RELATIONSHIPS AMONG INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY, PRINCIPAL OPENNESS AND TEACHER OPENNESS TO TEACHER LOYALTY TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE PRINCIPAL AND COLLEAGUES

Lum Hkung[1] and Zin Nwe Than[2]

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among teachers' perceptions of institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues at selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. The study was guided by three research questions. The study used quantitative research design. The research participants purposively selected based on research were 271 teachers and 5 principals from 5 selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. The data of the study were collected through *"The School Climate and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ)"* developed by Reiss and Hoy (1998, as cited in Walker, 2003) and *"The Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ)"* developed by Reiss and Hoy (1998, as cited in Walker, 2003). Pearson product-moment correlation was used for the analysis of the three research questions. Regarding to the results from the data analysis, it was found that there was no significance relationship between "institutional integrity" and "teacher loyalty to the school system". "Principal openness" was found a significance positive relationship with "teacher loyalty to the principal" and it also found that there was a significance positive relationship between "teacher openness" and "teacher loyalty to colleagues". The findings of this study have implications to the role of principal in leadership behaviour and teacher collegiality. Based on the findings, this study also provides recommendations for practices and further research.

Keywords: institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, teacher loyalty to the principal, teacher loyalty to colleagues

Introduction

Education is one of the cores for nation's development and prosperity. For the quality education, school should be more effective centers not only of teaching-learning, but of emotional and social integration and of inculcation of a new value system. School effectiveness is concerned with the structures and culture of an institution and expressing the manners in which plans, policies and practices help in improving the overall objectives of the school and teacher effectiveness (Hargreaves, 2001, as cited in Dahiru, Basri, Aji & Asimiran, 2018). There is a variety of ways to conceptualize the nature of the school organization. The fundamental starting point is the concept of social system of action (Parson, 1951). All social systems have some activities and functions that are accomplished in a fairly stable fashion (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). The structure of the school is through role allocation and performance that the system is accomplished and maintained (Reddy & Sailakshmi, 2018). Therefore, there are social positions of the student, members of the teaching and non-teaching staff in the school (Sharman, 2017). As a social system, the school is characterized by an interdependence of parts, a complex network of social relationship and its own unique culture (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). On the other hand, the school is one of the formal agencies for formal socialization. Therefore, the school is a community where people in the school interact with their environment doing common goals (Maxwell, Reynolds, Lee, Subasic & Bromhead, 2017). Additionally, socialization with environment can fulfill the school's needs and overcome disruptive forces from outside as it uses its power to accomplish its mission (Bustari, 2017).

---

[1] Senior Teacher, Basic Education High School - Naung Mon, Lashio, Myanmar.

[2] Dr, Professor and Head, Department of Educational Theory, Sagaing University of Education, Myanmar.

Besides, the principal is also essential to create an effective school. Moreover, the internal components of social system are consistent with each other in a dynamic process to produce an effective school (Dahiru *et al.*, 2018). Furthermore, teacher loyalty in the school organization is the only factor that behind the success of the school organization (Khan. M, Jan, Khan. I, Khan. S & Saif, 2015).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships among teachers' perceptions of institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues at selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township.

Research Questions

The following research questions guide the direction of the study.

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system at selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township?
2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between principal openness and teacher loyalty to the principal at selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township?
3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between teacher openness and teacher loyalty to colleagues at selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township?

Scope of the Study

The scope of this study is limited to Basic Education High Schools (not including Branch High Schools) in Lashio Township because of the available time and resources of the researcher. The sample schools are limited to the schools in which the principals have at least two year of administrative service at the current schools and the teachers have at least two complete years at the current schools. This study is also limited to Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township because the findings of this study may not be generalized to any other school than high schools in Lashio Township.

Operational Definitions of the Key Terms

The operational definitions of the key terms for this study are described as follows;

Institutional Integrity refers to the school system's ability to adapt to its environment and cope in ways of that maintain the soundness of its educational programs. Schools in systems with integrity are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Principal Openness refers to the degree to which the principal listens to and is open to teacher suggestions, gives genuine and frequent praise, and respects the professional competence of the faculty (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Principal Openness is composed of three principal behaviours such as supportive principal behaviour, directive principal behviour and restrictive principal behaviour.

> **(i) Supportive Principal Behaviour** is defined as behaviour of a principal that includes frequent praise of teachers. Criticism is constructive. Supportive principals respect the professional competence of their staffs and exhibit both a personal and professional interest in each teacher (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

(ii) Directive Principal Behaviour is defined as behaviour that requires rigid, close supervision. The principal maintains close and constant control over all teachers and school activities, down to the smallest details. (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

(iii)Restrictive principal behaviour is defined as behaviour that results in teachers being burdened with paperwork, committee requirements, routine duties, and other demands. It hinders rather than facilitates teacher work (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Teacher Openness refers to the degree to which teacher behaviour supports open and professional interactions. Teachers know each other well and are personal friends. They cooperate and are committed to their students (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Teacher openness is composed of three teacher behaviours such as collegial teacher behaviour, intimate teacher behaviour and disengaged teacher behaviour.

(i) Collegial Teacher Behavior is defined as behaviour which facilitates a pervasive professional relationship between teachers. Teachers are proud of their schools and take pleasure in working with their colleagues (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp. 1991).

(ii) Intimate Teacher Behavior is defined as behaviour in which strong social relationships are developed among the faculty (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

(iii)Disengaged Teacher Behavior refers to a lack of meaning and focus to professional activities. (Hoy *et al*., 1991).

Teacher Loyalty to the School System is a strong belief in and acceptance of the system's goals and values, a willingness to exert substantial effort on behalf of the system, and a strong desire to maintain teacher in the school system (Parson, 1967, as cited in Walker, 2003).

Teacher Loyalty to the Principal is a strong belief in and acceptance of the principal's goals and values, the willing compliance to perform duties for the principal that are not required by the formal organization, and a strong desire to maintain a professional relationship with the principal (Parsons, 1967, as cited in Walker, 2003).

Teacher Loyalty to Colleagues is the sharing of norms and values with the school staff, a willingness to exert effort beyond that normally expected in order to help colleagues achieve an organizational goal, and a strong desire to maintain a professional relationship with the faculty (Parsons, 1967, as cited in Walker, 2003).

Review of Related Literature

Institutional Integrity

Institutional integrity of a school can mobilize its resources and efforts to achieve its goals. It is important for schools to have legitimacy and backing in the community (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). It is also a community where people in the school interact with their environment doing common goals (Maxwell *et al*., 2017). The school with high institutional integrity can manage public resources efficiently and to adequate public participation in school activities. Moreover, when the institutional integrity of the school is high, people will carry out their duties and continues with their growth and development (Noori & Sabokro, 2016).Therefore, the principal and teachers need supports to perform their respective functions in a harmonious fashion without undue pressure and interference from individuals and groups outside the school (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Principal Openness

The principal occupies an important position in the school building. In order to survive and grow, the principal establishes important relationships with the teachers (Drake, 1992, as

206

J. Myanmar Acad. Arts Sci. 2021 **Vol. XIX. No.9A**

cited in Edgerson, 2006). Principal openness deals with the patterns of relationships that exist between principal and teachers in the school. Principal openness is one in which both the principal and teachers are genuine in their behavior. The principal leads by trust, providing the proper blend of structure and direction as well as support and consideration (Hoy, 1990). Therefore, the impression of the principal's benevolence, honesty, openness, competence, and consistency all contribute potently to the trust that the faculty place in the principal (Handford & Leithwood, 2013, as cited in Tschannen-Moran & Garies, 2015). Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) defined the concepts of principal openness. They defined principal openness in terms of three behaviors: supportive, directive and restrictive behavior.

Supportive Principal Behaviour: Principal's supportive behaviour consists of being friendly and approachable as a leader and includes attending to the well-being and human needs of teachers. In addition, such principal treat teachers as equal and give them respect for their status (Northouse, 2016). Moreover, the principal supports teachers and particularly careful so as not to allow the daily tasks to interfere with the responsibilities of teachers (Rapti, 2013). According to Hoy and Hannum (1997), the principal's supportive actions were a key to effective learning.

Directive Principal Behaviour: Directive principal behavior is characterized by authoritarian and legitimate power that uses high levels of strict direction, command and close supervision to provide psychological structure and task clarity (Northouse, 2016). Therefore, principal's directive behavior is non-supportive, inflexible, hindering, and controlling and a teacher that is divisive, intolerant, apathetic, and uncommitted (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Restrictive Principal Behaviour: A restrictive principal does not communicate openly with staff members but rather dictates what he or she wants done and maintains control over all aspects of the school organization (Hoy *et al.*, 1991). Restrictive principal behavior reflects a lack of understanding at the school and focusing on professional activities. The teachers only fill in time (Altinkurt, 2014). Finally, teachers working for principals who exhibit restrictive behavior do not have enough time to do meaningful work (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Teacher Openness

Teacher openness is considered as the mental and emotional attitude of teachers towards their tasks that has a direct effect on the enthusiasm, confidence, loyalty and interest displayed in performing their job. Teacher openness assists in establishing the character of a school and it is one of the factors that determine whether a school functions at its best or not (Ellenberg, 1972, as cited in Eboka, 2017). According to Lumsden (1998, as cited in Eboka, 2017) the absent of teacher openness can lead to a decrease in teacher productivity, loss of concern for students, alienation from colleagues, depression, and increased rate of sickness resulting in absenteeism on some workdays, general fatigue and burnout. Therefore, these roles undoubtedly have a profound influence in the attainment of school goals and objectives (Olujuwon & Perumal, 2015). Hoy *et al.* (1991) defined teacher openness as having three levels of behaviour: collegial, intimate and disengaged.

Collegial Teacher Behaviour

Teachers' satisfaction with their social and professional needs such as help, support, work with each other are important aspects of collegial teacher behavior (Halpin & Croft, 1963). According to Jarzabkowski (2002, as cited in Shah, 2012), collegiality encompasses both professional and social/emotional interaction in the workplace while collaboration mostly relates to the professional sphere of relationships. Collegial teacher behavior creates a feeling that it was important to know their colleagues on a level deeper than 'teachers': to know them as

'individuals'. It also plays a significant role in improving teaching and instructional practices and fostering innovation (Brownell et al., 2006; Zhao *et al*., 2002, as cited in Shah, 2012).

Intimate Teacher Behaviour

Intimate teacher behaviour involves "seeing" and being "seen" by having an empathic perception and a depth of understanding of the other (Kark, 2012). . In other words, their closest friends are among their colleagues (Selmat, Samsu & Kamalu, 2013). There is also a mutual validation of self-worth and collaboration among colleagues (Kark, 2012). Moreover, friendly social interaction may improve the emotional health of the colleagues, thus reducing emotional stress and burnout (Wainaina, Kipchumba & kombo, 2014).

Disengaged Teacher Behaviour

Disengagement may be particularly difficult to negotiate in relationships in which continued, frequent contact is mandatory (Sias & Perry, 2004). Disengaged teachers are not enthusiastic; they do not want to expend extra effort and support team work (Heikkeri, 2010). Disengaged teachers are disconnected from their jobs, tend to be significantly less efficient and less loyal to their school, principal, and colleagues; they are less satisfied with their personal lives, experience more stress and insecurity about their job than their colleagues (Gallup 2001, as cited in Heikkeri, 2010).

Teacher Loyalty to the School System

Teacher loyalty is teachers felt good and satisfied with the working environment and the work itself, thereby heightening their allegiance to the organization, and bringing forth their positive commitment towards the organization (Lee. Y, Lee. I & Lin, 2015).Teacher loyalty to the school system also brings faithfulness between individual teacher and the school. Teachers may consider themselves loyal to the school if they show up for work, complete required job assignments and do not take advantage of gaps in the school's monitoring of their performance (Khan *et al*., 2015). Teacher loyalty to the school is characterized as a strong desire to maintain membership of the school, and plays a positive role in retention of members in the school (Maric, Ferjan, Dimovski & Cerne, 2011).

Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

Teacher loyalty to the principal in the school has been linked to the concept of authority (Weber, 1964, as cited in Walker, 2003). Hoy and Miskel (2013) identified two other types of authority: formal and informal. Moreover, Hoy and Rees (1975) connected the concept of loyalty and these two types of authority by saying that highly influential principals would command more loyalty from teachers than less influential principals (Walker, 2003). Moreover, teachers in the school may have a cognitive orientation to their principal in terms of holding firmly to a set of beliefs that embody an unquestioning faith, trust, and loyal to the principal. Therefore, it can be concluded that principal with high emotional detachment would have significantly greater teacher loyalty than principal with low emotional detachment, and hierarchically independent principal would have significantly greater teacher loyalty than hierarchically dependent principals (Hoy & Rees, 1975).

Teacher Loyalty to Colleagues

Studies of loyalty to colleagues are founded in studies of groups in the workplace (Walker, 2003). Teacher loyalty among colleagues is based upon mutual commitments to maintain interpersonal harmony, to merit trust and to persist in allegiance between partners even in the presence of alternatives (Khan *et al*., 2015). Moreover, teacher loyalty among colleagues

contributes greatly to teacher performance (Preko & Adjetey, 2013). As a result, teachers become aware of their own strengths and weaknesses and deploy the necessary facilities to increase their effective performance (Saljooghi & Salehi, 2016). Therefore, loyalty of individual teacher represents a great advantage to the school whereas loyalty is the element that determines stability among colleagues (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Parsons (1967, as cited in Walker, 2003) emphasized that in order for an organization to survive, grow and achieve its goals, each level of the organization must generate employee loyalty. Therefore, it is important that schools must have loyal employees at each level of the organization for the success of the school (Walker, 2003).

Methodology

Population and Sample

The target population of this study was all principals and teachers (primary, junior and senior teachers) from all Basic Education High Schools (not including Branch High Schools) in Lashio Township. Purposive sampling is used in this study. Participants were selected by using the criterion that the principals who had at least two years of longevity and teachers who had been at least two complete years in the current school. Participants in this study were 5 principals and 271 teachers representing the 5 selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. The principal sample consisted of 1 male principal and 4 female principals. As for teachers, 3 (1.11%) of the participants were male teachers and 268 (98.89%) are female teachers. Among them, 90 (33.21%) were senior teachers, 138 (50.92%) were junior teacher and 43 (15.87) were primary teachers respectively.

Research Instrument

Questionnaires were used for the collection of data to answer the research questions. For this purpose, "Questionnaire for principals" was used to collect the general information of selected schools and basic demographic information of principal and "Questionnaire for teachers" was used to explore the basic demographic information of teachers and their perceptions of institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues. "Questionnaire for Teachers" included two parts. *"The School Climate and Health Questionnaire (SCHQ)"* and *"The Rutgers School Loyalty Questionnaire (RSLQ)"*.

"SCHQ" developed by Reiss and Hoy (1998, as cited in Walker, 2003) consists of 5-point Likert scale including "(1) never occurs", "(2) rarely occurs", (3) sometimes occurs", "(4) often occurs" and "(5) very frequently occurs". This questionnaire consists of 48 items defining three variable: institutional integrity, principal openness and teacher openness. *"RSLQ"* developed by Reiss and Hoy (1998, as cited in Walker, 2003) was also used to measure teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues. The RSLQ has three factors: teacher loyalty to the school system, teacher loyalty to the principal and teacher loyalty to colleagues. This questionnaire consists of 29 items and used 5-point Likert scale including"(1) strongly disagree", "(2) disagree", "(3) undecided", "(4) agree", and "(5) strongly agree".

Before field testing the instruments with a sample of teachers, the researcher created the teacher questionnaire based on *"SCHQ"* and *"RSLQ"* and then edited by the supervisor. Then, the instruments were reviewed by a panel of experts. The review panel scrutinized the instruments for format, dimension presentation, item clarity, instruction coherency, and grammar and syntax usages. The preliminary instruments were field tested by 2 principals (2 female principals) and 89 teachers (6 male teachers and 83 female teachers) representing 2 Basic Education High

Schools. The Pearson product-moment correlation method (Average Item Total Correlation) was used for the internal consistency reliability.

Data Collection Procedure

After taking permission from the responsible person, two types of questionnaires were distributed to 5 Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township from December 9, 2019 to December 13, 2019 and collected them after lasting 10 days. Data collected were listed by each school and data obtained from the study were scored.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated by using SPSS to explore institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues of selected high schools. The responses to each variable and dimension were calculated using mean and standard deviation scores. Moreover, procedures for scoring and analyzing data obtained on principal openness and teacher openness of the study were followed explicitly as instructed by Hoy *et al.*, (1991). Finally, Pearson product-moment correlation was utilized to investigate teachers' perceptions of institutional integrity, principal openness and teacher openness in relation to teacher loyalty.

Findings

According to Table 1, mean values of institutional integrity perceived by teachers from all selected high schools were at high levels. Similarly, the mean value for "overall institutional integrity" was at high level in all selected high schools.

Table 1 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Institutional Integrity Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

Schools	Mean	Standard Deviation
School A	4.42	(.376)
School B	4.36	(.395)
School C	3.93	(.637)
School D	4.27	(.609)
School E	4.49	(.250)
All Schools	**4.27**	**(.525)**

Note: 1.00-2.33 = low level,   2.34-3.67 = moderate level,   3.68-5.00 = high level

Procedures for scoring and analyzing data obtained on principal openness and teacher openness of the study were followed explicitly as instructed by Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991). First convert mean value of each dimension to standardized scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100, using the following formulae:

SdS for S= 100x(S-36.05)/6.302 + 500

SdS for D= 100x(D-35.19)/5.476 + 500

SdS for R= 100x(R-16.24)/3.197 + 500

The SdS scores were then used to calculate principal openness. The principal openness were computed using the following formula:

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

Table 2 depicts mean values and standard deviations of principal openness perceived by teachers in all selected Basic Education High Schools. According to Table 2, "supportive behaviour" of School A's principal was the highest and School E's principal was the lowest. The mean value for the "overall supportive behaviour" was at average level in all selected high schools. Similarly, "directive behaviour" of School B's principal was the highest and School C's principal was the lowest. The mean value for "overall directive behaviour" was at average level in all selected high schools. Again, "restrictive behaviour" of School B's was the highest and School C's principal was the lowest. The mean value for "overall restrictive behaviour" was at average level in all selected high schools. When analyzing the mean value for "principal openness", School C's principal was the highest and School B's principal was the lowest. Moreover, the mean value for "overall principal openness" indicated that principals from selected Basic Education High Schools had moderate level of principal openness.

Table 2 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Principal Openness Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

School	Dimensions of Principal Openness			Principal Openness
	Supportive Behaviour	Directive Behaviour	Restrictive Behaviour	
School A	556.39 (87.467)	519.20 (85.675)	491.41 (92.635)	515.26 (34.240)
School B	484.49 (95.5310	551.58 (72.473)	523.32 (90.639)	469.86 (46.659)
School C	493.12 108.100	434.14 (128.659)	467.99 (116.766)	530.33 (45.004)
School D	487.95 (91.546)	490.22 (79.849)	508.99 (88.850)	496.25 (36.919)
School E	460.90 (93.638)	494.01 (68.628)	510.83 (105.252)	485.35 (47.737)
All Schools	**499.97** (100)	**500.03** (99.998)	**500.00** (99.996)	**499.98** (47.537)

Note: below 400=very low,   400-449=low,
    450-474=below average   475-489=slightly below average,
    490-510= average,   511-524= slightly above average,
    525-549= above average,   550-600= high,
    above 600= very high

Again, mean values of teacher openness were calculated and then converted into standardized scores by using the following formulae:

SdS for C= 100x(C-33.85)/4.431 + 500

SdS for Int= 100x (Int- 29.11)/4.267 + 500

SdS for Dis= 100x (Dis- 6.60)/ 2.347 + 500

These SdS scores were then used to compute teacher openness by using the formula given by Hoy et al.(1991).

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

Table 3 depicts mean values and standard deviations of teacher openness perceived by teachers in all selected Basic Education High Schools. According to Table 3, "collegial behaviour" of teachers from School A was the highest and School E was the lowest. The mean

value for "overall collegial behaviour" was at average level in all selected high schools. Similarly, "intimate behaviour" of teachers from School A was the highest and School E was the lowest. The mean value for "overall intimate behaviour" was at average level in selected high schools. In the same taken, "disengaged behaviour" of teachers from School C was the highest and School A was the lowest. The mean value for "overall disengaged behaviour" was at average level in all selected high schools. When examining the mean value for "teacher openness", teachers from School A was the highest and School C was the lowest. Moreover, the mean value for "overall teacher openness" indicated that teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools had moderate level of teacher openness.

Table 3 Mean Values and Standard Deviation of Teacher Openness Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

School	Dimensions of Teacher Openness			Teacher Openness
	Collegial Behaviour	Intimate Behaviour	Disengaged Behaviour	
School A	530.23 (83.427)	540.25 (82.495)	450.19 (81.826)	540.10 (60.650)
School B	496.19 (95.553)	473.31 (110.653)	484.32 (82.394)	495.06 (80.302)
School C	478.18 (110.256)	490.39 (100.203)	542.61 (111.825)	475.32 (79.301)
School D	519.39 (94.427)	519.58 (94.005)	529.44 (103.289)	503.18 (74.486)
School E	456.69 (107.885)	465.10 (85.517)	492.07 (89.314)	476.57 (73.467)
All Schools	**499.97** (99.997)	**499.93** (99.999)	**499.91** (99.996)	**500.00** (77.409)

Note: below 400=very low,   400-449=low,
      450-474=below average   475-489=slightly below average,
      490-510= average,   511-524= slightly above average,
      525-549= above average,   550-600= high,
      above 600= very high

Referring to Table 4, the mean values for teacher loyalty to the school system in School E was at moderate level while the remaining selected high schools were at high levels. Similarly, the mean value for "overall teacher loyalty to the school system" indicated that teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township had high level of loyalty to the school system.

Table 4 Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Teacher Loyalty to the School System Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

Schools	Mean	Standard Deviation
School A	4.25	.593
School B	3.74	.531
School C	3.83	.590
School D	4.13	.435
School E	3.53	.533
All Schools	**3.93**	**.590**

Note: 1.00-2.33 = low level,   2.34-3.67 = moderate level,   3.68-5.00 = high level

According to Table 5, the mean values for teacher loyalty to the principal in all selected high schools indicated that teachers from all selected high school had high levels of teacher loyalty to their principals. Similarly, the mean value for "overall teacher loyalty to the principal" showed that teachers from selected high schools had high level of teacher loyalty to the principal.

Table 5 Mean Values and Standard Deviations for Teacher Loyalty to the Principal Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

Schools	Mean	Standard Deviation
School A	4.22	.369
School B	3.73	.373
School C	4.03	.393
School D	3.98	.395
School E	3.87	.286
All Schools	**3.97**	**.409**

Note: 1.00-2.33 = low level,   2.34-3.67 = moderate level,   3.68-5.00 = high level

Moreover, Table 6 depicts mean values and standard deviations of teacher loyalty to colleagues in all selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. Data obtained from Table 6, the mean values for "teacher loyalty to colleagues" were at high levels in all selected high schools. Similarly, the mean value for "overall teacher loyalty to colleagues" indicated that teachers from selected high schools had high level of teacher loyalty to colleagues.

Table 6 Mean Values and Standard Deviations for Teacher Loyalty to Colleagues Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

Schools	Mean	Standard Deviation
School A	4.20	.425
School B	3.91	.486
School C	3.81	.461
School D	4.05	.375
School E	3.95	.339
All Schools	**3.99**	**.451**

Note: 1.00-2.33 = low level,   2.34-3.67 = moderate level,   3.68-5.00 = high level

Based on the perceptions of teachers displayed in Table 7, teachers from all selected high schools indicated that their schools had high levels of "institutional integrity", "teacher loyalty to the school system", "teacher loyalty to the principal" and "teacher loyalty to colleagues". Again, they perceived that they had average levels of "principal openness" and "teacher openness".

Table 7 Mean Values of All Variables Perceived by Teachers in Selected Basic Education High Schools

Schools	School A	School B	School C	School D	School E	All Schools
Institutional Integrity	4.42	4.36	3.93	4.27	4.49	**4.27**
Principal Openness	515.26	469.86	530.33	496.25	485.35	**499.98**
Teacher Openness	540.10	495.06	475.32	503.18	476.57	**500.00**
Teacher Loyalty to the School System	4.25	3.74	3.83	4.13	3.53	**3.93**
Teacher Loyalty to the principal	4.22	3.73	4.03	3.98	3.87	**3.97**
Teacher Loyalty to Colleagues	4.20	3.91	3.81	4.05	3.95	**3.99**

Pearson product-moment correlation between teachers' perceptions of institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system was done and presented in Table 8. Based on the findings, there was no significant correlation between "institutional integrity" and "teacher loyalty to the school system" in all selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township.

Table 8 Correlation between Teachers' Perceptions of Institutional Integrity and Teacher Loyalty to the School System

	1	**2**
1. **Institutional Integrity**	1	
2. **Teacher Loyalty to the School System**	.085	1

Similarly, the correlation between teachers' perceptions of principal openness and teacher loyalty to the principal in all selected Basic Education High Schools are shown in Table 9. The result of the findings indicated that "principal openness" was positively and significantly correlated with "teacher loyalty to the principal" ($r=.281^{**}$, $p<0.01$).

Table 9 Correlation between Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Openness and Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

	1	**2**
1. **Principal Openness**	1	
2. **Teacher Loyalty to the Principal**	.281 **	1

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

In the same taken, the correlation between teachers' perceptions of teacher openness and teacher loyalty to colleagues in selected Basic Education High Schools is presented in Table 10. Based on the information given in Table 10, the correlation coefficient ($r=.628^{**}$, $p<0.01$) was indicated that there was a positive and significant correlation between "teacher openness" and "teacher loyalty to colleagues" in selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township.

Table 10   Correlation between Teachers' Perceptions of Principal Openness and Teacher Loyalty to the Principal

	1	**2**
1. **Teacher Openness**	1	
2. **Teacher Loyalty to Colleagues**	.628**	1

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

Discussion and Conclusion

This study highlights to investigate the relationships among institutional integrity, principal openness, teacher openness, teacher loyalty to the school system, the principal and colleagues at Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. Based on the research findings, there was no significant correlation between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system ($r=.085$). It can be interpreted that whether the school is able to cope successfully with destructive external forces or not, teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township were willing to exert substantial effort on behalf of the school system and a strong desire to maintain employment in the school system. The finding of this study is consistent with the study conducted by Walker (2003) which found that there was no significant relationship between institutional integrity and teacher loyalty to the school system. Thus, the researcher would like to give a piece of advice that high level of institutional integrity will not increase teacher loyalty to the school system.

Moreover, when investigating the relationship between principal openness and teacher loyalty to the principal, it was found that "principal openness" was significantly and positively correlated with "teacher loyalty the principal" ($r=.281$, $p<0.01$). Therefore it can be interpreted that the principal who listens to and is open to teacher suggestions, gives genuine and frequent praise, and respects the professional competence of teachers will likely to be more effect on teacher loyalty to the principal. This finding is consistent to the findings of Reiss (1994, as cited in Walker, 2003), and Hoy and Rees (1975) which stated that the greater the degree of openness in principal, the greater was the teacher loyalty to the principal. Therefore, the researcher wants to suggest the principals from Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township that the manner in which the principals carried out their duties such as "supportive", "directive" and "restrictive" behaviours affected teacher loyalty to the principal and this in turn as well as how they related to the authority. In addition, the findings revealed that the openness behaviour employed by the principals has implications for teacher loyalty to the principal.

Similarly, when analyzing the correlation between "teacher openness" and "teacher loyalty to colleagues", a positive and moderate correlation was found between teacher openness and teacher loyalty to colleagues ($r=.628$, $p<0.01$). It can be interpreted that teachers who are open in behaviour will maintain a professional relationship with colleagues and influence teacher loyalty to colleagues. This finding is congruence with Angle and Perry (1981, as cited in Walker, 2003) which stated that the greater the degree of openness of teachers, the greater was the teacher loyalty to colleagues. Therefore, the researcher would like to suggest teachers from selected Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township to reflect on their instructional strategies, share expertise and regularly collaborate in order to improve teacher loyalty to colleagues.

Based on the research findings, the researcher also wants to give suggestions to principals and teachers from Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township. With regard to institutional integrity of the school, principals and teachers from Basic Education High Schools in Lashio Township should try to maintain their integrity with the community to perform their respective functions in a harmonious fashion without undue pressure and interference from individuals and groups outside the school. Regarding principal openness, the principals should create positive climate in the school. They also should encourage life-long learning and should be open to allowing teachers who want to learn and improve, the opportunities to do so. Moreover, they also should practice more supportive behaviour and less directive and restrictive behaviours. Again, with regard to teacher openness, teachers should establish an environment that encourages and promotes collaborative relationships. Additionally, they also should try to establish collegiality and intimacy and minimize disengagement between colleagues in order to establish more teacher openness. In addition, with regard to teacher loyalty to three levels of organization, it was found that teachers' perceptions were high levels in teacher loyalty to the school system, teacher loyalty to the principal and teacher loyalty to colleagues. Therefore, the researcher wants to suggest that they should maintain a strong belief and faithfulness between teacher and the school. They also should accept the principals' goals and values. Additionally, they also should exert effort to help colleagues and maintain a professional relationship with colleagues.

In conclusion, this study leaves an important message to those who would like to improve teacher loyalty in the educational organization. In an educational context, both principals and teachers aware that schools with integrity are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands and also provide school products. Furthermore, they also should know that they need open and genuine in their behaviours. The principals should appropriately develop their behaviour according to the given situation of task and followers. Moreover, the principals need to know why and how their behaviour can bring into teacher loyalty. Similarly, teachers should use open behaviour to improve teacher relationship in the work place. Additionally, they should know that what make teacher loyalty related to the school system, the principal and

colleagues. The principals and teachers should know that teacher loyalty to the school system depend on the relationship in the school system. All in all, it can be generalized that the more principals practice openness behaviour highly, the more teacher loyalty to the principal. Similarly, the more openness behaviour of teacher is increased, the more teacher loyalty to colleagues will also be increased. In conclusion, other researches should be conducted on effectiveness in education organizational settings in order to improve the educational quality. As today, improvements are based on the recommendations of the study so that they will uncover other factors that the primary researchers did not find out. As a result, the possibilities for further studies are endless and meaningful.

References

Altinkurt, Y. (2014). The relationship between school climate and teachers' organizational silence behavior. *Anthropologist, 18*(2), 289-297. Retrieved August 4, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073. 2014.11891546

Bustari, M. (2017). The institutional integrity of secondary schools. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 66, 370-372. Retrieved August 5, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.2991/yicemap-17.2017.65

Dahiru, A. S., Basri, R., Aji, A. A., & Asimiran, S. (2018). Modelling social system for school effectiveness. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 8*(12), 178-186.doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i12/5004

Eboka, O. C. (2017). Influence of school climate on teachers, morale in public secondary schools in Delta state. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 7*(1), 19-24. doi:10.9790/7388-0701031924

Edgerson, D. E. (2006). The critical role of the teacher-principal relationship in the improvement of student achievement in public schools of the United States. *The lamar university of Journal of Student Research*, 3 , 1-6 . Retrieved August 3, 2019 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491985.pdf

Halpin, A. W. & Croft, D. B. (1963). The organizational climate of schools. *Administrator's Notebook, Midwest Administration Center, 11*(7). Retrieved August 2, 2019 from https://www.donpugh.com/Education/questionnaires/THE%2520ORGANIZATIONAL%2520CLIMATE%2520OF%2520SCHOOLS

Heikkeri, E. (2010). *Roots and consequences of the employee disengagement phenomenon* (M.Ed Thesis). Retrieved August 7, 2019 from https://pdfs.sematicscholar.org/58be/f1d0e868e8a19f198e3c1b19e140 66e3f2d2

Hoy, W. K. & Hannum, J. W. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational administration quarterly, 33*(3), 290-311. Retrieved August 3, 2019 from https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0013161X97033003003

Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1*(2), 149-168. Retrieved August 3, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532768xjep c0102_4

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (9th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoy, W. K., & Rees, R. (1975). Subordinate loyalty to immediate superior: A neglected concept in the study of educational administration. *Sociology of Education*, 47, 268-286. doi:10.1108/09578230010320082

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

Kark, R. (2012). Workplace intimacy in leader-follower relationships. doi:10. 1093/oxfordhb/9780199734610. 013.0032

Khan, M. R., Jan, F., Khan, I., Khan, S., & Saif, N. (2015). The teachers' loyalty and its attributes: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies. 9*, 4-9. Retrieved July 1, 2019 from https://iiste.org/Journals/index .php/JAAS/article/view/22748

Lee, Y. J., Lee, I. C., & Lin, C. L. (2015). The impact of employee loyalty and organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A case of Taiwan-listed family business. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management, 41*(1), 8-25. Retrieved August 10, 2019 from https://www.jitbm.com/41%2520volume/2%2520ORGANIZATIONAL%2520CITIZENSHIP%2520BEHIVAOR.pdf

Maric, M., Ferjan, M., Dimovski, V., & Cerne, M. (2011). Job satisfaction and loyalty to the organization. Paper presented at the 30th International Conference on Organizational Science Development: Future Organization, Portoroz, Slovenia. Retrieved August 11, 2019 from https://www.Researchgate.net/ publication/273137168_Job_Satisfaction_and_Loyalty_to_the_Organization

Maxwell, S., Reynolds, K. J., Lee, E., Subasic, E., & Bromhead, D. (2017). The impact of school climate and school identification on academic achievement: Multilevel modeling with student and teacher data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1-21. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02069

Noori, R., & Sabokro, M. (2016). Effect of organizational culture on organizational health. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Sciences (IJAEMS), 2*(11), 1892-1904. Retrieved February 1, 2020 from https://ijaems.com /detail/effect-of-organizational-culture-on-organizational health

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oakes: Sage Publication, Inc.

Olujuwon, O. & Perumal, J. (2015). *Exploring the hindrances in advancing teacher leadership in Nigerian public secondary schools*. Paper presented at the eight International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation, Seville, Spain. Abstract retrieved from https://library.iated.org/view/ OLUJUWON2015 EXP

Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Preko, A., & Adjetey, J. (2013). A study on the concept of employee loyalty and engagement on the performance of sales executives of commercial banks in Ghana. *International Journal of Business Research and Management (UBRM), 4* (2), 51-62. Retrieved August 11, 2019 from https://www.cs-journals.org/ manu-script/Journals/IJBRM /Volume4/issue2/IJBRM-143.pdf

Rapti, D. (2013). School climate as an important component in school effectiveness. *Academic International Scientific Journal*, 8, 110-125. Retrieved August 3, 2019 from https://doi.org/10.7336/academicus. 2013.08.06

Reddy, M. V. V. S & Sailakshmi, M. (2018). The school as a social system- A review. *International Journal of Engineering Science Invention (IJESI), 7*(8), 74-77. Retrieved February 12, 2020 from http://www. ijesi.org/zpapers/Vol(7)i8/Ver sion5/L0708057477

Saljooghi, B., & Salehi, K. (2016). Developing a teacher evaluation model: The impact of teachers' attitude toward the performance evaluation system (PES) on job satisfaction and organizational commitment with the mediating role of teachers' sense of efficacy. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Science, 5*(5S), 200-209. Retrieved August 12, 2019 from https://www.Sematischolar.org /paper/Developing-a-Teacher-Evalustion-Model%253A-The-Impact-Saljooghi-Salehi/e5e0831a297190 16f d8a66d47eb152814 5 1b 2e61

Selmat, N., Samsu, N. Z., & Kamalu, N. S. M. (2013). The impact of organizational climate on teachers' job performance. *Educational Research E-Journal, 2*(1), 71-82. doi:10.5838/erej.2013.21.06

Shah, M. (2012). The impact of teachers' collegiality on their organizational commitment in high-and low-achieving secondary schools in Islamabad, Pakistan. *Journal of Studies in Education, 2*(2), 130-157. Retrieved August 5, 2019 from http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jse.v2i2.1493

Sharman, C. B. (2017). School as a social organization. Retrieved 11 December, 2019 from http://www. egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/8311/1/Unit-7.pdf

Sias, P. M., & Perry, T. (2004). Disengaging from workplace relationships. *Human Communication Research, 30*(4), 589-602. doi:10.1093/hcr/30.4.589

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 53*(1), 66-92. Retrieved July 1, 2019 from http://dx.doi. org/10.1108/JEA-02-2014-0024

Wainaina, J. K., Kipchumba, S., & Kombo, H. (2014). A study on effect of co-worker and student-teacher relationship on teachers' organizational commitment in public secondary schools: A case of nakuru north district, Kenya. *International Journal of Education and Research, 2*(2),1-16. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.2004. tb00746.x

Walker, K. F. R. (2003). *Faculty loyalty in high priority elementary schools* (PhD thesis). Retrieved July 1, 2019 from http://hdl.handle.net/10724/21201