision elicits organizational citizenship behaviors, independently of its effect on job satisfaction.

The goal of a study of 422 employees and their supervisors from 58 departments of two banks was to detail the nature and predictors of citizenship behavior. Results indicated OCB to have two dimensions: altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism is voluntary behavior in a manner to help another specific individual. Assisting a fellow employee with a task in which they have sought help would be an example of altruistic behavior. Organizational characteristics of job satisfaction and educational level of employees were found to have significant and direct effects on altruism. Much of what is known as citizenship behavior has an altruistic character. Leader supportiveness was another organizational characteristic found to indirectly affect altruism through job satisfaction and directly affect generalized compliance (Smith et al., 1983).

Bateman and Organ (1983) predicted OCBs were related to job satisfaction. Their work drew upon social exchange theory (Blau, 1964, Emerson, 1976), arguing that given certain
conditions, people seek to reciprocate those who benefit them. In their study, data were obtained from a sample of employees in a major Midwestern state university. Those surveyed help a wide variety of jobs in non-academic administrative departments, including data programmers, loan collectors, student counselors, fund raisers, accountants, and other professional, supervisory, and technical positions. Citizenship behavior was measured using responses from each subject’s immediate supervisor on 30 seven-point items. The items examined a variety of behaviors such as compliance, altruism, dependability, housecleaning, complaints, waste, cooperation, criticism of and arguing with others, and punctuality. The results suggested that job satisfaction is strongly and positively related to a citizenship dimension of role performance.

A meta-analysis of over 55 studies supported the same relationship between job satisfaction and OCBs (Organ & Ryan, 1995). If attitude and morale factors such as job satisfaction relate more strongly to citizenship behaviors than to job performance, then it is all the more important that human resource management programs monitor, maintain, and seek opportunities to improve job attitudes (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Early studies erroneously proposed that job satisfaction caused productivity, a proposition that Bateman and Organ (1983) described as “naïve folk wisdom.” Teachers operate within two control systems in schools, the formal authority (i.e., the bureaucracy), and the informal authority of the education profession. Teachers require a degree of autonomy due to the dynamic nature of schools and individual classrooms. It would be valuable to learn if principal behavior can influence the professional authority used by teachers. Analyzing the relationship between job satisfaction and OCBs may assist principals in connecting with the informal authority network of teachers.

*DiPaola and organizational citizenship.* Job satisfaction has been found to be related to OCB. Employees who are willing to carry out tasks beyond their prescribed roles ultimately
permit management more free time to devote to other important organizational tasks. Generalized compliance describes action of a person along the lines of what is considered moral and proper for the best interest of organizational functioning. The concept appears akin to compliance with internalized norms defining “what a good employee should do.” Proper use of time in the workplace is an example of generalized compliance (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005b; Smith, et al, 1983).

Schools, in particular, rely heavily on the dedication of its employees to perform extra-role behaviors in order to meet the continually increasing demands of the administration. Professionals in schools regularly exhibit behaviors directed toward helping individuals, including students, parents, and colleagues, as part of their professional identity (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). The formal organization of teachers and other subordinates defines duties relevant to their positions; however, there is an important source of authority in the informal organization of teachers. Principals should find ways to tap this informal authority network (Hoy & Sousa, 1984). Katz and Kahn (1966) noted the numerous occasions in which organizations would benefit from employees routinely offering gestures outside the prescribed or required duties of subordinates. These supra-role behaviors cannot be prescribed by role descriptions and required in advance for a given job. They noted that these behaviors “lubricated the social machinery” of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Other researchers. Organizational citizenship behavior is ascribed initially to behaviors that exceed administrative expectations; however, more and more these behaviors are deemed to be part of managerial expectations for acceptable job performance (Forsyth et al., 2011). The very nature of schools as service organizations implies altruistic behaviors directed toward clients and colleagues in the accomplishment of the fundamental mission of the organization.
Forsyth et al. (2011) asserted that collective trust in the leader affects task performance directly as well as indirectly through employee OCB. There is also evidence that collective trust in colleagues is strongly and positively related to the emergence of OCBs (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). Data from that same study were consistent with others demonstrating that collective trust in the principal is positively related to OCBs (Podsakoff et al., 2000). For teachers, OCBs were enhanced by leader behaviors and the trust that individuals as well as the group have for leaders (Forsyth et al., 2011).

Podsakoff et al. (2000) elaborated on earlier work and organized OCBs in seven categories and defined the behaviors as follows:

1. **Helping behaviors** include generously helping others or preventing work task-related problems.

2. **Sportsmanship** involves accepting inconveniences without complaint (Organ, 1990). Workers demonstrating sportsmanship are not offended when others do not accept their suggestions, do not take rejection of their ideas personally, and put personal interests secondary to the interest of the group.

3. **Organizational loyalty** includes promoting, protecting and defending the organization and remaining committed to it.

4. **Organizational compliance** refers to a person’s acceptance and adherence to rules and procedures, even when compliance is not monitored.

5. **Individual initiative** includes innovation used to improve the individual’s or the organization’s performance, as well as enthusiasm for the job, volunteering to accept additional responsibilities, and encouraging of others to as well.
6. *Civic virtue* describes an individual’s commitment to the organization as a whole and a willingness to participate in governance or contribute to organizational decisions.

7. *Self-development* describes an individual’s willingness to improve his work-related knowledge and skill.

The most frequently investigated antecedents of OCBs are those categorized in a generalized “morale” factor, including variables Organ and Ryan (1995) thought undergird attitudes such as employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceptions of leader supportiveness. All demonstrated significant relationships with citizenship behaviors of comparable strength (Podsakoff et al., 2000).

The work of schools has both unpredictable and interdependent elements. The dynamic nature of teaching requires a measure of teacher autonomy. Responding to the needs of individual learners is difficult, if not impossible, to monitor or evaluate easily by simple means such as observations. Ideally, teachers are treated professionally, and are allowed to practice their craft with a great deal of independence. Organizational citizenship behavior is vital under these circumstances. When present, OCBs substituted for close managerial supervision and organizational formalization (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Not only does citizenship behavior support and often substitute for performance monitoring, but it is also a vehicle for developing successful schools through its support of risk taking, flexibility, creativity, and reflective teacher response to students (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

DaPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001) supported the notion that the type of organizational setting determined what constitutes OCB. In the school setting, behaviors directed at helping individuals were routinely observed as part of employees’ professional identity. Helping others also furthered organizational goals; hence, the behaviors contributing to
organizational citizenship collapsed into a single, bi-polar construct in the researchers’ study (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Their findings will be used to develop the definition for OCB in this investigation. Principals may find their own jobs easier and have extra time for more substantive tasks in organizations with high levels of citizenship behavior.

A study of 3,000 companies, performed by researchers at the University of Pennsylvania, found that spending 10% of revenue on capital improvements advanced productivity by 3.9%. A similar investment in human capital increased productivity by 8.5%, or more than twice as much (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005). If principals invest in human resources and relations by delegating decision-making authority, it appears that this behavior may yield OCB as a result. Principals who delegate decisions to teachers demonstrate a trust in the teachers that could prove reciprocal (Hoy & Sousa, 1984). This study proposes organizational citizenship is likely fostered by trust and delegated decision making.

**Trust**

The study of trust has been extensive. Scholars and practitioners widely acknowledge the importance of trust. Trust is a key element to positive interpersonal relationships in various settings (e.g. Fox, 1974; Kotter, 1990; Likert, 1967) because it is central to how we interact with others (Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975).

In an early line of trust research, Deutsch (1962) used the term when referring to cooperation within groups. Rotter (1967) defined trust as the expectancy held by someone that the word, promise, or written statement of someone could be relied upon. Rotter created the Interpersonal Trust Scale (ITS) to measure his definition of trust. The scale consisted of 25 Likert-type, self-report items designed to measure a person’s generalized expectancy that the
promises of other individuals or groups can be relied upon. He conceived trust as the extent to which people are willing to rely upon others to make themselves vulnerable to others.

Initial studies of trust and mistrust emerged during the mid-20th century. Some early studies were based on game theory where the motive to trust and cooperate would have mutual benefits for the players. According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), the conceptualization of trust occurred to some extent because of the rising tensions associated with the Cold War. As society began to question government and authority in the 1960s, focus moved to trust as a personality trait. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) noted that trust scholarship eventually progressed to interpersonal relationships in the 1980s and emerged as a subject of study in sociology, organizational science, and economics during the 1990s. Society was motivated to find ways to increase productivity and efficiency, which eventually channeled to a focus on the organizational trust in schools (Hoy & Tchannen-Moran, 1999).

**Trust in schools.** This study focused on trust as it relates to schools. Thus, the following section of the literature review will pertain to faculty trust in the educational setting. Blumberg, Greenfield, and Nason (1978) conducted research on trust between teachers and principals. Besides clarifying the meaning of trust, the researchers sought to better describe the substance of trust between teachers and their relationships with their principals. They surveyed 85 teachers engaged in graduate study. The teachers were asked to respond, in writing, to the meaning of the statement, “I trust my principal.” A total of 179 statements resulted from this procedure. When the responses were sorted, 10 separate categories or meanings that teachers attached to the trust relationship between the teachers and their principals emerged.

The researchers then constructed a questionnaire in which the meaning of each of the 10 categories was described. The questionnaire had two major sections. The first section asked the
respondents to order the dimensions of trust they felt most important in the maintenance of an acceptable relationship with their principal. Secondly, the respondents were asked to characterize, on a 5-point rating scale, their principal’s behavior in terms of the degree of emphasis he placed on each trust dimension. The scale ranged from No emphasis to Very heavy emphasis. Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate one trust dimension they felt their principal had most difficulty performing.

The ranking revealed the most important dimensions of trust identified by the teachers related to professional role expectations. These included, in rank order, credibility, support, fairness, participative decision making, professional openness, interpersonal openness, technical competence, personal warmth, confidentiality, and follow-through. The surveys revealed teacher perception of principal’s emphasis to be ranked (most to least): support, confidentiality, technical competence, follow-through, professional openness, fairness, credibility, interpersonal openness, personal warmth, and participative decision making. Teachers perceived principals have the most difficulty with credibility and participative decision making. It would appear the qualities teachers want most are difficult for principals to possess. A striking negative correlation was revealed when the two survey rankings were correlated with the ranking of trust behaviors in terms of difficulty of enactment, as perceived by teachers. In each case, the correlation was negative ($R = -.15, p < .01$).

Principals’ actions play a major role in the establishment and maintenance of faculty trust in the principal. Their day-to-day management of school affairs, and the consistency of their words and actions, helps principals to build trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Principals who wish to be trusted by their teachers should extend trust by openly sharing information, by sharing the
decision-making process, and by sharing their power through delegation of decisions to teachers without micromanagement (Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

**Two views on trust.** Two sets of researchers have emerged over the past three decades who are persistent in their study of trust as it relates to school organizations. Bryk and Schneider (2002), from the University of Chicago, have performed longitudinal quantitative and qualitative studies. These studies viewed trust as a product of everyday individual and group interactions. They found these interpersonal relationships can become part of the school culture. Hoy and colleagues from Ohio State University have conducted empirical studies of trust from a climate perspective made up of specific characteristics that can be measured. The work of Bryk and Schneider carries its own merit; however, this study will draw from the conceptual framework and the development of trust scales from Hoy and colleagues.

According to Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), “Trust is an individual’s or group’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open” (p. 189). The five facets of trust are consistent throughout the literature (Forsyth et al., 2011; Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, 2003).

Perhaps the most familiar facet of trust is *benevolence*, defined as the confidence one will not be harmed by a trusted party. Vulnerabilities will not be exploited and there is an attitude of mutual concern. Benevolence implies that one can count on the good will of another person to act in his best interest. According to Baier (1986), benevolence is the most common form of trust. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (2003) emphasize the importance of benevolence in interpersonal relationships because of the significance of mutual goodwill in building an attitude of trust.
Reliability is the confidence that others will be consistent in their actions. Reliability is important in relationships because this behavior occurs over time; it is not an immediate attribute. It must be built as people consistently perform as expected over time. Predictability, however, in and of itself, is unsatisfying as a condition of trust (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). We can trust a person to be consistently late, or we can count on someone to be invariably dishonest, rude, or selfish. Reliability combines a sense of predictability with benevolence. In schools, where interdependence requires action from another person or group, the reliable person or group can supply it.

Competence is the ability to perform as expected or to have the skills to complete the task at hand. Teachers are professionally trained for their roles in schools. They tend to resent lock-step, one-size-fits-all curricula designed to “teacher-proof” the work of schools. These actions are viewed as assaults on their professional status and training (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008).

Honesty is another important facet of trust. Honesty speaks to the integrity of a person and the authenticity of behavior. In order to build trust, one must be able to rely on the word or actions of another. Likewise, accepting responsibility for one’s actions and not shifting blame is another component of honesty (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Many researchers and scholars see honesty as a critical factor of trust (Baier, 1986, Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

The last facet of trust is openness. Openness is the extent to which relevant information is shared and not withheld. Typically, people who withhold information breed distrust because others become suspicious of what they are hiding (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). Openness also includes transparency in decisions and sharing of control (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

In order to be viewed as trustworthy, a leader must demonstrate the five facets of trust (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Because of the interdependence necessary for school organizations
to accomplish their goal of student learning, schools are the perfect laboratory in which to study the effects of trust. Faculty trust appears to be the most frequently studied form of collective trust (Forsyth et al., 2011). This study focused on faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues.

*Hoy and Kupersmith.* Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) defined trust as “a generalized expectancy held by the work group that the word, promise, and written or oral statement of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon” (p. 2). The researchers developed an instrument for the measure of trust. Referred to as Trust Scales (T-Scales), the instrument was based on the earlier work of Rotter (1967) and Golembiewski and McConkie (1975). The T-Scale instrument had seven items used to measure three referents: faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in the school district. The initial research associated trust with principal authenticity as measured by the Leader Authenticity Scale. The concept of authenticity referred to behaviors of the principal. These behaviors included the ability of the principal to admit mistakes, to demonstrate non-bureaucratic behaviors, and to avoid manipulating other people. The results of their research indicated that all three dimensions of trust were related to each other. Furthermore, the results indicated that authentic principal behaviors lead to teacher trust in the principal and in the organization.

*Hoy, Tarter, and Wiskowskie.* Several studies have focused on the importance of trust in the principal, climate, and school effectiveness. One early study by Hoy, Tarter, and Wiskowskie (1992) examined the relationship of teacher trust in the principal and school effectiveness. Their study was influenced by the management theory Z of Ouchi (1981). They explored the relationships of the teachers’ trust in the principal and in colleagues, and the connection between trust, leadership, and effectiveness.
Hoy, et al (1992), developed five hypotheses that were supported in their study:

H1: Supportive principal behavior is related to trust.

H2: Supportive principal behavior is related to effectiveness.

H3: Collegial teacher behavior is related to effectiveness.

H4: Trust in one’s colleagues is related to effectiveness.

H5: Trust in the principal is related to effectiveness.

In the study, Hoy and colleagues sampled 44 elementary schools in New Jersey using the OCDQ-RE to measure leader supportiveness and faculty collegiality, T-Scales developed by Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) to measure trust in the principal and trust in colleagues, and an 8-item instrument used to measure perceived effectiveness. The results supported all hypotheses except the last, which found that trust in the principal is related to effectiveness. Conclusions found supportive leadership promotes teacher collegiality and trust in the principal but does not support trust in colleagues or effectiveness. It was noted that teacher collegiality and confidence in the principal supports trust in colleagues, and trust in colleagues promotes school effectiveness.

Tarter, Sabo, and Hoy. Teacher trust in the principal and in colleagues has been linked to effectiveness of schools (Hoy et al., 1992; Tarter et al., 1995). In 1995, Tarter et al. replicated this study in 87 New Jersey middle schools. Unlike the first study, their results supported effectiveness was related to faculty trust in the principal. Supportive leadership was related to both faculty trust in the principal and school effectiveness. Also, strong connections were found between collegial behavior, faculty trust in colleagues, and effectiveness. Though the two referents of trust are on independent paths toward school effectiveness, the study suggests the culture of trust is a powerful indicator to make schools successful.
Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran. Recognizing the intricacies of appraising school effectiveness, Hoy and Miskel (1982, 1991, 1996) proposed a synthesis of two commonly applied models, the goal model and the systems model. Within the goal model, schools are effective to the degree that they achieve their established goals. The systems model describes individual actors and the organic nature of the organizations in which they function. Hoy and Miskel recognized these two models as complementary; behavior within each model was defined either as explicitly or implicitly goal directed. Uline, Miller, and Tschannen-Moran sought to further the Hoy-Miskel (1982) model by further examining fundamental dimensions of the model. Hoy and Ferguson (1985) adapted Parson’s and Etzioni’s ideas into instrumental activities and expressive activities.

Uline et al. (1998) tested the relationships posed in the study with a sample of 86 middle schools, surveying 2,777 teachers in the state of New Jersey. The teachers were given the Organizational Heath Inventory for Middle Schools (OHI-RM), a 45-item instrument that measures aspects of school climate. All items on the instrument are simple descriptive statements to which teachers indicate the extent that each statement characterizes their school. The 4-point Likert-type scale ranges from rarely occurs to very frequently occurs. Two trust scales used in this study, developed by Hoy and Kupersmith (1985), are each composed of seven items that assess faculty trust in the principal and in colleagues along a 6-point Likert-type scale. Sample items for these scales include the following: “The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal; the principal takes unfair advantage of teachers in this school” and “Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other,” “teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.”
All of the instrumental and expressive variables were significantly correlated with perceived overall effectiveness (ranging from $r = .56$ to $r = .72$, $p < .01$). The expressive measures were more varied with teacher trust in colleagues as most highly correlated with effectiveness ($r = .72$, $p < .01$); however, teacher trust in the principal had the lowest association with effectiveness ($r = .56$, $p < .01$). Each of the six individual measures (teacher trust in colleagues, teacher trust in the principal, school health, and achievement in reading, math, and writing) were substantially and significantly related to effectiveness. As a group, the six independent measures explained almost three-quarters of the variance of effectiveness. Consistent with the literature (Hoy & Miskel, 1982), the model testing the significance of both instrumental and expressive activities as necessary elements of effectiveness was strongly supported.

*Hoy, Tarter, and Hoy: Academic optimism.* In their search to find organizational properties that contributed to the achievement of students in schools, Hoy, Tarter, and Hoy (2006) developed the concept of academic optimism. The researchers chose three organizational properties to comprise this construct: academic emphasis, collective efficacy and faculty trust.

Research has demonstrated that these three properties are emergent group-level attributes rather than simply the sum of teachers’ perceived personal attributes (Bandura, 1986, 1997). The researchers suggested academic optimism is powerful because it shapes group norms and sets behavioral expectations. When faculties have strong group norms that support teachers’ trust and work with parents, the group will strive for cooperation and collaboration (Hoy et al., 2006).

The relationships among the three dimensions of academic optimism can be seen as a set of interactions among the variables, with each element dependent upon the other. Collective trust in parents and students encourages a sense of collective efficacy; collective efficacy complements and reinforces trust. Similarly, when teachers trust parents, they can insist on
higher academic performance with the knowledge they will be supported and not undermined by the parents. High academic standards reinforce faculty trust. Finally, when faculty believes in its ability to organize and execute actions that will have positive effects on student achievement, this leads to academic emphasis, which reinforces a strong sense of collective efficacy. The triad of properties is reciprocal, each contributing to the culture of academic optimism in the school organization. This study proposes a similar reciprocal relationship among the variables of organizational citizenship behaviors, collective trust in the principal and in colleagues, and the delegated decision-making practices of the school leader.

According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), there are a number of organizational properties that influence in organizations; they would include structures, policies, leadership, and culture (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) studied trust as a collective trait that explained the degree to which teachers, as a collective group, displayed the facets of trust. From this research, the Omnibus Trust Scale was developed. This instrument measured trust as a school characteristic that positively related collective teacher efficacy and academic achievement. The instrument rated responses along a Likert-type scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Sample items from the survey follow:

- Teachers in this school trust their students.
- Students in this school care about each other.
- Teachers think that most parents do a good job.
- Teachers can believe what parents tell them.
- Teachers in this school trust the principal.
The research that developed the Omnibus Trust Scale revealed a correlation among faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) established that schools exhibiting a high level of faculty trust in clients also exhibited higher levels of shared decision making with faculty and parents. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000) researched further by exploring the relationship of trust in schools to communication, collaboration, school climate, organizational citizenship, and abundance of rules. They hypothesized principals who display trust in teachers by allowing their collaboration in decision-making processes would also increase all aspects of trust in the school organization. This study proposes the connection of the principal’s willingness to delegate decisions to teachers as a trust-building action that produces greater faculty trust in the principal and greater faculty trust in colleagues.

**Summary.** The establishment and maintenance of trust in schools is important for many reasons. Trust has been demonstrated to have a direct effect on collective teacher efficacy and motivation (Adams & Forsyth, 2009; Forsyth et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000), as well an indirect effect on student performance (Adams & Forsyth, 2009; Goddard et al.; Hoy et al., 1992; Louis & Wahlstrom, 2011, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Collaboration between the principal and stakeholders of schools has been related to trust. Tschannen-Moran (2001) noted schools with high levels of collaboration relate to trust between the faculty and principal, trust in clients, and trust in colleagues. Collaboration among colleagues was also significantly related to trust in the principal. Collaboration with parents was related to trust in the principal as well as trust in colleagues. Instructional practice can improve as teachers share their skills and support each other. Typically, as trust levels in school increase,
it is more likely for collaboration to occur between the principal and faculty, among the faculty, and with parents on school decisions.

Trust has a mediating effect between poverty, racial composition, and student achievement (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009). Research has implicated the relationship between trust and organizational citizenship behaviors (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Podsakoff et al., 2000) through leadership actions. Trust has been shown to be associated with teacher empowerment. In schools in which the principal’s leadership is collegial, teachers demonstrate a high degree of professionalism, and there is strong internal academic press determined to be conducive to teacher empowerment. According to Sweetland and Hoy (2000), principals who trust and respect teachers are more likely to involve them in decision making. Principals who view their teachers as professionals, respect their decision making, and support them are more likely to empower the teachers.

Principals have the legitimate authority of their positions; they are able to make decisions and have power appropriate to the scope of their duties. Teachers complain about their lack of legitimate influence over the outcome of decisions (Conway, 1976). Although efforts in recent years have encouraged principals to move toward a collaborative model, teachers have not felt that their participation in the decision-making process was genuine. Delegated decision making and citizenship behaviors will not thrive in an atmosphere of distrust. Principals who do not trust their teachers will not share decision-making authority or responsibility with them (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Teachers who do not trust one another will not work together in a spirit of cooperation and citizenship.
Delegated Decision Making

Scientific research on leadership did not begin until the 20th century (Yukl, 2006). According to Bennis (1989), leadership is like beauty--hard to define, but you know it when you see it. Yukl (2002) stated the term projected romanticized images of powerful, charismatic leaders who commanded armies, built empires, or altered the courses of nations. This great man view of leadership proposed that leaders are simply born with the necessary internal characteristics such as charisma, confidence, intelligence, and social skills that made them natural-born leaders.

Halpin (1966) proposed we abandon the notion of leadership as a trait, and concentrate instead on analyzing the behavior of leaders. In his analysis, Halpin concurred with Hemphill’s and Coons’ (1957) assertion that variance in leader behavior was associated with situational variance. According to Hemphill and Coons, (1957) (p. 7). The behavior of school principals in the decision-making process will be of primary interest in this study, particularly if a relationship exists between the principal’s propensity to delegate decisions, facets of trust, and organizational citizenship.

The past half-century has yielded many types of leadership and management behaviors that are relevant and supported by empirical research in literature. Yukl and Lepsinger (2005) discussed three broad categories for organizing these behaviors:

1. Task-oriented behaviors focus on improving efficiency and process reliability.
2. Relations-oriented behaviors focus on improving human resources and relations.
3. Change-oriented behaviors focus on improving innovation and adaptation.

Yukl and Lepsinger (2005) proposed a flexible leadership model to help scholars understand the leader versus manager controversy and point to a resolution of the problem. They
proposed that arguments arise when roles are narrowly defined. They agreed with Kotter (2001), who noted overemphasizing one role will have undesirable results. The personality and the skills of the leader, the situational context, as well as the personalities and skills of the subordinates contributed to effective leadership and management (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973).

Studies in leadership and management in the mid-20th century sought to define the best pattern of leadership for effective organizations. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) explored how a modern manager can be democratic in his relations with subordinates and at the same time maintain the necessary authority and control in the organization. They proposed a continuum of leadership behavior appropriate to the situational context. Rather than a choice between two styles, authoritarian or democratic, they proposed a range of behavior.

**Decision Making As a Responsibility of Leadership**

One task common to both the leadership and management role of the principal is the responsibility of decision making. Decision making occurs in all organizations. Even across different institutions, governmental, industrial, service, or education, the process is similar. There is no single best way to make decisions. The ideal strategy is the one that best fits the circumstances (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Employee performance determinants may be influenced by certain leader behaviors. Leaders who consult with others regarding decisions and who empower their subordinates and delegate decisions improve human resources and relations (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005) Research points to the importance of employee involvement and participation in decision making (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973).

**Chester Barnard.** Barnard (1938) conducted early studies on shared decision-making practices and described making decisions as a “burdensome task.” He warned of the tendency of personnel to avoid responsibility (partly due to the fear of criticism) but that the executive must
distribute responsibility or else run the risk of being overwhelmed with the burdens of decision making. “The fine art of executive decision consists in not deciding questions that are not pertinent, in not deciding prematurely, in not making decisions that cannot be made effective, and in not making decisions that others should make” (Barnard, 1938, p.194).

Alluto and Belasco. Alluto and Belasco (1972) conducted a study of faculty employed in two school districts in Western New York State. Research site one was a small urban school district, while site two was a medium-sized rural district. Their study tested the variable “decisional participation,” which was conceptualized as the difference between the number of decisions in which an individual desires to participate and the number of decisions in which he actually participates. They characterized three conditions, decisional deprivation, equilibrium, and saturation. The researchers found that not every segment of a population was equally desirous of additional decisional participation in the organization. Their results correlated gender and number of years’ experience to be related to the individual’s desire for participation. Their results suggested more decisional saturation was reported from female teachers employed in the rural district with more years’ experience, and male teachers with fewer years’ experience reported more decisional deprivation. Individuals who desired greater decisional participation than they currently experienced (decisionally deprived) tended to perceive top administrative officials--principals and superintendents, as exercising high decisional control (Alluto & Belasco, 1972).

The effects of varying degrees of decisional involvement were most clearly observed in the group of teachers characterized as decisionally deprived. The greater the number of teachers wished to participate, but did not, (a) the greater the perceived role conflict, (b) the greater the attitudinal militancy, (c) the higher probability that the highest administrative official will be perceived as relatively influential, and (d) the greater the probability of employment in secondary
schools. Their results suggested that more participation was important for situations of decisional deprivation; however, for organization members experiencing equilibrium or saturation, increasing participation may prove dysfunctional (Alluto & Belasco, 1972).

James Conway. Conway (1976) built on the work from Alluto and Belasco (1972) and found subordinates who participated more than they desired, a condition he termed decisional saturation, were lowest in their reports of satisfaction with the organization. Thus, it is important for the leader to match the subordinates’ desire for involvement with the appropriate amount of decisional participation. Past research treated all decisions as though they were of equal importance to all subjects, but it was apparent that not all issues were equal (Alluto & Belasco, 1972).

Hoy and Tarter. Hoy and Tarter (2008) built upon Barnard (1938) and Bridges’ (1967) work and developed a set of heuristics to determine the appropriate circumstances for involving subordinates in the decision-making process. Their model proposed a Zone of Acceptance in which subordinates accept the leader’s decision because they are indifferent to the outcome of the decision. Involving subordinates in these types of decisions can actually be detrimental to the organization’s effectiveness. Subordinates do not need to be involved in decisions of this type, and may actually resent giving up time for participation they determine is unnecessary or meaningless (Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

In schools, when decisions lie outside the teachers’ zone of acceptance, involving the teachers in the decision-making process will increase the likelihood that the decision will be accepted (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Subordinates will want to be involved in decision making in situations where they have a personal stake in the decision’s outcome or in situations where they have expertise to contribute toward the solution (Hoy & Tarter, 1995). The Hoy-Tarter
Model of Shared Decision Making (2008) noted that subordinates should be involved in the decision-making process when they meet two conditions and pass the test of trust. First, the subordinate should have a personal stake in the outcome of the decision. Second, the subordinate should have expertise in order to make a useful contribution to the decision. After meeting the two conditions, the leader should determine if the subordinate can be trusted to make a decision in the best interests of the organization. If the subordinate meets the conditions and passes the test of trust, he or she should be extensively involved in the decision-making process.

If the subordinate only partially meets the criteria, this is a marginal situation, and his or her involvement in the decision should be limited (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). If teachers have a personal interest in the decision, but have no genuine expertise to add, then the principal may include them, but structure the process so that the teachers can see the appropriate expertise modeled and begin to conceptualize the factors involved in the decision. If the teacher has expertise in a situation, but no personal stake, then the principal may choose to involve them as a consultant, but full participation in the final decision is not necessary (Hoy & Tarter, 1995). In order for principals to extend genuine and not just token decision-making authority to teachers, they must first trust the teachers’ intentions as well as their capability (Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

Research has supported that teacher perception of their organizations was not simply a function of their participation in decision making, but rather was related to the level of participation that the teachers preferred (Conway, 1976). This finding underscores Hoy and Tarter’s assertion that there are some decisions in which subordinates should not be involved (Hoy & Tarter, 1995). Conway (1976) cautioned that over-participation in decision making can be almost as counter-productive as what he described as the deprived condition, that is, participating less than desired. This finding supports earlier research by Alutto and Belasco.
It would appear that the relationship between teachers’ desired and perceived participation in decision making is curvilinear, with the peak of the curve occurring where current and desired levels of participation is about equal (Conway 1976). The challenge to administrators is matching teachers’ desire to participate with opportunities for contribution and finding the seemingly elusive state of equilibrium.

The literature on shared decision making is extensive. Hence, this investigation focused on one model, delegation, as a means for the principal to involve teachers in the decision-making process. Failure to delegate sufficiently in order to get the job done is the characteristic most often identified with poor supervisors (Watkins, 1972). The process of delegating decision-making authority to subordinates is not the same as jointly arriving at a decision (Hoy & Sousa, 1984). In delegation, the subordinate is free to make the decision without further consultation with the principal. It would appear that by delegating decisions to subordinates, principals demonstrate trust (Mokoena, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

There are several potential benefits for principals and school organizations when principals are willing to delegate decision-making authority to teachers and other subordinates. These benefits include teachers’ identification with the goals and objectives of the school, teachers’ greater sense of job satisfaction, and teachers’ loyalty to the principal (Hoy & Sousa, 1984; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973; Watkins, 1972). Principals who delegate decisions to teachers demonstrate a trust in the teachers that could prove reciprocal (Hoy & Sousa, 1984).

Formal and Informal Consequences

School leaders who delegate decisions to teachers demonstrate a trust in the professional ability of the teacher (Mokoena, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). This trust decentralized the locus of control, affecting the formal school structure. Hoy and Sweetland (2000, 2001)
demonstrated that formalization and centralization co-varied together and created a bi-polar factor enabling at one extreme and hindering at the other.

There are distinct characteristics in enabling school structure. The school facilitates problem solving, enables cooperation, encourages collaboration, promotes flexibility, encourages innovation, protects participants, values differences, delights in the unexpected, learns from mistakes, and views problems as opportunities (Sinden, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2004). Teacher trust in the principal and a structure for shared decision making are both components of enabling school structure (Sinden, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2004).

Organizational citizenship behaviors gravitate toward the informal structure of the schools. If OCBs can be encouraged through the principal’s use of delegated decision-making practices or by presence of trust, the result could make “above and beyond” the informal norm of the school.

Rationale and Hypotheses

Drawing on work from earlier researchers, Gouldner (1960) described the norm of reciprocity. He suggested the universal form of this norm made two interrelated minimal demands: (1) People should help those who have helped them. (2) People should not injure those who have helped them. Gouldner described how the idea of reciprocity contributed to the stability of social systems. He noted that the norm commonly imposed obligations of reciprocity only when the individual was able to reciprocate and left questions regarding occasions when the individual’s return was appropriate or sufficient.

This idea of social exchange is further supported by the work of Emerson (1976), who defined social exchange theory as a “frame of reference” regarding “actions that are contingent on awarding the reactions from others” (p. 336). Individuals have evolved unique capabilities to
reason about social exchange. These abilities lead people to reason differently about social choices than they would about situations that do not involve interdependence (Bottom, et al., 2006).

Social psychology has continued to research social influence processes. Members are more likely to trust and follow leaders if they treat them fairly and with respect (Hogg, 2010). Hoy and Sousa (1984) found that principals who shared decision making with teachers had more loyal teachers, had more satisfied teachers, and had teachers who described the structure of authority as less rigid than principals who did not share decision making. Considering the previous explanations, the following hypotheses are proposed.

**H1. Delegated decision making practices, collective trust in the principal, collective trust in colleagues, and organizational citizenship behaviors will covary.**

There is strong evidence that trust in the leader affects task performance directly as well as indirectly through employee organizational citizenship behavior (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Forsyth & Adams, 2010). There is also evidence that collective trust in colleagues is strongly and positively related to the emergence of organizational citizenship behaviors (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a). For teachers, as well as other employees in general, OCBs are improved by leader behavior and the trust that individuals and the work group have for leaders (Forsyth et al., 2011).

It would appear that leaders would cultivate organizational citizenship behaviors, if those behaviors can be elicited through predictable means. One explanation is that principals can improve organizational citizenship behaviors through the use of delegated decision-making opportunities for teachers. The use of delegated decision-making opportunities may improve the collective trust in the principal, which may yield an increase in organizational citizenship behaviors among the staff.
H2. Delegated decision making, collective trust in the principal, and collective trust in colleagues will both individually and collectively contribute to an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviors.

Teachers are more likely to perform duties beyond formal role expectations when they are delegated decisions where they have a personal stake or interest and expertise to lend to the decision, and can be trusted to act in the best interest of the organization (Hoy & Tarter, 2008). Teachers are more likely to perform duties beyond formal role expectations when they have confidence in the competence, reliability, honesty, openness, and benevolence of their principal and of their colleagues (Bryk & Schneider, 2003, Tschannen-Moran, 2009). There should be an expectation that delegated decision making and the targeted referents of collective trust (principal and colleagues) should collectively contribute to the level of organizational citizenship of the school.

Summary

This chapter explored the history of the constructs of organizational citizenship behaviors, trust, and delegated decision making from their foundations to more current research. Each sections listed major contributors to the research body and identified the specific researchers whose work supported the study. The last section identified the rationale for the hypotheses that guided the study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research problem, data sample, collection procedures, instrumentation, and data analysis procedures.

The purpose of the study was to build upon a body of research concerning organizational citizenship behaviors, faculty trust in the principal and colleagues, and the propensity of a leader to delegate decisions using a sample from public elementary schools in north Alabama.

Population and Sample

The population sample in this study came from 60 public elementary schools in North Alabama. Participants were full-time teachers serving Grades K-6 or a combination thereof. Surveys were distributed to the faculty in each of the 60 schools. Each respondent was guaranteed anonymity, confidentiality, and the option to refuse participation. In addition, volunteers had the option to skip any question or discontinue participation at any time during the survey.

Instrumentation

*Delegated Decision Making*

Delegated decision making is the entrusting of authority to others; the administrator assigns specific decisions to other members of the organization (Hoy & Sousa, 1984). Propensity to delegate was operationalized using the 10 decision questions revised by Hoy and Sousa as adopted from the Aston approach developed by Pugh and Hickson (1978), and listed in their delegation study (Hoy & Sousa, 1984).
The interview survey was administered to each principal and teacher in the study in order to identify the level at which decisions are made at each school. This information provided a means for investigating the extent to which the principals delegate their decision-making authority. Sample questions included the following: “Who decides the number of department heads in the schools?”, “Who determines the appointment of a teacher?”, “Who determines the amount of money to be allocated to each department?”, and “Who decides how unallocated funds will be spent?” (Hoy & Sousa, 1984).

Faculty Trust in Principal and Colleagues

Trust is one’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based upon the confidence that the other participant is benevolent, reliable, competent, open, and honest (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Trust was measured using the Omnibus Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Items were scored on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). There were eight items that are used to measure teacher trust in the principal and eight items that are used to measure teacher trust in colleagues. Each item on this instrument has reported high construct reliability (.93) and validity as they were established and supported in previous research (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Sample items included the following: “Teachers in this school trust the principal,” “Teachers in this school trust each other,” “Teachers in this school typically look out for each other,” and “Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.” For the purpose of this study, the influence of faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues was investigated. The subscale measuring collective trust in the principal has a Chronbach alpha reliability coefficient between .90 and .98 (Hoy et al., 2002, p. 203). The subscale measuring collective trust in colleagues has a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient between .90 and .98 (Hoy et al., 2002).
Organizational Citizenship

Organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors that are directed toward helping others or toward achieving organizational goals (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a, 2005b). Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured using the OCB Scale (DiPaola & Hoy, 2004). The OCB is a revision of the earlier OCBSS developed by DiPaola and Tschannen Moran (2001). The OCB Scale is a 12-item instrument that measures the degree to which the teaching faculty of a school engages in organizational citizenship behavior; the higher the score, the greater the extent of organizational citizenship of the school. Items were scored on a 6-item Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). The reported alpha coefficient of reliability for the OCB scale (.93) was shown to be high in comparison to the OCBSS (.87). The construct validity has also been supported in three separate factor analyses (DiPaola, Tarter, & Hoy, 2005). Sample items included the following: “Teachers help students on their own time,” “Teachers voluntarily help new teachers,” “Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees,” and “Teachers arrive to work and to meetings on time.”

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status (SES) is the social standing or class of an individual or group. SES is often measured as a combination of education, income, and occupation. Socioeconomic status was operationally defined with a formula using the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunches (FRL) through the National School Lunch Program at schools included in this investigation. SES is inversely related to the percentage of students receiving FRL. This study used the formula 1-FRL to calculate the SES of the school. Although this is not an exact measurement, this formula served as a proxy for SES.
Design

This investigation utilized a quantitative approach to answer the research questions. Surveys were used to gather data. Correlational analysis was used to test the relationship between collective trust in the principal, collective trust in colleagues, the propensity of the principal to delegate decisions, and organizational citizenship. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the individual and collective relationships between the independent variables, collective trust in the principal, collective trust in colleagues, and delegated decision-making practices, and the dependent variable, organizational citizenship. The control variable was socioeconomic status (SES). In addition, reliability measures were run. All variables in this study were considered institutional variables; thus, the school was the unit of analysis.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the data analysis of the relationship between delegated decision-making practices, collegial trust in the principal and in colleagues, and organizational citizenship. The chapter comprises descriptives, reliabilities, correlations, tested hypotheses, and un-hypothesized findings. Free and reduced lunch data were used in proxy as a control variable for SES, using the formula 1-FRL.

Descriptives

The study examined schools in Northwest Alabama. Of the 77 schools contacted, 60 schools participated in the study. Although elementary schools with an arrangement of Grades K-6 was the desirable configuration, it became problematic to limit the study to this structure due to the lack of consistency in the Northwest Alabama area. Configurations varied widely across school districts, and sometimes within districts. A summary of configurations that participated in the study is given in Table 1.

From the participating schools, 1,665 teacher respondents completed surveys. The survey instruments were administered during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting. Completion of the surveys was strictly voluntary and anonymity was assured. The school was the unit of analysis, and each school was given a 7-digit identifying code for comparative analysis. Table 2 shows the descriptive characteristics of the measures, including the range, mean, and standard deviation for all the variables used in the study including socioeconomic status.
### Table 1

**Summary of School Configurations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SES data from the sample seems to correspond to Alabama data for all schools (see Table 2). According to data from National Center for Education Statistics (2013), 57.4% of students in Alabama qualify for free or reduced lunches. Schools in the study had an average of 43% free and reduced lunch.

### Table 2

**Descriptive Statistics of the Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Dec Mkg</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability

The survey instruments used in the study included the OCB Scale, two subtests of the OMT Scale to measure trust in the principal and trust in colleagues, and the 10 decision-making questions revised by Hoy and Sousa (1984) from the Aston approach developed by Pugh and Hickson (1978). The OCB Scale is a 12-item response survey with a 6-point Likert-type scale. The principal and colleague subtests of the OMT Scale are each 8-item instruments with a 6-point Likert-type scale. Finally, the 10 decision-making questions required respondents to indicate the level at which decisions were made, out of six hierarchical choices ranging from teacher to local board of education, at their respective schools. The alpha coefficient of reliability for each of the measurements is listed in Table 3. According to Kline (1999, as cited in Field, 2009), an alpha of .7 or higher is appropriate for reliability. The alpha coefficients for reliability of all of the measures were found to be highly reliable with the OCB at .92, the OMT for trust in principal at .95, the OMT for trust in colleagues at .94, and the Delegated Decision-Making Questions at .77.

Table 3

*Cronbach’s Alpha for Study Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Dec Mkg</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMT Principal</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMT Colleagues</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlations

Correlations among all the variables examined in the study are given in Table 4.

Delegated decision making and organizational citizenship behaviors were not related ($r = .13, p < .01$). The Pearson correlation between delegated decision making and trust in the principal and in colleagues was not statistically significant. Trust in the principal and trust in colleagues were related ($r = .50, p < .01$). Trust in the principal and organizational citizenship behaviors were related ($r = .44, p < .01$), as well as trust in colleagues and organizational citizenship behaviors ($r = .51, p < .01$). The relationship of socioeconomic status, the control variable, to any of the variables in the study was not significant.

Table 4

*Pearson Correlation Coefficients among all Major Variables Examined in the Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>DDM</th>
<th>Trust in Principal</th>
<th>Trust in Colleagues</th>
<th>OCB</th>
<th>SES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DDM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Delegated Decision Making (DDM), Trust in Principal, Trust in Colleagues, Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1, which predicted all variables in the study would be related, was partially supported. Surprisingly, delegated decision making was not related to any of the variables in the study (see Table 4.) Trust in colleagues and trust in the principal were both correlated with organizational citizenship, $r = .51, p < .01$ and $r = .44, p < .01$, respectively.
Hypothesis 2, which predicted delegated decision making, trust in the principal, and trust in colleagues would both individually and collectively contribute to an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviors, while controlling for SES, was partially supported. When organizational citizenship was regressed on to delegated decision making, trust in the principal, and trust in colleagues, while controlling for SES, the multiple correlation was significant (adj. $R^2 = .32, p < .01$) (see table 5.) However, only trust in the principal ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) and trust in colleagues ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) made unique contributions to citizenship. Neither delegated decision making ($\beta = .20, p = .08$) nor SES ($\beta = .13, p = .26$) uniquely related to organizational citizenship behaviors.

Table 5

Regression of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors on Delegated Decision Making and Trust in the Principal, Trust in Colleagues, and SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated Dec Making</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significant at $p < .0.01$ (2 tailed). $R = .60$, $R^2 = .36$, Adj $R^2 = .32$.

Summary

Chapter 4 reported the findings of the research study, descriptive statistics, reliability of the instruments, bivariate correlations, and regression analysis. Two hypotheses guided this study:
H1. Delegated decision-making practices, collective trust in the principal, collective trust in colleagues and organizational citizenship behaviors will covary.

H2. Delegated decision making, collective trust in the principal, and collective trust in colleagues will both individually and collectively contribute to an explanation of organizational citizenship behaviors, while controlling for SES.

Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Collective trust in the principal and collective trust in colleagues were related. Trust in the principal was related to OCB. Trust in colleagues was also related to OCB. Delegated decision making was not related to the other variables in the study.

Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Collective trust in the principal and collective trust in colleagues contribute to an explanation of OCB. Delegated decision making does not individually or collectively contribute to an explanation of OCB in this study.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study’s purpose and findings. Theoretical implications of the study are discussed. Practical strategies are given for enhancing collective trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. Suggestions for extending the study are presented.

Summary of Findings

This study analyzed the relationship existing between delegated decision-making practices, principal and collegial trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors within the school setting. In the regression model (Table 5), the predictors comprised 32% of the variance for delegated decision making and trust in principal and trust in colleagues when controlling for socioeconomic status. Trust in the principal ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) and trust in colleagues ($\beta = .33, p = .015$) were both found to be good predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. Delegated decision-making ($\beta = .20, p = .08$) and SES ($\beta = .13, p = .26$) practices were not found to be good predictors for organizational citizenship behaviors. The hypothesized findings from the study are as follows:

1. Delegated decision making and trust in the principal were not correlated.

2. Delegated decision making and trust in colleagues were not correlated.

3. Delegated decision making and organizational citizenship behaviors were not correlated.

4. Trust in the principal and trust in colleagues were related.
5. Trust in the principal and organizational citizenship behaviors were related.

6. Trust in colleagues and organizational citizenship behaviors were related.

Limitations

The results of the study were likely influenced by the wide range of school configurations surveyed. As previously mentioned, the intended target was the elementary setting; however, many configurations, including secondary teachers, participated in the study. There are distinct differences in the organizational structures of typical elementary and secondary schools, which would likely influence the survey responses.

The survey area was limited to schools in Northwest Alabama. The surveys were not distributed randomly, so caution should be exercised in making generalizations using data from the study.

Theoretical Implications

Delegated Decision Making

The initial research question in this study asked about the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors, trust in the principal and trust in colleagues, and delegated decision making. A positive relationship was anticipated between the pairs of variables. When the hypothesis was tested, all variables were not related. Delegated decision making was not related to trust in the principal ($r = -.20, p > .01$) or to trust in colleagues ($r = -.05, p > .01$). Delegated decision making was also not related to OCB ($r = .13, p > .01$).

Principals who delegate decisions to teachers demonstrate trust. Bureaucratic structures are incompatible with the needs of professionals and do not facilitate trust (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002; Tschannen-Moran, 1999, 2009). One possible explanation of the findings may be found in the structures of the schools in the study. Herriott
and Firestone (1984) suggested a typology for schools: a rational bureaucracy and a loosely coupled system. Surprisingly, the study identified elementary schools to the rational bureaucratic image. Upon examination, the researchers proposed this was due to the relatively limited curriculum, primarily emphasizing basic cognitive and social skills. In contrast, secondary schools tended to offer a broader curriculum, including advanced classes, citizenship skills, preparation for work and/or college, in addition to remediation in basic cognitive and social skills. The organizational structure of elementary schools may suggest one explanation for the lack of relationship found between delegated decision making and trust.

As a practicing administrator in an elementary school, I find delegation necessary to the daily demands of basic operation. Some of my staff members have talents in scheduling, organization, documentation, and other skills that contribute to the successful management of schools. My teachers are all trained professionals and I treat them as such. Individual classrooms are laboratories for experimentation and flexibility. There are basic criteria that must be met, but aside from mandated time allocations, I exercise the right to trust my teachers’ professional judgment when thinking about classroom routines and schedules. Responsibility is both shared and delegated in our school to fulfill our mission. Perhaps the types of delegated tasks differ from secondary schools to elementary schools. It would appear that at least three of the statements on the delegated decision-making instrument are not common decisions in elementary schools: number of department heads, introduction of a new course or subject and creating a new teacher or administrative position. Conceivably, the results might be different if each statement on the instrument was a decision commonly made in elementary school settings.

Hoy and Sousa (1984) found that principals who shared decision making with subordinates had more loyal and satisfied teachers. The literature also supported a relationship
between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Early research attempted to relate job satisfaction with job performance, a notion that Bateman and Organ referred to as “naïve folk wisdom” (1983). The findings, rather, held that leader supportiveness affected supra-role behaviors indirectly through its effect on job satisfaction. Delegated decision making was proposed to be an example of supportive leader behavior. Perhaps this action was mediated by another variable that would require future study.

Trust

Trust is a vital issue in schools. Principals who trust their teachers will share authority and responsibility. Teachers who trust one another will give up a share of autonomy in order to collaborate with others (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). There is an embedded set of mutual dependencies within the social exchanges in any school community (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Collective trust within one role group for another tends to have a positive reciprocal effect (Forsyth et al., 2011). This was supported in the current study by the significant positive relationship between trust in the principal and trust in colleagues ($r = .50, p < .01$), confirming previous research identifying such a relationship (Hoffman et al., 1994; Hoy et al., 1992; Tarter et al., 1989b; Tarter et al., 1995; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

Research confirmed trust can be built by school communities regardless of external environment (Forsyth et al., 2011). Public schools depend on bureaucratic structures—structures with a hierarchy of authority, division of labor, impersonality, objective standards, rules, and regulations. In the bureaucracy, leadership is held responsible for the performance of the group; however, sustaining an atmosphere of trust is dependent on the external environment and all relevant school stakeholders. Social cohesion and shared responsibility are the result of
interactions that are both personal and professional in nature. The principal should focus on minimizing conflict and facilitating cooperative interactions around a common school vision. Successful leaders mitigate conflict in schools by removing barriers that hamper interactions, marginalize parents, or compromise the expertise and autonomy of teachers, and prevent the development of a shared vision (Forsyth et al., 2011).

Trust and OCB

Organizational citizenship behaviors are behaviors that are directed toward helping others or toward achieving organizational goals (DiPaola & Tchannen-Moran, 2001). School organizations would cease to be well-functioning were it not for the contributions of teachers beyond the basic job description. As organizations designed for helping people, citizenship behaviors are implicit in daily interaction within schools.

This study found a significant and positive relationship between OCB and principal trust ($r = .44, p < .01$) and between OCB and collegial trust ($r = .51, p < .01$). The finding supports previous research connecting principal and collegial trust to OCBs (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Podsakoff et al., 2000). This appears to support the idea of social exchange in which OCBs are demonstrated as a reciprocal offering in return for principal trust.

Implications for Practice

In this study, delegated decision-making practices were not related to organizational citizenship behaviors or to trust; however, principal trust and collegial trust were related and both were each found to be good predictors of OCBs. Building trust in schools begins with the leadership. Thus, it would be prudent for administrators to develop management and organizational structures that have supported building principal and collegial trust in their organizations. The literature suggests principal-teacher interactions that are viewed by teachers
as authentic, open, or collegial strengthen faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1984; Tarter et al., 1989b; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998) found feelings of professionalism among teachers to be strongly related to collegial trust. Teacher morale was also found to be associated with collegial trust (Smith et al., 2001).

Trust creates an atmosphere of cooperation (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Under high-trust conditions, individuals believe other parties are devoted to carrying out their responsibilities and expectations (Adams & Forsyth, 2009). Trust is not built in the short term, rather, over time and validated through repeated exchanges. Principals working to build trust should model trust’s key facets of benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

In recent years, schools have become increasingly pressured to perform on high stakes standardized testing. Annual measurable objectives include performance standards on these assessments. These changes may have decreased the scope of teacher autonomy over the past few decades. Simple tasks are desirable for standardization. However, the complex task of educating students, who arrive at schools with a spectrum of talents, deficiencies, motivation, skills, and background knowledge, yields altered, but far from standardized, results (Thompson, 1967). Forsyth et al. (2011) propose leader behavior and activity directed toward enhancing social control are often the behaviors that cultivate collective trust. These behaviors include a leader’s decision to give flexibility and discretion in planning for instruction to fit learners’ needs.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Organizational citizenship behaviors are desirable in any organization, but are particularly appealing in the school setting, where altruistic behavior is inherent in the daily work
of teachers. Supportive leader behavior has been related to organizational citizenship behaviors through job satisfaction (Smith et al., 1983). It would be practical for researchers to identify specific leader behaviors that could be used to cultivate an atmosphere of citizenship.

This study focused on a variety of school configurations. Most of the configurations were elementary and all of them had elementary school elements. The findings might be different if the study were duplicated focusing on specific configurations of elementary or secondary schools. The results might reveal whether there is a difference in the relationship between delegated decision making and OCBs in the different school configurations.

The delegated decision-making instrument may have influenced the results. Teachers struggled with completing the survey. Several surveys were not completed or were completed incorrectly. These inconsistent responses likely influenced the interpretation of the data.

Some of the statements on the instrument appeared to be more common in secondary or higher education. These included statements that described the number of department heads in the school, whether a new course or subject would be introduced, creating a new department, and creating a new teaching or administrative position. This instrument was chosen because of its previous use in educational settings. Although the delegated decision-making instrument appears appropriate for secondary or higher education, it might be prudent for another instrument to be developed with statements specifically designed for the elementary school organization.

There would be a number of statements that might serve more appropriately on an instrument oriented toward an elementary school. Using the same format as Hoy and Sousa, questions might include: Who decides individual classroom schedules? Who decides class rosters? Who decides the master schedule? Who decides whether students are retained or promoted? Who decides the grading system in classes? All of these questions are specific to the
elementary school environment of which I am a member. A new instrument would have to be
developed and tested for reliability, but it is my opinion that the nature of elementary schools,
particularly those with self-contained classrooms, offer autonomous environments where
teachers may have delegated authority to make decisions that are not present in other
configurations.

Research on trust is abundant; however, research on its relationship with other school
behavior is worth expanding. The value of cultivating OCBs is clear. In schools, it is a necessity.
Determining the antecedents of citizenship behaviors and developing research on its relationship
with other actions will strengthen the organization.

Summary

This chapter summarized the findings of the research study, offered theoretical and
practical implications and made recommendations for future research. As helping organizations,
the mission of schools will be enhanced and improved through additional study on the
antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors.
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APPENDIX A

OCB SCALE
OCB-SCALE

Indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with the following statements about your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers help students on their own time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers waste a lot of class time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers voluntarily help new teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers volunteer to serve on new committees.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers volunteer to sponsor extracurricular activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teachers arrive to work and meetings on time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers take the initiative to introduce themselves to substitutes and assist them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers begin class promptly and use class time effectively.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers give colleagues advance notice of changes in schedule or routine.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teachers give an excessive amount of busywork.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teacher committees in this school work effectively.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers make innovative suggestions to improve the overall quality of our school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© DiPaola & Hoy, 2003
APPENDIX B

OMNIBUS T-SCALE
Faculty Trust in the Principal - Items 1, 4*, 7, 9, 11*, 15, 18, 23*

Faculty Trust in Colleagues - Items 2, 5, 8*, 12, 13, 16, 19, 21

Faculty Trust in the Clients - Items 3, 6, 10, 14, 17, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26*

*Items are reversed scored, that is, [1=6, 2=5, 3=4, 4=3, 5=2, 6=1]

**NOTE – For this study only the subcales measuring Faculty Trust in the Principal and Faculty Trust in Colleagues were used.
APPENDIX C

DELEGATED DECISION-MAKING INSTRUMENT
Decision making authority means action taken on the decision, although the decision might be subject to ratification at a later time. This means that although others might ratify the decision, the intentions of the decision will not be altered.

**Directions:** Please indicate the level at which decisions are made at your school for each of the following items by placing an X in the appropriate column for each question. Make one choice per question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Local Board of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The number of department heads in the schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The appointment of a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The amount of money to be allocated to each department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How unallocated funds will be spent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Whether a new course or subject will be introduced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whether a new program will be introduced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The procedures for purchasing materials for the school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Which suppliers or materials will be used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To create a new department?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To create a new teaching or administrative position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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