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ABSTRACT

With the constant concern for improving student achievement, educators must be able to identify factors that will help increase student achievement, especially in urban Title I schools. Examining schools through their organizational health is a means of determining what changes could be made to improve student achievement.

Organizational health is the interpersonal dynamics of students, teachers, and administrators. In this research study, the relationship between organizational health and student achievement of 26 urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama was examined. A correlational design was used to analyze the results from the electronic survey Organizational Health Index for elementary schools (OHI-E) in relation to the reading results from the schools’ Stanford Achievement Test, Tenth Edition (SAT-10) of fourth grade students in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression were used to analyze data to test six null hypotheses addressing the relationships among organizational health factors and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools. A strong correlation between overall OHI-E of Title I elementary schools and resource influence was revealed. Previous research has shown academic emphasis as the strongest predictor of student achievement. However, the findings from this study were not consistent with this body of knowledge. Teacher affiliation was found to be the most significant factor in improving student achievement. Teacher affiliation refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation
with the school. Teachers feel good about each other and they have a sense of accomplishment from their jobs. Teachers are committed to both their students and their colleagues. They find ways to accommodate to the routine, accomplishing their jobs with enthusiasm. The results of this study may help legislators, board members, administrators, and other stakeholders improve levels of student academic achievement.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

“We are now at a point where we must educate our children in what no one knew yesterday, and prepare our schools for what no one knows yet.”

– Margaret Mead

Educators have been concerned about the decline in academic achievement among certain groups of students for decades. Alarming statistics about reading competence could signal deeper, more systemic problems in the nation’s public schools. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2011), 8.7 million fourth through twelfth graders are unable to read at grade level. Close to 70% of eighth graders read below the proficiency level and 25% fail to read at the most basic level. This number has remained relatively constant since 1980, when 23% of students in fourth grade were reading below grade level. As a result, with more than two third of today’s fourth graders struggling to read, reform in reading continues to be a prominent issue for educators (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2009).

The worries are profound for the nation’s Title I schools. The prevailing sentiment has long been that schools with low socioeconomic status (SES) cannot produce students who are successful (Reeves, 2003; Reeves, 2011). Title I schools have a higher concentration of students from low-income families; many stakeholders have abandoned the possibility of seeing improvements in student achievement (Reeves, 2003;
W. K. Hoy, Sweetland, and Smith (2002) established that SES has a direct effect on student achievement, but teachers’ efficacy and academic emphasis had a greater correlation with student achievement. Bulach, Malone, and Castleman (1995) discovered that the relationship between school climate and achievement was stronger than the relationship between the SES of students and achievement. The authors posited that school climate scores could be increased, but that the SES of students was more difficult to increase. Additionally, researchers who have studied schools with high rates of poverty among students have seen high academic performance in these schools. In a study with more than 130,000 students in 228 schools, investigators established that demographic characteristics did not determine academic performance (Reeves, 2003). Reeves (2003) called these schools 90/90/90 schools. These schools were characterized as having 90% or more students eligible for free and reduced lunch, 90% or more students as members of an ethnic minority group, and 90% or more students who met the district or state academic standards. These schools were exceptional because they defied the commonly held belief that high poverty and high ethnic minority enrollment in schools is inextricably linked to lower student achievement (Reeves, 2003).

The most important difference between 90/90/90 schools and low-achieving schools was that the 90/90/90 schools had developed a keen focus on student achievement; academic performance was highly prized in these schools. According to W. K. Hoy, Tartar, and Kottkamp (1991), this focus on student achievement was a key ingredient for a healthy school. Although achievement is one aspect of school effectiveness, it is not the whole of it (W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Kirtman, 2014; Lunnenburg, & Ornstein, 2012). Another frame for viewing a school’s effectiveness is its
organizational health. Organizational health reflects the general health of a school. A healthy school exhibits the following characteristics: (a) copes successfully with its environment, (b) utilizes resources and efforts to reach its goals, (c) is driven by academic excellence, (d) sets high goals for students and teachers, (e) respects others who do well academically, (f) maintains a safe and orderly learning environment, (g) exhibits high collegial leadership, and (h) provides resources for teachers to do their jobs (W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Thus, maximizing organizational health provides a holistic approach to improving student achievement.

The organizational health of elementary schools can be defined by specific patterns of interactions in the schools (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). For the purpose of this study, organizational patterns of interaction included (a) institutional integrity, (b) teacher affiliation, (c) academic emphasis, (d) principal’s influence, (e) collegial leadership, and (f) resource support.

Institutional integrity is determined by a school’s ability to cope with external destructive forces. Teacher affiliation refers to the sense of friendliness, openness, and trust among faculty members. In schools with high teacher affiliation teachers like and help each other. They are proud of their students and school.

Academic emphasis is a term used to describe the extent to which the school strives for academic excellence. Teachers who believe in their students and set high academic standards, and students who work hard and respect those who achieve excellence, are found in schools with strong academic emphasis.

Principal influence is the principal’s ability to influence the actions of superiors to aid teachers’ acquisitions of additional resources. Collegial leadership is a type of
leadership that is supportive, friendly, and open. The principal exhibits a genuine concern for the welfare of teachers and staff at the school and articulates clear standards of performance. Finally, resource support is the degree to which teachers have the necessary instructional materials and can readily acquire additional supplies as needed. These dimensions of school health represent the basic needs of social systems as well as the interaction patterns found in schools (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008; W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998).

Questions remain regarding the effectiveness of Title I programs (Borman, 2003). In an effort to reform, many schools have implemented programmatic components. Shaffer (2004) explored the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in Title I schools and showed that academic emphasis had a significant positive relationship to student achievement. In the search for solutions, reformers and educational researchers have long suggested that school climate makes a difference in the learning environment of schools and in student achievement (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996; Goddard, Sweetland, & W. K. Hoy, 2000). However, W. K. Hoy and Hannun (1997) argued that the concept of school climate is often a slogan rather than a carefully defined, meaningful construct. Adding to the debate, Anderson (1982) noted that few clear links to a theory of schooling or to student learning had been made to the concept of school climate. More recently, in the wake of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), answers to questions about school success became paramount because of annual high-stakes testing, national rankings, and yearly progress reports emphasizing accountability for schools as well as students. Many educators reported the issue of student achievement
must be given the highest priority in the mission of all schools (Edmondson, 2011; Reeves, 2003).

Few studies have explored the relationship between student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools and the more holistic and comprehensive theory of organizational health. Working with a new assessment tool for holistic organizational health, researchers have demonstrated the importance of organizational health to student achievement at the high school level (W. K. Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991; Ramdass & Lewis, 2012). However, little research has been conducted in Alabama’s urban Title I elementary schools using the organizational health model.

**Statement of the Problem**

Although many public schools are no longer operating under the Bush-era education reform known as No Child Left Behind Act (2002), NCLB mandated that by 2014 every child in public school must be performing on grade level in reading and math. However, as 2014 ends; educators have increasingly expressed concern that all students be proficient in reading and math. This directive is especially true for schools that receive Title I funding. Schools that receive Title I funding must make adequate yearly progress (AYP) on test scores. Each year, students in the current grade must perform better on standardized tests than they did the previous year. According to the NCLB legislation, schools are required to pass yearly tests that demonstrate how much improvement students have made over the academic year. If improvements are not made in schools within a specific timeframe, schools face decreased funding and increased accountability (NCLB, 2001). Although NCLB expired in 2007, states still have to abide by its
requirements or apply for a waiver. In response to failure to rewrite NCLB, President Obama enacted the Race to the Top Initiative, which provides competitive grants to states to help prepare all students for college and careers, to invest in teachers and school leaders, to turn around lowest performing schools and to use data to support decision-making on the school and district levels (U.S. Department of Education, 2013).

With the increased drive toward accountability and urgent concerns about student achievement, educators must be able to accurately identify the factors that influence student achievement, especially in Title I urban elementary schools (Borman, 2003; Siccone, 2012). Historically, Title I funds have been used to help close the disparity between student achievement in high poverty and affluent schools. Despite the additional funding from the Title I Program, some 12 urban Title I school districts do not make AYP on test scores (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011). Based on the literature, however, a measure of student achievement for schools may involve examining the organizational health of the school through a set of comprehensive factors related to improved student achievement (Farahani, Mirzamohamadi, & Afsouran, 2014; W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Little research has been conducted on the impact of organizational health on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**Purpose of the Study**

Educators are required by federal and state legislation to investigate multiple aspects of school organizations and address factors that may increase student achievement. Based on studies in U.S. schools, organizational health appears to be a key factor in determining the success or failure of students in a particular place of learning.
Moreover, the literature on school health and student achievement offers important theoretical guidance for exploring why schools are effective. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between the organizational health factors of 28 urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama and student achievement using fourth grade reading scores from the Stanford Achievement Test, 10th Edition (SAT-10).

**Research Question**

This quantitative study was designed to examine the relationship between organizational health of elementary schools and student achievement in reading, as expressed by SAT-10 scores. The independent variables were school scores as measured with the Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools (OHI-E); the dependent variables were the schools’ fourth grade reading scores. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), fourth grade represents a critical juncture in academic achievement (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013).

To address the potential relationship between the independent and dependent variables, the following research question guided this study:

What is the relationship between organizational health factors of urban Title I elementary schools and student achievement in reading of urban Title I elementary schools as expressed by SAT-10 scores?
Null Hypotheses

H1o. There is no significant relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

H2o. There is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

H3o. There is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

H4o. There is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools Alabama.

H5o. There is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

H6o. There is no significant relationship between resource influence and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this study:

Academic emphasis: The degree to which a school strives for academic excellence. Academic emphasis consists of setting high but achievable academic goals for students, having an orderly and serious learning environment, and having students who work hard and respect other students who excel academically (W. K. Hoy, Tarter, & A. W. Hoy, 2006).

Collegial leadership: Collegial leadership comprises certain behaviors and attitudes of principals such as friendly, supportive, and open. The principal exhibits a
genuine concern for the welfare of the school members (W. K. Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Tarter & Hoy, 1988).

**Institutional integrity:** The school’s ability to cope with environmental demands while maintaining educational goals. Schools with institutional integrity are buffered from unreasonable demands from parents and the community (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

**Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE):** A way of calculating where a student falls along the normal curve. The numbers on the NCE line run from 1 to 99, with a mean of 50. NCE scores have a major advantage over percentiles in that they can be averaged. This is an important characteristic when studying overall school performance, particularly when measuring school-wide gains and losses in student achievement (Mertler, 2002).

**Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools (OHI-E):** An instrument used to examine the overall health of a school. It is used to examine the behaviors and interactions in schools so that schools may be characterized on the continuum of healthy to unhealthy (W. K. Hoy, 2003b).

**Organizational health:** The interpersonal dynamics of students, teachers, and administrators in a school. The degree to which a school organization is healthy can be classified based on how well a school can cope with external forces and mobilize resources in order to reach its goals (W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998)

**Resource influence:** The extent to which teachers are provided with the instructional material that they need and the availability of additional supplies (W. K. Hoy & Feldman, 1987).
Stanford Achievement Test, 10th Edition (SAT-10): A norm-referenced test used to measure students’ academic performance in reading, mathematics, social studies, and science.

School climate: A set of internal factors that distinguish one school from another and influence the actions of the school’s participants. It also refers to the general feel of the school (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Teacher affiliation: The degree to which general friendliness is expressed among teachers. Teachers feel good about the school, their job, and their students (W. K. Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Teacher efficacy: Teachers’ confidence in their ability to promote student learning (W. K. Hoy, 2000).

Title I Program: A U.S. federal program that provides financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEA) serving areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families to improve students’ educational achievements (Aud et al., 2010).

Title I school: A school in which at least 40% of students are enrolled in the free or reduced lunch program (Aud et al., 2010).

Urban school district: A school district in which 75% or more of the households served are located in the central city of a metropolitan area (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

1. Participants in this study submitted truthful responses to the survey;
2. The variables identified in the study conformed to normal distribution;  
3. The students’ test scores obtained from the school district were precisely recorded.

**Limitations**

The following limitations are recognized:

1. Data were limited to only teachers’ responses to the survey. Responses from parents, students, and administrators were not solicited.
2. Gathering data were confined to a self-reported survey.
3. Causality among variables was not determined because the research was not experimental.
4. The results of this study are limited to the population of urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**Delimitations**

1. This study was confined to one urban school system in central Alabama.
2. This study was used to examine only fourth grade reading scores.
3. This study was limited to Title I elementary schools whose configuration contained a fourth grade.

**Significance of the Study**

NCLB statutes make no allowance for failure; schools are faced with the task of bringing every child in every public school up to grade level by 2014 (NCLB, 2002).
However, even in the absence of federal legislation, schools must still confront the serious and urgent problem of student achievement. Educational leaders have often looked for answers to the problems of school improvement and student achievement in studies involving factors of SES, race, and location (Koon et al., 2000; Orr, et al., 2005; Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992). Although these studies have informed current efforts of reform, they do not provide the school-specific empirical data that are needed to implement effective change (Koon et al., 2000). The information gained from this study may significantly aid administrators, local school boards, and state legislators in the identification of internal determinants that can affect positive improvements in student achievement; this is especially true for Title I schools in Alabama that have not met minimum testing standards. The results of this study may be instrumental in providing Title I schools with information needed to improve the overall effectiveness of schools by affirming the importance of establishing healthy school organizations, and have the potential to provide practitioners new insights into how schools may survive and develop within the complexities of the 21st century.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study was the organizational health theory based on the work of W. K. Hoy and Feldman (1987). This theory is influenced by the social systems movement in organizational theory. Social systems investigators view organizations as a combination of the interactions between structure and people. Organizations must maintain a balance between these interactions. Sociologists Parsons, Bales, and Shils (1953) asserted that every system has four problems to overcome: (a)
adapting to the environment, (b) attaining goals, (c) maintaining itself as an entity, and (d) maintaining and preserving its motivation and culture.

Schools are characterized as social systems because they are systems of social interactions that affect organizational behavior (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Schools are service organizations that have the ultimate goal of student learning. As social system organizations, schools can be judged on how well they function to accomplish their goals. One of the pioneers of examining properties of schools was Miles (1969). Miles examined properties of schools that developed growth and properties that impeded healthy organization interactions. A healthy organization may be defined as one that not only survives in difficult times, but one that also continues to grow and prosper (W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Healthy organizations manage disruptive outside forces while keeping true to their missions and values. W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) identified healthy schools as schools that cope successfully with their environments and use their resources to accomplish their goals.

In order to identify a favorable environment for schools, W. K. Hoy and Miskel (1996) defined the organizational health of a school as the set of internal characteristics that sets one school apart from another and influences the behavior of its members. School health is the property of the school environment that is experienced by participants and is based on their collective perceptions of behavior in schools. Healthy schools successfully adapt to their environments, achieve their goals, and share common values (Roney, Coleman, & Schlichting, 2007). Together, these characteristics constitute the health of a school.
Hoy and Hannum (1997) suggested that schools exert three levels of control over activities: technical, managerial, and institutional. The technical level is associated with effective teaching and learning. Two key components of the technical level are academic emphasis and morale. W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) defined academic emphasis as the school’s desire to maximize student achievement by creating an environment of enthusiasm, confidence, and sense of accomplishment that permeates students and faculty.

At the managerial level, issues of leadership, principal influence, and resource support are at work. Principals are the main administrators in schools; therefore, they must find ways to develop loyalty, motivate teachers, and coordinate work. W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) further defined the aspects of individuals at the managerial level to include: (a) principal influence, (b) consideration, (c) initiating structure, and (d) resource support.

Influence is the ability of the principal to affect the decisions of superiors (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Consideration includes open, friendly, and supportive behaviors of the principal. Initiating structure is how the principal defines the expectations, standards of performance, and work procedures at schools. Resource support refers to the extent to which classroom supplies and instructional material are readily accessible or easily obtained for teachers.

The institutional level connects the school to its environment. Institutional integrity is a key aspect of this level. It is described as the degree to which the school can cope with its environment and still maintain educational integrity (W. K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997). W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) claimed that it is important for schools to
have support from the community without undue pressure and interference from groups or individuals outside the school. Based on Miles (1969), all social systems must solve four basic problems to survive. Parson et al. (1953) refers to the imperative function of (a) adaption, (b) goal attainment, (c) maintaining solidarity and (d) creating a unique culture or value system.

From Hoy and Hannum’s (1997) perspective, all organizations, including schools, need to have the three levels of control to some degree in order to solve the four problems of social systems (Parsons et al., 1953). Therefore, a healthy school is one in which the (a) technical, (b) managerial, and (c) institutional levels work harmoniously to create a favorable environment (Henderson et al., 2005). The characteristics of healthy schools and the level of control the school has over each dimension are outlined in Table 1. Table 1 displays the level of control in the school and the corresponding Organizational Health Inventory dimension. Within the technical level, teachers and students have control over academic emphasis and teacher affiliation. Meanwhile, the principal has control over collegial leadership and resource influence. Likewise, the school, parents, and community have control over intuitional integrity.
Table 1  

Hierarchical Level of Control of School Health Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of control</th>
<th>Health dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Academic emphasis, Teacher Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: teaching and learning</td>
<td>Morale&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors: teachers and students</td>
<td>Cohesiveness&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Principal influence&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: administration of the school</td>
<td>Principal consideration&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors: principal</td>
<td>Initiating structure&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource support&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Influence, Collegial Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process: connection between the school and the external environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors: school, parents, and community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note</sup>. The health dimensions are labeled as they were in W. K. Hoy and Ferguson’s (1985) original iteration in order to show the closest link to the framework of Miles (1969). <sup>a</sup>Morale and cohesiveness were later combined to form a health dimension termed teacher affiliation (W. K. Hoy et al., 1991). <sup>b</sup>Principal influence and resource support were later combined in elementary schools to form a dimension named resource influence (W.K. Hoy et al., 1991). <sup>c</sup>Principal consideration and initiating structure were found to be one factor in elementary schools called collegial leadership (W. K. Hoy et al., 1991).

Summary

Given the constant concern about student achievement, educators must be able to identify factors that increase student achievement, especially in Title I schools (Reeves, 2003). Many administrators and teachers struggle with improvements in student achievement because Title I schools, by definition, are schools serving families with low SES. Although W. K. Hoy, Sweetland, and Smith (2002) established that SES has an impact on student achievement; academic emphasis promotes a greater impact on student achievement than SES. Reeves (2003) also discovered that demographic characteristics
do not determine academic performance in 90/90/90 schools. These schools defied the notion that high poverty and high minority enrollment in schools are linked to lower achievement. Although student achievement is one aspect of school effectiveness, organizational health provides an all-inclusive approach to school effectiveness. W.K. Hoy and Sabo (1998) defined organizational health as the interpersonal dynamics of students, teachers, and administrators in a school. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in Title I elementary schools in an urban school district in Alabama based on reading scores from the SAT-10.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organization of Review of Literature

In the United States, education has been reformed over the years (Borman, 2003; Reeves, 2011). As the country’s social problems grew in the 1960s and 1970s, educational reforms were sought to address problems of poverty, racism, and disparities in student achievement. During this time, the concept of organizational health emerged and provided a comprehensive and informative model with which to create effective schools. This chapter examines the educational literature of organizational health and student achievement. First, the impact and perspective of Title I on American education will be discussed. Second, organizational health and the specific subtests of the OHI-E will be explained. Factors that represent a healthy school verses an unhealthy school will be presented. Third, studies specifically connecting organizational health and student achievement will be reported. Finally, the significance of this study in relationship to the literature reviewed will be discussed.

Title I in Perspective

As early as the 1950s, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) reported that poverty, illiteracy, and the number of students dropping out of school were wreaking havoc in American society (HEW, Office of Education, 1969). As a result of these conditions, a number of laws were created to combat the country’s
social ills. However, none of the new laws addressed the educational problems of children from poverty (HEW, Office of Education, 1969). In response to this need, a presidential task force prepared a basic outline for legislation enacted as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Act into law on April 11, 1965 (HEW, Office of Education, 1969). In 1968, Congress re-designated the legislation as Title I of the ESEA. The purpose of this program was to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEA) that serve areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families to improve students’ educational achievements. This new law was widely considered to be a legislative triumph because it was the first major funding for the nation’s elementary and secondary schools by the federal government (HEW, Office of Education, 1969). Title I of ESEA requires that schools receiving funds under Title I must provide services comparable to those in schools that do not receive Title I funds (HEW, Office of Education, 1969).

After audits found school districts were misusing Title I funds, as published in *Title I of ESEA; Is It Helping Poor Children?*, which was authored by the Washington Research Project and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund in 1969, Title I became a supplementary program targeting educationally disadvantaged students in high-poverty schools rather than serving the general needs of entire schools or districts (Peterson, Rabe, & Wong, 1986). Under the Reagan administration in the 1980s, Title I was renamed Chapter I and criteria for demonstrating comparability and reporting requirements were relaxed (Peterson et al., 1986).

After the 1994 reauthorization, federal attention shifted from comparability to standards and assessments coordinated at the state and local levels. Comparability
guidelines shifted again in 2002 when the Bush Administration enacted NCLB of 2001. This legislation led to achievement-focused monitoring by the Education Department (Aud et al., 2010).

Currently, Title I is no longer a program focused solely on improving education for educationally disadvantaged students in high-poverty schools. Rather, it has become the vehicle for raising the academic achievement of the nation’s students as evidence has emerged that the level of poverty in a school can affect academic outcomes (Borman, 2003; Raza, 2010).

**Organizational Health**

Previous research looked at the climate of schools using the concept of personality of the schools, but W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) suggested viewing the climate of schools in terms of their organizational health. They defined organizational health as the vitality and dynamics of professional interactions among students, teachers, and administrators. Using the metaphor of health and well-being to examine the environment of schools came from Miles’s (1969) work which called attention to conditions that facilitate growth, development, and healthy organizational interactions. Parsons (1960) suggested that all social systems, including schools, must solve four basic problems in order to survive, grow, and be effective. Each school must (a) accommodate its environment, (b) set and implement its goals, (c) maintain a cohesive system, and (d) create and preserve a distinctive culture.

Parsons explained that schools have three levels of control with which to solve their basic problems: the technical, managerial, and institutional. The technical level is
concerned with the teaching and learning in schools for which teachers are directly responsible. Educated students are the product of schools. The technical level is focused on effective teaching and learning. The managerial level controls the internal affairs of the schools. The administrative process is the key function. Principals must find ways to develop loyalty among staff members, coordinate work, and allocate resources. The institutional level connects the schools with their environment or community. It is important for schools to have support from the community without undue pressure or interference from individuals or groups outside of the school (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Hoy & Sabo, 1998). W.K. Hoy (2003b) developed OHI-E to measure the organizational health of schools. The subtests for the OHI-E are as follows:

- **Academic emphasis** refers to the school’s press for achievement. The expectation of high achievement is met by students who work hard, are cooperative, seek extra work, and respect other students who get good grades.

- **Teacher affiliation** refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation with the school. Teachers feel good about each other and, at the same time, have a sense of accomplishment from their jobs. They are committed to both their students and their colleagues. They find ways to accommodate the routine while accomplishing their jobs with enthusiasm.

- **Resource influence** describes the principal’s ability to affect the actions of superiors to the teachers’ benefit. Teachers are given adequate classroom supplies and extra instructional materials and supplies are easily obtained.

- **Collegial leadership** refers to behavior by the principal that is friendly, supportive, open, and guided by norms of equality. At the same time,
however, the principal sets the tone for high performance by letting people know what is expected of them.

- Institutional integrity describes a school that has integrity in its educational program. The school is not vulnerable to narrow, vested interests of community groups. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands. The school is able to cope successfully with destructive outside forces.

Researchers have demonstrated that the organizational health of schools can be measured using OHI. This instrument measures key dimensions of the organizational health of schools that are consistent with the characteristics of effective schools (P. A. Smith, W. K. Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Tarter & W. K. Hoy, 1988).

**The Healthy School Verses the Unhealthy School**

Healthy organizations are those in which all three levels (technical level, managerial level, and institutional level) are working in harmony (W. K. Hoy, 2003a). Organizations are meeting their needs while coping with external forces as they move forward toward their goals. W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) described healthy schools as:

- protected from unreasonable community and parental pressures. The board successfully resists all narrow efforts of vested interest groups to influence policy. The principal of a healthy school provides dynamic leadership—leadership that is both task oriented and relationships oriented. Such behavior is supportive of teachers and yet provides direction and maintains high standards of performance. Moreover, the principal has influence with his or her superiors as well as the ability to exercise independent thought and action. Teachers are committed to teaching and learning. They set high but achievable goals for students; they maintain high standards of performance; and the learning environment is orderly and serious. Furthermore, students work hard on academic matters, are highly motivated, and respect other students who achieve academically. Classroom supplies and instructional materials are accessible. Finally, in a healthy school
teachers like each other, trust each other, are enthusiastic about the work, and are proud of their school. (pp. 203-204)

In addition, W.K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) provided a description of what they found to be an unhealthy school.

The unhealthy school is vulnerable to destructive outside forces. Teachers and administrators are bombarded with unreasonable demands from parental and community groups. The school is buffeted by the whims of the public. The principal does not provide leadership: there is little direction, limited consideration and support for teachers, and virtually no influence with superiors. Morale of teachers is low. Teachers feel good neither about each other nor about their jobs. They act aloof, suspicious, and defensive. Finally, the press for academic excellence is limited. (p. 204)

**Organizational Health and Student Achievement**

Many researchers have used the OHI to study the possible correlation between student achievement as measured by standardized tests and the health of a school.

Researchers found strong correlations between four aspects of organizational health and student achievement (Browne, 2002; W. K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Ramdass & Lewis, 2012; P. A. Smith, 2002; Valente, 1999). They discovered that teacher affiliation, resource support, and academic emphasis positively correlated to student achievement, whereas institutional integrity correlated negatively to student achievement. These findings remain consistent even when the researchers control for socioeconomic status. Across many of the studies, the strongest correlation existed for the academic emphasis in the schools (Brown, Roney, & Anfara, 2003; W. K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Sweetland & W. K. Hoy, 2000). In other words, it appears that schools that hold high expectations for their students and maintain an orderly environment see higher student achievement scores on standardized tests (Goddard et al., 2000). This finding was so consistent that Goddard
et al. (2000) focused one study on that result and found strong positive correlations between academic emphasis in a school and the achievement of its students.

The negative correlation between institutional integrity and student achievement was troubling to Hoy and his colleagues initially (see W. K. Hoy et al., 1991). However, W. K. Hoy et al., (1991) theorized that schools with higher achievement levels often have more involvement from the community. Schools with higher socioeconomic status often find more parental involvement as well. W. K. Hoy and Hannum (1997) pointed out that although teachers often wish to be shielded from the involvement of parents in their classrooms, such involvement is often associated with positive outcomes for the students. W. K. Hoy and Hannum suggested that teachers recognize the potential that parental involvement holds for the benefit of the students. Although such involvement can threaten the institutional integrity of the school, it should be welcomed and cultivated for the best possible results (W. K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997).

Another consistent finding concerned the influence of the principal on student achievement. The principal bears most of the responsibility for the managerial area of W. K. Hoy and Feldman's (1987) organizational health framework. Accordingly, the influence of the principal on student achievement was indirect at best (Browne, 2002; Goddard et al., 2000; W. K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997; W. K. Hoy, 1990; Kirtman, 2014; P.A. Smith, 2002; Sweetland & W. K. Hoy, 2000; Valente, 1999). P. A. Smith (2002) proposed that principals support the teachers by staving off unreasonable external demands and using influence on superiors to fulfill the needs of schools.

School and district leadership have been under scrutiny in recent years as researchers try to define not only the qualities of effective leadership but also the impact
of leadership on the operation of schools and even on student achievement. Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) claimed that leadership is second to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to student achievement. The authors also stressed that leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most. Without a powerful leader, troubled schools are unlikely to be turned around. The authors proclaimed that a number of factors may contribute to a turnaround, but leadership is the catalyst. Leithwood et al. (2004) examined three sets of practices that make up the basic core of successful leadership: setting direction, developing people, and redesigning the organization. They noted that these practices alone are not sufficient for leaders aiming to improve student learning, but without these basic core practices leaders would be unable to affect change in a school.

Leithwood et al. (2004) acknowledged that further study would reveal more about what is needed to identify specific leadership practices that lead to student achievement. Nonetheless, based on their findings the authors recommended that principals: create and sustain schools that can compete with private, charter, and magnet schools; empower others to make decisions; provide instructional guidance; and develop and implement strategic and school improvement plans.

Henderson et al. (2005) explored organizational health and student achievement in middle level schools using a mixed methods approach. The focus of this investigation was on three dimensions of organizational health (teacher affiliation, resource support, and academic emphasis) and their relationship to student achievement. Ten middle level schools in six school districts in Tennessee were selected as sites for data collection. The study utilized both school district data and a 45-item questionnaire: Organizational
Health Inventory-Middle Level (OHI-ML) that was administered to all the teachers and administrators in the 10 middle level schools to generate quantitative data. Student achievement scores from 2003 (reading and language, math comprehension, science, and social studies) were obtained for each of the middle level schools in the form of median national percentile scores for eighth grade. Quantitative data were analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlation. Correlations were computed for OHI index scores and the median national percentile scores for each subject area. Following the administration of the OHI-ML, semi-structured interviews were conducted with an administrator and at least two teachers at each of the 10 middle level schools. The interview questions were designed to allow a more complete exploration of the six dimensions of the OHI-ML inventory. Henderson et al. (2005) detected a positive relationship between a school’s academic emphasis and student achievement. It should be noted that the study was limited by including only 10 middle level schools and not having access to disaggregated student achievement data to see the effects of organizational health factors on subgroups in each school's population.

Brown et al. (2011) affirmed the work of W. K. Hoy, Tarter, and A. W. Hoy (2006), who noted that the collective properties of academic emphasis, collective efficacy, and faculty trust work together to create positive academic environments. Brown et al. (2011) explored how state-recognized “honor schools of excellence” either promoted (or failed to promote) both academic excellence and systemic equity for all students. Twenty-four schools participated in this mixed-methods study. Quantitative data were collected through equity audits. The 24 schools were ranked based on minority achievement and then grouped into two types of schools: small gap (SG) schools and
large gap (LG) schools. Qualitative data were collected through the use of semi-structured interviews with principals, assistant principals, teachers, and parent leaders to document best practices and effective strategies that principals used to confront and change past practices anchored in open and residual racism and class discrimination. The results identified three areas in which there were differences between the SG schools and the LG schools: encouraging academic achievement, offering instructional feedback, and expecting excellence. Based on the findings, Brown et al. (2011) recommended that to truly honor excellence, educators need to embrace equity. As such, the outcomes of interest are better in schools in which principals support, model, and monitor a teamwork approach, a strong sense of purpose, and an insistent disposition to assure that all students are served well and that all are encouraged to perform at their highest levels.

Bevel (2010) examined the effects of academic optimism on student academic achievement by measuring the individual and collective effects of academic emphasis, collective efficacy, and faculty trust in the students, parents, and each other in 29 elementary schools in Alabama. Data were obtained using the School Academic Optimism Scale (SAOS) developed by W. K. Hoy et al., (2006) and the reading section of the Alabama Reading and Mathematics Test (ARMT) administered to fifth graders in the spring of 2008. Control variables included student to teacher ratio and student socioeconomic status as determined by the percentage of students participating in the free and reduced lunch program. Independent variables were academic emphasis, collective efficacy, and teacher trust of students, parents and other teachers. The dependent variable of student achievement was measured using fifth grade reading scores on the ARMT. Data analysis included bivariate correlations of all variables and multiple regressions to
test the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The results confirmed that there is a positive correlation between academic optimism and student achievement as measured by fifth grade reading scores on the ARMT. Collectively, all variables were strong predictors of reading scores on the ARMT.

Previous studies have found significant correlations between aspects of organizational health and student achievement (Bevel, 2010; Coleman & Roney, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2000). The organizational health of a school appears to be a factor that can affect students in positive or negative ways. It can also provide insights for leaders into aspects of their schools that could have gone unnoticed. Finally, organizational health can be used as a gauge for reform in schools (W.K. Hoy & Hannum, 1997).

High Performance in High Poverty Schools

The term 90/90/90, coined by Reeves in 1995, was used to identify schools with the following characteristics: 90% or more students were eligible for free or reduced lunch, 90% or more students were members of an ethnic minority group, and 90% or more students met the district or state academic standards in reading or another area (Reeves, 2003).

The original research on the 90/90/90 schools was conducted at the Center for Performance Assessment and has been instructive in the evaluation of the use of assessments and standards (Reeves, 2003). The researcher included test data from 1995 to 1998 from students in elementary through high school. Data were gathered from more than 130,000 students in 228 schools. School locations included the inner-city, the
suburbs, and rural areas. Student populations ranged from poor and/or minority to schools that were largely Anglo and/or economically advantaged.

Reeves (2003) reported that the educational practices in 90/90/90 schools are worthy of notice because many people assume that there is an inextricable relationship between poverty, ethnicity, and academic achievement. While the impact of poverty clearly has not been eliminated, the prevailing hypothesis that poverty and ethnic minority status are invariably linked to low student achievement does not conform to the data.

Using a mixed methods approach, Reeves (2003) sought to identify common behaviors exhibited by leaders and teachers in 90/90/90 schools. Site visits and analysis of accountability data were used in the study. As a result, the researcher found five characteristics common to all 90/90/90 schools. These characteristics were as follows:

- a focus on academic achievement,
- clear curriculum choices,
- frequent assessment of student progress and multiple opportunities for improvement,
- an emphasis on nonfiction writing, and
- collaborative scoring of student work.

**Focus on academic achievement.** The 90/90/90 schools had a laser-like focus on student achievement. In the 90/90/90 schools it was clear that academic performance was highly prized. The focus on achievement included a particular emphasis on improvement. This is especially important in environments in which many students come
to school with academic skills that are below grade level. Teachers and administrators paid particular attention to students who had deficiencies in reading and writing. Literacy interventions were designed to help students reach the desired achievement levels (Reeves, 2003).

**Curriculum choices.** In 90/90/90 schools, emphasis on achievement led to fewer curriculum choices. Teachers spent more time on the core subjects of reading, writing, and mathematics and less time on other subjects. Despite the disproportionate emphasis on language arts and mathematics, these schools outperformed their peer schools on science tests as well. The results of this study illuminated an important point: tests of science and social studies, study skills, and every other subject area are, in fact, tests of reading and writing (Reeves, 2003).

**Frequent assessment of student progress with multiple opportunities for improvement.** The consistent message from the 90/90/90 schools was that there was no penalty for poor performance and low grades; instead, students were given multiple opportunities to improve performance. Schools conducted weekly assessments of student progress. In a classroom in which there were multiple opportunities to improve, the consequences for poor performance were not bad grades and discouragement (Reeves, 2003).

**Emphasis on nonfiction writing.** Reeves (2003) pointed out that the 90/90/90 schools emphasized written responses in performance assessments. The use of written
responses appeared to help the teacher obtain better diagnostic information about the students, and certainly helped students demonstrate the thinking process used to find a correct response to an academic challenge. Teachers in successful 90/90/90 schools placed high emphasis on informative writing. They used a typical scoring rubric to evaluate all writings.

In addition, Reeves (2003) suggested that the benefits of emphasizing writing appeared to be two-fold. First, students processed information in a much clearer way when they were required to write an answer. Second, teachers had the opportunity to diagnose obstacles to student learning through students’ writings.

**Collaborative scoring of student work.** Reeves (2003) recognized another characteristic of the 90/90/90 schools was frequent external scoring of assessments. High achieving schools developed common assessment practices and reinforced those practices through regular exchanges of student papers. To reduce the cause for disagreements when teachers exchanged papers, they developed a uniformed basis to evaluate student work.

The findings from the research pointed out that while poverty and other demographic variables may be important, they were not determinative in predicting student success. The key variable was not poverty but teaching quality. Effective teaching made a difference in student achievement. The lessons of the 90/90/90 schools provided evidence that properly designed accountability systems can provide a wealth of information for those desiring to find the keys to improve achievement for all students (Borman, 2003; Reeves, 2003).
Summary

As a result of poverty, illiteracy, and increasing school dropout rates, the federal Title I program was established in 1965 to combat the country’s social ills (HEW, Office of Education, 1969). Poverty in schools can affect academic outcomes and the Title I program was focused on improving the achievement levels of all low performing students. However, many urban schools are still faced with a decline in student achievement or persistent underachievement. In order to find solutions to the decline in student achievement, W. K. Hoy and Miskel (2008) suggested viewing schools through the lens of organizational health. Organizational health is the interpersonal dynamics of students, teachers, and administrators. The level of a school’s organization health is a factor of how well a school can cope with its external forces and mobilize its resources in order to reach its goals (W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Several studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between organizational health and student achievement (Goddard et al., 2004; Tarter & W. K. Hoy, 1988; W. K. Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Correlations between some factors of organizational health and student achievement have been found in previous studies (Bevel, 2010; Goddard et al., 2004; Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992). This current study was conducted in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The results of this study may significantly aid state legislatures, local and state school boards, administrators, and educators in identifying determinants that can affect positive improvements in student achievement, provide meaningful professional development opportunities, and provide practitioners greater insights into how schools may survive and develop in a complex 21st century setting.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in reading in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Also, the 2011 SAT-10 was used to measure student achievement as expressed by reading scores for students enrolled in fourth grade. Organizational health of schools was measured using the OHI-E questionnaire developed by W. K. Hoy (2003b). The organizational health of schools was described as the way in which faculty, staff, students, and administrators interact within a school (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Based upon W.K. Hoy and Feldman’s (1987) definition of organizational health that linked healthy school climates to improved learning environments and increased student achievement, organizational health was defined as the set of internal characteristics that differentiate schools from one another and influence the behavior of faculty, staff, and students (W.K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In addition, the five levels of organizational health examined in this investigation were (a) academic emphasis, (b) teacher affiliation, (c) collegial leadership, (d) resource influence, and (e) institutional integrity. Finally, the contents of this chapter include a description of the research design, sample, instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures.
Research Design

A correlational design was used for this quantitative study to examine the organizational health of urban Title I elementary schools and student achievement in reading. Data collection included a review of results from the 2011 SAT-10 reading scores of fourth grade students in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama, and the scores on the OHI-E from the teachers in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The following hypotheses were tested:

**H1**: There is no significant relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H2**: There is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H3**: There is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H4**: There is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools Alabama.

**H5**: There is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H6**: There is no significant relationship between resource influence and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Rationale for Quantitative Research

According to Creswell (2007), the research design process begins with philosophical assumptions that researchers make when deciding to undertake a study. In
research design, researchers use interpretive and theoretical frameworks to further shape the study. These philosophical assumptions and frameworks are used to guide the method of inquiry. Creswell (2003) identified the following philosophical concepts: (a) a position toward the nature of reality (ontology), (b) how the researcher knows what is right; especially value judgments in ethics (axiology), (c) the language of the research (rhetoric), and (d) the methods used in the process (methodology). In addition to these elements, Hatch (2002) contended that researchers further shape an investigation by introducing paradigms or a basic set of beliefs to the research.

The philosophical framework for the current study was based on a postpositivism orientation. The postpositivism tradition is rooted in the 19th-century writings of Comte, Mill, Durkheim, Newton, and Locke (J. K. Smith, 1983). More recently, postpositivism has been articulated by writers such as Phillips and Burbules. According to Phillips and Burbules (2000), postpositivism rejected the view that knowledge has a solid foundation. These researchers stated that fallacies in research are unavoidable and are omnipresent for the postpositivist researcher. Research or knowledge is full of conjecture, which can be re-theorized at a later date as better data become available (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Creswell (2003) noted that postpositivist assumptions are grounded in the scientific method of what has come to be known as quantitative research. Hatch (2002) differentiated postpositivism and positivism by acknowledging that both paradigms agree that reality exits, but because of the limitations of human inquiry we cannot be positive about claims of knowledge when studying the behavior and actions of humans.

In quantitative or postpositivism studies, researchers examine the relationships among variables by asking questions or stating hypotheses (Creswell, 2003). Through the
postpositivist lens, knowledge is based on careful observations and measurements of the objective reality that exists in the world. Researchers seek to maintain an objective position in relation to the phenomena they are studying and use disciplined research techniques to ensure that empirical data drive their findings (Hatch, 2002). Theories are used to generate general explanations of phenomena that occur in the world and to guide research (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The hypotheses and research questions are often based on theories that the researcher seeks to test (Creswell, 2003).

In practice, postpositivist researchers view research as a series of logical and related steps and espouse rigorous methods of data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2007). Researchers use multiple levels of data analyses, employ computer programs to assist in analyses, use multiple methods to establish validity, and write scientific reports that specifically address the problem, questions, data collection, results, and conclusions (Creswell, 2007). Finally, there are laws or theories that govern the world that need to be tested. Using the scientific method approach, researchers begin with a theory, collect data that either supports or refutes the theory, and make empirical generalizations (Creswell, 2003).

**Population**

A total of 193 teachers participated in the study. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2011), Alabama has one urban school district. The unit of analysis was the 28 schools identified as urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.
Instrumentation

The instruments used to determine if there was a significant difference in organizational health in urban Title I elementary schools and student achievement in reading as expressed by fourth grade reading scores were (a) the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) reading scores from the 2011 SAT-10, and (b) the OHI-E. The first instrument was the NCE scores. NCE scores were used to study overall school performance in student achievement. The second instrument was the OHI-E. This survey was used to assess the overall environment of the school based on participants’ responses.

SAT-10. As of 2011, all students in Alabama in grades 3-8 took the SAT-10 in April of each school year. The primary purposes of the test were to (a) compare individual and group performance with performance of the norming group, (b) report relative strengths and weaknesses of individuals and groups, and (c) provide data to study changes in performance over time. The results of the SAT-10 provide Alabama educators, parents, and the public with comparisons of performance by Alabama students, schools, school systems, and the state to the performance of students in the nation. The SAT-10 is a norm-referenced test, which means that each student is measured against a norming group which is comprised of students who are representative of that grade level across the country.

NCE. NCE is a way of standardizing scores on a test. It is a standardized score with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 21.06 resulting in near equal interval scales from 0 to 99 if the scores are normally distributed. The NCE was developed by RMC
Research Corporation in 1976 to measure the effectiveness of Title I programs across the United States; it is often used to measure gains over time (Mertler, 2002).

**OHI-E.** The OHI-E developed by W.K. Hoy is an instrument designed to examine the overall health of schools (W. K. Hoy, 2003b). It is used to describe the behavior and interactions in schools to classify them as either health or unhealthy. In healthy schools, behaviors of students, teachers, and principals are in accord with one another. Whereas, in unhealthy schools, behaviors of students, teachers, and principals are in conflict with one another and the school is vulnerable to destructive outside forces.

W. K. Hoy (2010) described the dimensions of the OHI-E as follows:

1. **Academic emphasis** refers to the school’s press for achievement. The expectation of high achievement is met by students who work hard, are cooperative, seek extra work, and respect other students who get good grades.

2. **Teacher affiliation** refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation with the school. Teachers feel good about each other and, at the same time, have a sense of accomplishment from their jobs. They are committed to both their students and their colleagues. They find ways to accommodate the routine while enthusiastically accomplishing their jobs.

3. **Resource influence** describes the principal’s ability to affect the actions of superiors to the benefit of the teachers. Teachers are given adequate classroom supplies and extra instructional materials and supplies are easily obtained.

4. **Collegial leadership** refers to a principal’s behavior as it relates to being friendly, supportive, open, and guided by norms of equality. At the same time,
however, the principal sets the tone for high performance by letting people know what is expected of them.

5. Institutional integrity describes a school that honors its educational mission.
   The school is not vulnerable to narrow, vested interests of community groups.
   Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.
   The school is able to cope successfully with destructive outside forces.

**Reliability**

Each of the dimensions of the survey was measured by a subtest of the OHI-E.

The reliability scores for the subtests were high, with reported scores at the following levels: institutional integrity (.90), collegial leadership (.95), resource influence (.89), teacher affiliation (.94), and academic emphasis (.87). In addition, the results of a factor analysis supported the construct validity of the concept of organizational health (W. K. Hoy & Tarter, 1997; W. K. Hoy et al., 1991).

**Construct Validity**

Construct validity was based on the logical relationship among variables. It refers to how much a measure covers the range of meanings included within a concept (Babbie, 2007). The questions on the OHI-E were developed by Hoy (2003b). The survey is a 37-item instrument composed of dimensions or subtests. A factor analysis of several samples of the instrument supported the construct validity of the concept of organizational health (W. K. Hoy & Tarter, 1997; W. K. Hoy et al., 1991).
The OHI-E is in the form of a questionnaire and contains 37 items with five subtests in which educators describe specific behaviors in their schools. This broad climate perspective allows for examination of the relationships between the school and its environment, the leadership of the principal, relationships among teachers, and relationships between teachers and students. The five subtest scores represent the health profile of the school. Items are scored using a 4-point Likert scale with the following options: 1 (rarely occurs), 2 (sometimes occurs), 3 (often occurs), and 4 (very frequently occurs) (Hoy, 2003b). Eight items on the questionnaire are written in the negative. These items are scored in reverse. For these questions, the following scale was used: 4 (rarely occurs), 3 (sometimes occurs), 2 (often occurs), and 1 (very frequently occurs). The subtest scores are converted to standardized scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100. The overall health scores can be found in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Above 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>551-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>525-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly above average</td>
<td>511-524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>490-510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly below average</td>
<td>476-489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>450-475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>449-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Below 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from “The Organizational Health Inventory for Elementary Schools” by Hoy, 2003b, [http://www.waynehoy.com/ohi-e.html](http://www.waynehoy.com/ohi-e.html)*
Data Collection

The primary data collection methods used for this study were retrieving the public SAT-10 NCE group scores for each school from the school district and collecting responses to the OHI-E from the teachers at the urban Title I elementary schools (Appendix A and C). After approval was received for all of the components of the proposal by the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (IRB) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB), a written letter was sent to the superintendent of the school district requesting permission for his or her school to participate in the research project (Appendix B and D). After acquiring permission from the superintendent, email invitations were sent to the teachers at urban Title I elementary schools requesting participation in the study (Appendix E and F). One hundred ninety-three self-selecting teachers responded to this request. Data were obtained from teachers using an electronic survey in Qualtrics, a commercially-available survey instrument. Each teacher was asked to complete a 37-item electronic survey. Although teachers were asked not to give their names, they were asked to identify their schools so that survey results would be credited to the proper school. No other identifying marks were presented. Teachers’ responses were anonymous. The results of the survey were compared to the SAT-10 scores. No identifiable student information was retrieved. In the findings report of this study, the anonymity of the participants and schools was protected by coding.

Data Analysis

Data from the study were analyzed using multiple regression analysis. Multiple regression analysis permits the researcher to analyze the relationship among two or more
independent variables (scores on the OHI-E) and a dependent variable (student achievement; Healey, 2005). Multiple regression analysis is a strength of relationship index that indicates the degree to which the predicted scores are correlated with the observed scores (Green & Salkind, 2008). The unit of analysis was the school. The regression equation allowed the assessment of the importance of various independent variables by comparing beta weights. Using SPSS (version 16) software for statistical data analysis for all variables, a table of results was generated. This study was limited to the teachers’ responses to the survey. Responses from parents, students, and administrators were not solicited. This study was not able to determine causality among variables because the research was not experimental. The results of this study were limited to the population of urban Title I Elementary schools in Alabama.

**Ethical Considerations**

According to Creswell (2003), all phases of the research process have associated ethical issues. Researchers need to anticipate the ethical issues that may arise during their studies. Studies should be designed to contain the use of well-established ethical principles and practices with considerations for participants, research sites, and potential readers. This study was designed to eliminate possible risks of ethical issues that typically arise in research. The purpose of the study was disclosed to the participants and the voluntary aspects of the study were explained. The research study was explained to the participants through the use of an electronic information sheet. The information sheet accompanied the electronic survey and additionally served as the consent documentation. Participants and their responses were anonymous. All data collected was in full
compliance with the UAB IRB guidelines. There were no known risks or discomforts associated with participation in this study. Participants were advised that no personal or financial benefits would result from participating in this study. Information obtained from the participants was kept private to the extent allowed by law. Data were collected at a secure online survey site, then downloaded and stored on a password-protected computer and will be kept for five years from the end of the study.

Summary

This quantitative study examined the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in reading of urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. A correlational design was used in this study. Data collection included a review of the results from the SAT-10 reading scores of fourth grade students in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama and the scores on the OHI-E. The study population consisted of 193 teachers who were teaching in an urban elementary school that included fourth grade. The NCE reading scores from the SAT-10 and the OHI-E were the instruments used in the study. Participants were asked to complete the survey electronically. Data from the study were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression analysis. This study was designed to eliminate the possible risk of ethical issues that can arise in research by containing ethical principles and practices for participants, research sites, and potential readers.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in reading at urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The data presented in this study were obtained from teachers’ responses to the OHI-E electronic survey and the SAT-10. The OHI-E instrument was presented in accordance with the published directions to 193 public, urban, Title I elementary school teachers in an urban Title I school district. (W. K. Hoy, 2003b). The SAT-10 data was retrieved from the school district. The statistical procedures used in this research were multiple regression and correlation analyses. The criterion employed to determine significance was an alpha level of .05. In this chapter findings of the research, along with descriptive statistics and analyses of data, are presented.

Descriptive Statistics

This study was conducted in an urban Title I school district. Participants were public school teachers who taught in urban Title I schools. At the time of this study there were 28 Title I elementary schools located within the urban school district. The total population of teachers in urban elementary schools in the district was selected for this study. Data retrieved from the local education agency confirmed that there were 840 teachers employed within the urban school district. A total of 193 participants responded to the electronic survey; however, only 180 teachers returned useable surveys. A
descriptive analysis of the responses to the survey can be found in Table 3. The configuration of the responding schools varied from pre-kindergarten to fifth grade (PK-5), kindergarten to fifth grade (K-5), pre-kindergarten to eighth grade (PK-8), and kindergarten to eighth grade (K-8). The most common configuration of the responding schools was kindergarten to fifth grade.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K - 5th</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 5th</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K - 8th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8th</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Information</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of Subscales of OHI-E

Internal consistency was measured using Cronbach’s alpha (α) reliability statistic. The Cronbach’s α statistic increases as the inter-correlation of scale items increases. A high value of α is often used as evidence that the items measure an underlying construct. A Cronbach’s α score for each subtest of the OHI-E was computed and is listed in Table 4. Results were obtained for institutional integrity (α = .53), collegial leadership (α = .89), research influence (α = .79), teacher affiliation (α = .78), and academic emphasis (α = .58). In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha scores calculated were different from the results obtained by W. K. Hoy et al., (1991) when they computed the alpha for the subtests:
institutional integrity ($\alpha = .90$), collegial leadership ($\alpha = .95$), resource influence ($\alpha = .89$), teacher affiliation ($\alpha = .94$), and academic emphasis ($\alpha = .87$). Babbie (2007) noted that when describing internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha, a sample with a narrow range can deflate the values of alpha. For this study, the sample size was 180, thus producing a lower value of alpha. Nonetheless, the $\alpha$ values are within the acceptable range and indicate good internal consistency between scale items (Soper, 2012).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cronbach’s $\alpha$</th>
<th># of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional integrity</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial leadership</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource influence</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher affiliation</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. % = percentage of total participants’ data used to calculate Cronbach’s $\alpha$.

**Construct Validity**

Construct validity is based on the logical relationship among variables. It refers to how much a measure covers the range of meanings included within a concept (Babbie, 2007). The questions on the OHI-E were developed by W. K. Hoy (2003b). The survey is a 37-item instrument composed of dimensions or subtests. A factor analysis of several

OHI-E is administered as a questionnaire and contains 37 items with five subtests. Educators filling out the questionnaire describe specific behaviors in their schools. This broad climate perspective examines the relationships between the school and its environment, the leadership of the principal, relationships among teachers, and relationships between teachers and students. The six subtest scores represent the health profile of the school.

**Correlational Analysis**

OHI-E scores were standardized to obtain an overall standardized OHI-E score for schools and standardized subtest scores in each of the five areas of organizational health outlined by W. K. Hoy and Tarter (1997): institutional integrity (II), academic emphasis (AE), teacher affiliation (TA), resource influence (RI), and collegial leadership (CL). Data from the OHI-E were examined to find potential correlations among variables. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed with the standardized subtest scores and the standardized OHI-E score for each school using SPSS software. Pearson correlation analysis was performed to examine relationships among variables. Pearson $r$ was found for each subset of the OHI-E and the overall OHI-E scores to examine the strength and direction of the relationships among the variables.

As seen in Table 5, the correlation between institutional integrity (II) and resource influence (RI) was significant, $(r = -.164, p = .030)$. The correlation coefficient for the relationship was -.164 and was significant at the .05 alpha level, indicating a negative
Table 5

*Pearson Correlation Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SDS II</th>
<th>SDS CL</th>
<th>SDS RI</th>
<th>SDS TA</th>
<th>SDS AE</th>
<th>Overall OHI-E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDS II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS CL</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.719**</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.848**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS RI</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>.719**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS AE</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.464**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.746**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall OHI-E</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.848**</td>
<td>.853**</td>
<td>.809**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

The results suggest that II and RI are negatively correlated. CL was positively significantly correlated with RI \((r = .719, p = .000)\), TA \((r = .600, p = .000)\), and AE \((r = .354, p = .000)\). RI was positively significantly related to TA \((r = .578, p = .000)\) and AE \((r = .510, p = .000)\). Also, TA was significantly positively related to AE \((r = .464, p = .000)\). Additionally, the overall OHI-E score was positively significantly correlated with all subtests except II.
Testing the Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

**H1**
There is no significant relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H2**
There is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H3**
There is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H4**
There is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H5**
There is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H6**
There is no significant relationship between resource influence and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Multiple Regression

Multiple regression was performed to assess the ability of the independent variables: institutional integrity, collegial leadership, resource influence, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis to predict schools’ national NCE total reading achievement on the SAT-10. The regression line represents all of the subtests considered as a unit. The data presented in Table 6 show how the independent variables (the subtests of the OHI-E) interacted with the dependent variable (mean national NCE total reading score).
Results for each hypothesis were examined in two phases. First, a preliminary analysis was conducted to ensure there were no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and multicollinearity. Green and Salkind (2008) described normality as each value or variable is normally distributed resulting in a linear relationship among variables. They point out the linearity refers to the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable as being linear and multicollinearity suggests that there should be no perfect linear relationships among the predictors. Second, the most representative values of each statistical procedure were assessed in order to accept or reject each null hypothesis.

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no significant relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the overall organizational health inventory score of a school and student achievement as
measured by the mean national NCE total reading scores in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The results of the multiple regression analysis are shown in Table 6. The relationship between overall organizational health and student achievement was not significant at the .05 level, $R^2 = .014$, $F(1, 149) = 2.11$, and $p = .15$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. Based on the multiple regression results, the overall organizational health of a school does not significantly predict student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools.

**Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

The multiple regression analysis output revealed that the relationship between institutional integrity of urban Title I elementary schools and student achievement was not statistically significant at the .05 level, $R^2 = .01$, $F(1,173) = 2.33$, and $p = .13$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

**Null Hypothesis 3.** There is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

The results of the multiple regression analysis of the relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools were significant at the .05 level, $R^2 = .04$, $F(1,161) = 6.13$, and $p = .01$. Based on these results, teacher affiliation appears to have an effect on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools.
Null Hypothesis 4. There is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools Alabama.

The multiple regression analysis of the relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama revealed no statistical difference at the .05 level and produced $R^2 = .00, F(1,173) = .12$, and $p = .90$. These results indicate that academic emphasis does not appear to show an effect on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Null Hypothesis 5. There is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

A multiple regression was conducted on the relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The results were not significant at the .05 level, $R^2 = .00, F(1,169) = .34$, and $p = .56$. Based on these results, collegial leadership does not appear to offer predictive power on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Null Hypothesis 6. There is no significant relationship between resource influence and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

The results of the multiple regression analysis between resource influence and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama were not significant at the .05 level, $R^2 = .00, F(1,171) = .28$, and $p = .60$. These results indicate that resource influence does not appear to offer predictive power with regard to student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.
Summary

In order to answer the research question, six null hypotheses were examined and analyzed. For this study, the dimensions of the OHI-E --institutional integrity, teacher affiliation, academic emphasis, collegial leadership, and resource influence -- were investigated along with the overall organizational health of the schools to evaluate the effect of each dimension on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools.

Dimensions of the OHI-E were individually tested by performing a Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis. The appropriate statistical test was selected for each hypothesis according to the data type and the purpose of the analysis to explore potential relationships.

According to the Pearson correlations, institutional integrity and resource influence were statistically significant and negatively correlated at the 0.05 level. Collegial leadership was positively correlated to resource influence, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis. Also, resource influence was positively significant related to teacher affiliation and academic emphasis; teacher affiliation and academic emphasis were positively significant. Finally, the overall OHI-E score was significantly correlated with all of the other subtests except institutional integrity. The multiple regression analysis revealed, as it relates to student achievement on the SAT-10 test, that teacher affiliation indicated a significant effect on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter provides a brief summary of the study, including an overview of the problem, the purpose statement, and the methodology. The results are then presented in terms of the major findings for the hypotheses and relationships to the literature. Finally, implications for theory, research, practice, and policy are presented, followed by limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and concluding observations.

Summary

With the increased drive toward accountability and urgent concerns about student achievement, educators must be able to accurately identify factors that influence student achievement, especially in Title urban I elementary schools. Historically, Title I funds have been used to help bridge the gap of student achievement in high poverty schools. Title I programs have included preschool interventions, summer enrichment programs, class size reductions, and school reform programs (Borman, 2003). However, a measure of student achievement for schools may involve examining the organizational health of the school through a set of comprehensive factors related to improved student achievement (Farahani et al., 2014; W. K. Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Ramdass & Lewis, 2012). The goal of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational health and student achievement of urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. In order to
recognize connections between organizational health and student achievement in urban
Title I elementary schools, this study addressed the following null hypotheses:

**H1o.** There is no significant relationship between organizational health and
student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H2o.** There is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and
student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H3o.** There is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student
achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H4o.** There is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student
achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H5o.** There is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student
achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

**H6o.** There is no significant relationship between resource influence and student
achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

The 2011SAT-10 was used to measure student achievement as expressed by
reading scores for students enrolled in fourth grade. The organizational health of schools
was measured using the OHI-E questionnaire developed by W. K. Hoy, (2003b). The
organizational health of schools was described as the way in which faculty, staff,
students, and administrators interact within a school (W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008).
Organizational health was defined as the set of internal characteristics that differentiate
schools from one another and influence the behavior of their faculty, staff, and students
(W. K. Hoy & Miskel, 2008). The five levels of organizational health that were examined
in this investigation were (a) institutional integrity, (b) collegial leadership, (c) resource
influence, (d) teacher affiliation, and (e) academic emphasis. W. K. Hoy et al. (1991)
described the subtests of the OHI-E as follows:

1. Institutional integrity describes a school that has integrity in its
   educational program. The school is not vulnerable to narrow, vested
   interests of community groups. Teachers are protected from unreasonable
   community and parental demands. The school is able to cope successfully
   with destructive outside forces.

2. Collegial leadership refers to the behavior of the principal that is friendly,
   supportive, open, and guided by norms of equality. However, the principal
   sets the tone for high performance by articulating high expectations.

3. Resource influence describes the principal’s ability to affect the action of
   superiors to the benefit of the teachers. Teachers are given adequate
   classroom supplies and extra instructional materials and supplies are easily
   obtained.

4. Teacher affiliation refers to a sense of friendliness and strong affiliation
   with the school. Teachers feel good about each other and have a sense of
   accomplishment from their jobs. They are committed to both their students
   and their colleagues. They find ways to accommodate to the routine,
   accomplishing their jobs with enthusiasm.

5. Academic emphasis refers to the school’s press for achievement. The
   expectations of high achievement are met by students who work hard, are
   cooperative, seek extra work, and respect other students who achieve.
Urban Title I elementary teachers were considered the population for this study. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2011), Alabama has one urban school district; therefore, the unit of analysis was each one of the 28 schools identified as urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. There were 193 teachers who participated in this study.

The two statistical procedures of Pearson correlation analysis and multiple regression were applied to assess the variables under investigation that were significant at the .05 level. Five dimensions of organizational health and the schools’ overall health scores were analyzed as independent variables. One variable was analyzed as the dependent variable: reading achievement on the SAT-10. Based on this study, institutional integrity and resource influence were statistically significant and negatively correlated at the .05 level.

Collegial leadership was positively correlated to resource influence, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis. Additionally, resource influence was statistically significant and positively correlated with teacher affiliation and academic emphasis. Consequently, teacher affiliation and academic emphasis were also statistically significant and positively correlated. The overall OHI-E score was significantly correlated with all of the subtests with the exception of institutional integrity. As it relates to student achievement on the SAT-10 test, the multiple regression analysis revealed that teacher affiliation had a significant effect on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools.
Discussion of Findings

The main findings are related to the correlations and multiple regression analyses for the variables tested and summarized in this section. Five dimensions of the OHI-E were individually examined to assess potential relationships with student achievement on the SAT-10; conclusions are described in the following paragraphs.

Hypothesis 1. Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Results from the multiple regression analysis indicated that overall organizational health was not a strong predictor of student achievement in urban schools in Alabama.

However, the results from the correlation found significant relationships among the dimensions of organizational health in collegial leadership, resource influence, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis. As findings of this study indicated, several dimensions of organizational health were positively correlated with student achievement. This finding is consistent with those of previous researchers who found strong positive correlation among four aspects of organizational health and student achievement (Brown et al., 2003; Farahani et al., 2014; W. K. Hoy, Hannum, & Tschanannen-Moran, 1998; P. A. Smith, 2002; Uline et al., 1998).

Uline et al. (1998) investigated the impact of organizational health on math, reading, and writing achievement in high schools. The authors identified a significant correlation between an overall organizational health score and math achievement. In a subsequent study of middle schools, Sweetland and W. K. Hoy (2000) concluded that
organizational health has a positive correlation with teacher empowerment and student achievement in reading and math.

Similarly, Brown et al. (2003) interviewed teachers at high- and low-performing middle schools in Tennessee that were implementing the *Turning Points* reform and found evidence of significant differences between the high- and low-performing schools in five areas of organizational health. In the area of academic emphasis, high-performing schools held high expectations, encouraged active involvement, and teachers were confident in their students’ abilities. Conversely, in low-performing schools teachers had lowered their expectations in an attempt to give students a taste of success. They taught from a stagnant curriculum and lacked overall confidence in the abilities of their students (Brown et al., 2003; Moolenaar, Sleeers, & Daly, 2012).

In the area of teacher affiliation, teachers from both high- and low-performing schools were found to be committed to their students. However, teachers in the high-performing schools expressed more satisfaction with their jobs and spoke of a strong sense of collegiality, as compared to teachers in the low-performing schools. In the area of collegial leadership, teachers in the high-performing schools reported that their principals were instructional leaders who fostered a shared vision, growth, and development for the school. Principals of the low-performing schools were reported to be focused mainly on test scores. In the area of resource support, teachers in the high-performing schools reported an abundance of resources while the teachers from low-performing schools said that they had adequate to low levels of resources. Teachers from both sets of schools reported a lack of time. Finally, in the area of institutional integrity, teachers from high-performing schools reported high levels of parental involvement, a
focus on what the schools can do for the community, and high levels of resistance to external pressures. Teachers from low-performing schools asked what the community could do for their schools. They reported low levels of parental involvement and resistance to outside pressures.

**Hypothesis 2.** Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there is no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Results from the correlations indicated that resource influence, teacher affiliation, academic emphasis, and overall organizational health had significant positive relationships to collegial leadership. However, multiple regression analysis showed no significant relationship between collegial leadership and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.

Researchers in education have long recognized that educational leaders, especially school principals, influence school effectiveness (Chang, 2011; Levin & Lezotte, 1990; Pashiardis, 2004; Reynolds & Cuttance, 1992). According to Leithwood (2004), leadership is widely regarded as a key factor in accounting for academic success in schools by fostering high expectations of learning from the students. Surprisingly, the multiple regression findings of this present study did not support these earlier studies. Researchers have published some contention as to the directness or existence of the impact of collegial leadership on student achievement (Marzano, 2004; Senge, 2014; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). McGuigan and W. K. Hoy (2006) theorized that principals’ positive leadership behaviors can improve school climate, specifically through academic optimism. These researchers also discovered that in an urban context, an
orderly school environment with high expectations and involvement of the community produced a positive force for learning.

Thirty years of research by Marzano (2004) and Waters et al. (2003) revealed a substantial association between leadership and achievement. Similarly, researchers at the Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement (2009) determined that principals who effectively formulated school goals, set and communicated expectations, allocated resources, supervised teacher performance, and promoted an orderly, positive environment of learning had a positive effect on teaching in the classroom and student achievement. Consistent with previous studies, the findings of this current study found no influence on student achievement (Chang, 2011; Heck, 1992; Johnson, 1993).

**Hypothesis 3.** Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there is no significant relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. The results from the multiple regression analysis revealed a strong relationship between teacher affiliation and student achievement, which is consistent with previous research findings. Dufour and Eaker (1998) stated, “The bottom line is that there is just no way to create good schools without good teachers” (p. 205). Using data from a 50-state policy survey, Darling-Hammond (2000) noted “differential teacher effectiveness is a strong determinant of differences in student learning” (p. 1). In addition, schools function as collaborative communities; the importance of a collective focus on the singular mission of student achievement has been identified as a critical component of effective schools (Bandura, 2002; Barr, 2002; Goddard et al., 2000; Lezotte & Pepprl, 1999; Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). This current study
revealed that high-performing schools have a higher collective efficacy than low-performing schools. These results are similar to the results seen in twelfth graders studied by Goddard, LeGerfo and Hoy (2004) in which the authors identified a positive correlation between collective efficacy and student achievement on reading assessments. Additionally, the correlates from the effective schools research movement identified collaboration and a focus on common vision and mission as critical components of successful schools (e.g., Lezotte & Pepperl, 1999; Moolenaar, Sleegers, & Daly, 2012). Schools with higher collective efficacy have a tendency to set high expectations and create an environment that encourages teachers to strive for excellence, which increases student achievement and therefore builds a strong sense of individual teacher efficacy (Fryer et al., 2012; Goddard et al., 2000).

**Hypothesis 4.** Null Hypothesis 4 stated that there is no significant relationship between institutional integrity and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. According to the results of the multiple regression analyses, the findings from this study indicated no significant relationship exists between institutional integrity and student achievement. In contrast to the present findings, there is a general agreement in the literature that the more parents are involved in the schooling process, the better students will perform (Mau, 1997; Ramdass & Lewis, 2012; Wang & Wildman, 1996). Conversely, W. K. Hoy and Ferguson (1985) concluded that while schools strive to involve parents and the community in their endeavors, they must shield themselves from unreasonable pressures and demands made by external powers.
The survival of schools depends on their environment and on interactions between the components within the school. Research findings support the notion that bridging strategies to engage actively stakeholders in the life of the schools have positive consequences for students (Henderson & Map, 2002). As a result, cooperative strategies that schools employ to increase the interdependence of schools with elements in the environment embody community engagement.

**Hypothesis 5.** Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there is no significant relationship between student achievement and resource influence in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Results from the multiple regression analyses revealed that resource influence was not a significant predictor of student achievement in urban Title I schools. The results from this study were consistent with the landmark input/output studies by Coleman et al. (1966) and Jencks et al. (1972) that detected no effects of increased resources in schools on student achievement. However, Brookover et al. (1978) stated that not only does the amount of resources matter to student achievement, but also that effective and efficient use of resources is essential to student achievement.

**Hypothesis 6.** Null Hypothesis 6 stated that there is no significant relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Based on the multiple regression analyses, no significant relationship was observed between academic emphasis and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools. In contrast to the present findings, multiple authors have acknowledged that the strongest correlation with student achievement is the academic
emphasis in the schools (Brown et al., 2003; W. K. Hoy et al., 1998; W. K. Hoy et al., 2006; Lumpe et al., 2012). In other words, it appears that schools that have high expectations for students and maintain a safe and civil environment realize higher student achievement on standardized tests (Goddard et al., 2000). Similar studies have all shown strong positive associations between academic emphasis and student achievement (Brookover et al., 1978; Cawelti, 1999; Glidden, 1999).

Additionally, Lee and Bryk (1989) established a link between a school’s academic focus and student achievement regardless of student socioeconomic or minority status. Despite these findings, W.K. Hoy et al. (2002) found that academic emphasis “flows through” (p. 290) collective efficacy in order to influence student achievement. In other words, schools that exhibit a high degree of academic emphasis have teachers who assert high teacher affiliation or collective efficacy.

**Summary of Findings**

Schools administrators have the task of improving student academic achievement regardless of the prior knowledge or lack of prior knowledge students possess. Sweetland and W. K. Hoy (2000) identified areas that school personnel and stakeholders can control that affect academic achievement of students; organizational health has been identified as one such area. This current study investigated the relationship between organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. Based on statistical data analysis, teacher affiliation emerged as the strongest underlying factor of organizational health. These results are consistent with those of W. K. Hoy et al. (1991) who established that teacher affiliation has a direct impact on student achievement. The
results of this current study also support the findings of Sweetland and Hoy (2000), who linked organizational health and student achievement in middle schools. These authors observed that organizational health has a positive impact on teacher empowerment. Sweetland and W. K. Hoy (2000) also established a correlation between teacher empowerment and student achievement in reading and math. In addition to W.K. Hoy’s (2003a) concept of healthy schools, this current study may suggest Title I elementary schools in Alabama should have teachers who are committed to teaching and learning (Chang, 2011; Fryer et al., 2012; Hoy et al., 1991; Lumpe, et al., 2012; Moolenaar, et al., 2012).

**Implications**

Alabama public schools are no longer operating under the NCLB reform of the George W. Bush era (NCLB, 2002). In their place, the state is now following its own reform program known as PLAN 2020 (Belanger, 2013). The comprehensive PLAN 2020 seeks to achieve a 90% graduation rate and ensure that all graduates are prepared for college or a career by the year 2020. Although the original intent of NCLB legislation was admirable, many Alabama legislators suggested that the all-or-nothing approach did not give hard-working schools credit for realizing significant growth in academic achievement. PLAN 2020 will continue to examine the academic progress of all student subgroups in schools by using the college and career readiness scores of graduates as capstone measures of success.

Educators are focused on closing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, moving students to proficiency, and ensuring that graduates are prepared for college
and/or a career without remediation. The findings of this study, therefore, are extremely important. Specifically, findings indicated that teacher affiliation in urban Title I elementary schools strongly correlated with student achievement. Teacher affiliation on the OHI-E was more than a feeling of efficacy, it reflected teacher friendliness with other teachers and students and a commitment to the seriousness of the teaching and learning process.

For students in urban environments to become high performers they must have the guidance of teachers with a strong sense of teacher efficacy within a school with a strong collective efficacy. Raza (2010) found that teachers perform better if their schools have a healthy organizational climate. Therefore, teachers should be included in the recruitment process and interview process for teachers. Taylor (2011) pointed out that school districts should hire for attitude then train teachers for skills. Moreover, it is the responsibility of administrators of urban schools to develop teachers’ skills and develop collective efficacy within schools. Setting high standards and expecting all children to learn a challenging curriculum is doomed to failure without the teaching staff who can effectively bring all children to the desired point of learning. This means finding polices to attract and retain the best individuals and ensuring that teachers have the content knowledge and teaching skills to meet the demands placed upon them. To attract and retain the best teachers, policymakers should investigate the need to change existing pay scales. Highly compensated teachers may be more likely to remain in the field. Moreover, districts paying higher salaries may be able to recruit higher-quality teachers. Additionally, ongoing, strong professional development and training for teachers will play an important role in improving student achievement in urban schools. Strong professional development
should be a key ingredient in school reform as should increase opportunities for collaboration to build trust and instructional development activities. Fullan (2001) stated that collegiality among teachers, as measured by the frequency of communication, mutual support, and help, was a strong indicator of the success of a school in making needed changes. Adding a school support group for teachers may help in the development of building trust and affiliation with other teachers. Because many teachers work in isolation, a support team will allow teachers to share ideas, build trust, and form bonds with other colleagues. While collegial leadership was not found to have a direct impact on student achievement in this study, educational leaders should seek to develop in teachers the quality of teacher affiliation that builds camaraderie and enthusiasm for what has to be accomplished on a daily basis.

As a result of this study, school leaders and policymakers may want to examine how school districts distribute effective teachers across districts and schools. It would seem reasonable to expect that an educational leader in a Title I school would seek to employ teachers who believe that all students can achieve at the highest levels regardless of their socioeconomic status, believe in the nobility of their labors, and are willing to work collaboratively with their peers.

**Limitations**

The following limitations should be considered when inferences are drawn from the results of this study. First, the study was limited to self-selecting teachers’ responses to a web-based survey. Responses from parents, students, and administrators were not solicited, and the self-selective nature of the recruitment process may have skewed the
data. Second, the population was comprised of teachers from only one urban school district. The use of this population may limit the generalizability of study results to other urban districts. Further, the sample was smaller than anticipated due to the number of teachers who responded to the survey. Third, because the teachers were exclusively from an urban school district, results may not be generalizable to smaller and/or rural districts (Johnson, 2001). Urban schools often face challenges such as high student poverty, mobility rates, large numbers of English language learners, and unsafe neighborhoods (Orr, Byrne-Jimenez, McFarlane, & Brown, 2005). A composite of these factors may not be present in rural and suburban schools, thereby limiting generalizability of results. Fourth, the use of self-reports may have biased results; teachers may have responded as they believed the researcher would wish or because of their self-images (Holtgraves, 2004), although self-reports have been used extensively and successfully to study organizational health in a wide range of organizations, including schools.

Finally, the response rate was less than optimal, but entirely consistent with prior web-based survey research (Crawford, Couper, & Lamais, 2001; Dillman & Bowker, 2001). Test data management principles were followed to maximize responses, including distributing the surveys via Qualtrics, sending follow-up reminders, hand delivering survey links to schools, and following up with phone calls (Dillman, 2007). Thus, this study may not be representative of all of the teachers surveyed or reliably generalized to other similar sampling frames (Creswell, 2008).
Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study and the resulting conclusions, several areas were identified that could be important considerations for future research. This study should be replicated with a larger sample drawn from a different geographic area in order to provide greater generalizability. Data analysis did not take into account the size of the schools surveyed; therefore, it is recommended that additional research be conducted based on the size of the school as it relates to student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools. Future researchers are also encouraged to survey paraprofessionals along with teachers; this may be especially important in Title I schools that have multiple adults, teachers, or tutors in a classroom. Furthermore, additional research in the area of institutional integrity in urban Title I schools could be beneficial to the field of education. Finally, future researchers should include a qualitative method to interview teachers to gain knowledge of their experiences teaching in a urban Title I elementary school.

Concluding Observations

This study was conducted to examine the relationship of organizational health and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. As a result of this study, a number of correlations between organizational health and student achievement of urban Title I elementary schools were identified as statistically significant. Using a multiple regression technique, final data results revealed that teacher affiliation was a predictor of student achievement. Since the results of this study provided consistent information that may be used in further investigations with similar topics, findings and conclusions may be incorporated into the existing knowledge base of organizational
health and student achievement. The most compelling results from this study is that teachers matter in increasing student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama.
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APPENDIX A

OHI-E SURVEY
**OHI-E**

**Directions:** The following are statements about your school. Please indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes your school from rarely occurs to very frequently occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely Occurs</th>
<th>Sometimes Occurs</th>
<th>Often Occurs</th>
<th>Very Frequently Occurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The principal gets what he or she asks for from superiors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The principal discusses classroom issues with teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The principal accepts questions without appearing to snub or quash the teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extra materials are available if requested.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students neglect to complete homework.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students are cooperative during classroom instruction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The principal is able to influence the actions of his or her superiors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The principal goes out of his or her way to show appreciation to teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classrooms.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers in this school like each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers receive necessary classroom supplies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The principal conducts meaningful evaluations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Students respect others who get good grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers feel pressure from the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The principal's recommendations are given serious consideration by his or her superiors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The principal maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Supplementary materials are available for classroom use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of faculty members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers express pride in their school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Teachers identify with the school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The school is open to the whims of the public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. A few vocal parents can change school policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Students try hard to improve on previous work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The learning environment is orderly and serious.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The principal is friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. There is a feeling of trust and confidence among the staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Teachers show commitment to their students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Teachers are indifferent to each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Copyright © Hoy, 2003]
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May 23, 2012
Dear Lora--

You have my permission to use the OHI-E in your research. The measure and detail about it can be found on my web page [www.waynehoy.com].

Best wishes.

Wayne

Wayne K. Hoy
Fawcett Professor of
Education Administration

hoy.16@osu.edu
www.waynehoy.com

On May 23, 2012, at 6:38 PM, Lora Perry wrote:

Dear Dr. Hoy,

My name is Lora Perry. I am a doctoral student at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). My dissertation chairperson in the Educational Leadership Department is Dr. Loucrecia Collins. I am conducting a research study to explore the relationship among organizational health factors and student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in central Alabama.

I am requesting permission to use OHI-E in my research. By granting me permission, you will have agreed to allow me to use your survey to determine the overall health of the schools in my research. If you have any questions, please contact me by emailing me. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,
Lora Perry
UAB Doctoral Student
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LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENT
June 01, 2012

Dear Superintendent:

My name is Lora Johnson Perry. I am a doctoral student at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). I am presently working on my dissertation in the Educational Leadership Department under the direction of Dr. Lourecicia Collins. I am conducting a study entitled *An Investigation of Organizational Health and Student Achievement in Urban Title I Elementary Schools in Alabama*. The purpose of this research is to examine factors of organizational health of urban Title I elementary schools and their potential the impact on student achievement.

I am requesting permission to conduct this research in your district. By granting me permission to conduct research in your school district, you will have agreed to allow me to administer electronic surveys to teachers in Title I elementary schools and access to the Title I elementary schools’ SAT-10 scores for 2011. By participating in this study, your district will be adding to the general body of knowledge on organizational health and student achievement. Your decision to allow or not to allow your school district to participate is voluntary and will be kept confidential. If you choose not to allow your district to participate or to withdraw the district from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. There are no risks associated with this research.

All surveys are anonymous and respondents’ answers will be kept completely confidential. The results of the study may be published but the district, the school, and participants’ names will not be known. The anonymity of the district and school personnel will be protected through the use of coding. All records will be retained for at least three years on a computer that is password protected. After three years, all records will be destroyed by the researcher.

If you have questions concerning this research study, please contact me at (205) 253-5503 or email me at laiperry@yahoo.com. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Lourecicia Collins at (205) 919-7466 or lcollins@uab.edu. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints regarding the rights of research participants in this study, please contact the Director of the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (OIRB) at UAB at (205) 934-3789 or 1-800-822-8816.

By signing below and checking below, you are acknowledging your understanding of the information provided to you and your decision to participate. You will be given a copy of this form for your records. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Lora Johnson Perry
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E-MAIL INVITATION
Email Invitation

Dear Teacher:

My name is Lora Perry. I am a doctoral student at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB). I am presently working on my dissertation in the Educational Leadership Department under the direction of Dr. Loucrecia Collins. I am inviting you to participate in a brief web-based research study titled “An Investigation of Organizational Health and Student Achievement in Urban Title I Elementary Schools in Alabama”- Protocol Number: X120530013. You are being asked to participate in this survey because you teach in an urban Title I elementary school in central Alabama. The purpose of this research is to examine factors of organizational health of urban Title I elementary schools and the impact on student achievement.

If you agree to participate, you will complete a brief informative web-based survey using Qualtrics. The survey is a 37 item Likert survey. The survey should only take 10 to 15 minutes to complete. I will use the survey results to determine the overall health of the schools in my research. Your participation is voluntary. You may withdraw from the research at any time by exiting the site. There will be no penalty. If you choose to withdraw, your decision to participate will be kept confidential.

Your survey responses will be anonymous. The results of the study may be published, but your name or school will not be known. All records will be retained for three years on a computer that is password protected. After three years, all records will be destroyed by the researcher.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study. Your contribution is important to this research study.

If you have any questions concerning this survey or research study, please feel free to contact me 205-253-5503 or by email at lajperry@yahoo.com. If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research, you may contact the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (OIRB) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) at 934-3789 or 1-800-822-8816. If calling the toll free number, press the option for “all other calls” or for an operator/attendant and ask for extension 4-3789. Regular hours for the OIRB are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT, Monday through Friday. You may also call this number in the event the research staff cannot be reached or you wish to talk to someone else.

If you agree to participate, click on the link below to complete the survey.

http://bamaesprmc.us2.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6hPN7H0VnxcmSJ6
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INFORMATION SHEET
TITLE OF RESEARCH: An Investigation of Organizational Health and Student Achievement
In Urban Title I Elementary Schools in Alabama

IRB PROTOCOL: X120530013

INVESTIGATOR: Lora J. Perry

SPONSOR: The University of Alabama at Birmingham
Department of Human Studies

Explanation of Procedures

You are being asked to participate in a dissertation research study. Your participation in the research is voluntary. You have been asked to participate in this study because you teach at an urban Title I elementary school in Central Alabama. The purpose of this quantitative study is to examine the factors of organizational health and the impact on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Alabama. This research is important because it will add to the general body of knowledge on organizational health and student achievement. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a 37 item electronic survey. This web based survey should take approximately 10-15 minutes. You may complete the survey in the privacy of your home or at a convenient location.

Your survey responses will be anonymous. You have the option to withdraw from the study at any time or not to participate. There is no penalty. The data from this research will be used in partial fulfillment of the Investigator’s doctoral dissertation degree requirement. Please respond to the survey by September 30, 2012. You may print a copy of this document for your records.

Risks and Discomforts

The risks and discomforts involved in this study are no greater than the risks and discomforts of day-to-day living. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with your participation in this study.

(continued)
Benefits

You may not personally or financially benefit from participating in this study. However, your participation may provide valuable information as it relates to a greater understanding of organizational health factors and the impact on student achievement in urban Title I elementary schools in Central Alabama.

Confidentiality

The information obtained during this study will be kept confidential. Your survey responses will be combined with all the others and only group responses will be reported. Your responses will be anonymous. The electronic data from this research will be stored on password protected computers. The anonymity of the participants and schools will be protected through coding. All records will be retained for three years on a password protected computer. After three years, all records will be destroyed by the researcher.

Refusal or Withdrawal without Penalty

Your participation in this research is voluntary. At any point, either prior to or even during the process, you are free to withdraw from this research without penalty. Your decision to participate will not affect your relationship with the investigator or the institution. Your responses will not affect your participation in the study.

Cost of Participation

There will be no cost to you for taking part in this study.

Payment for Participation in Research

Your participation in this study is on a volunteer basis. There is no financial payment for participation in the research.

Alternatives

Your alternative is to not participate in this study.

Questions

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this research, please contact Lora Perry at 205-253-5503 or email at lajperry@yahoo.com. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may contact the Office of the Institutional Review Board for Human Use (OIRB) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB) at 934-3789 or 1-800-822-8816. If calling (continued)
the toll free number, press the option for “all other calls” or for an operator/attendant and ask for extension 4-3789. Regular hours for the Office of the IRB are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. CT, Monday through Friday. You may also call this number in the event the research staff cannot be reached or you wish to talk to someone else.

**Legal Rights**

You are not waiving any of your legal rights by clicking the link to proceed.

I have read this information sheet. The study has been explained to me. I understand what I will be asked to do. I freely agree to take part in the study.